Croatia: 2014–2016 End-of-term Report

The Croatian OGP action plan featured a host of commitments aimed at improving access to information, civic participation, and public accountability. The focus areas included the development of Right to Access Information legislation, deepening transparency in election and referendum cycles, and improving transparency in the public sector as well as in the Parliament. A change in government and two parliamentary election cycles negatively affected the second year of Croatia's OGP action plan implementation.

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 review of the activities of each OGP participating country. This report includes a summary of the implementation results for the period between July 2014 and June 2016 and includes developments up to September 2016, where relevant.

Croatia began its formal participation in August 2011. A special council known as the Council for the Open Government Partnership Initiative of the Government of the Republic of Croatia (referred to as the OGP Council) serves as a centralised hub for communication between implementing and monitoring stakeholders. The OGP Council is responsible for coordination of Croatia's national action plan with expert and administrative support provided by the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs. The implementation responsibilities are spread among a large group of government institutions, including the Croatian Parliament.

The OGP Council was headed by the minister for administration in 2016, whose appointment followed the parliamentary elections held in November 2015, and was to consist of 24 members, representing public, private, and civil society organisations. However, the new coalition government was voted out by their own parliamentary majority after less than six months in power, and it is expected that, following the 11 September 2016 parliamentary elections, the government will make new appointments to the OGP Council.

At the time of writing this report, Croatia had not presented a new action plan for its third cycle, which, according to the OGP schedule, should have started implementation in July 2016. This delay in implementing the third action plan was due to political instability caused by three changes in government during the second action plan period. However, the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs conducted two public consultations: one in May 2016 regarding priorities

Table 1: At a Glance		
	Mid-term	**End-of-term**
Number of commitments	16	
Level of completion		
Completed	4	5
Substantial	6	6
Limited	5	5
Not started	1	0
Number of commitments with:		
Clear relevance to OGP values	16	
Transformative potential impact	7	
Substantial or complete implementation	10	11
All three ( )	4	4
Did it Open Government?		
Major		4
Outstanding		3
Moving forward		
Number of commitments carried over to next action plan	_Unclear_	

for the third action plan and one on 14 September 2016 regarding the government self-assessment report for the 2015/16 action plan implementation.

Consultation with civil society during implementation

A regular multi-stakeholder consultation on OGP implementation was established in the form of the Croatian Council of the Open Government Partnership initiative. The council was formed in February 2012 before the preparation of the first action plan. The council is responsible for the preparation of the action plan, for monitoring its implementation, as well as for proposing amendments to the action plan to the Croatian government. The government conducted extensive consultations, both in-person and online, to invite public participation during the development of the OGP action plan. Stakeholders who participated were satisfied with the consultation process. While consultations were only conducted in the capital, local and regional government representatives attended the meetings. According to the interviewed stakeholders, the consultation process was meaningful and participatory, with sufficient time allowed for comments, proposals, and queries by the interested public.

The Croatian government used the OGP Council to monitor the implementation of the action plan. In that way, broader consultation and public engagement, as well as monitoring and management of the implementation of Croatia's OGP activities, was ensured. Since the beginning of the second action plan implementation period, the OGP Council held three meetings (16 December 2014, 15 May, and 15 September 2015), and regular communication between the members of the OGP Council was maintained by e-mail, according to interviewed government and CSO representatives. The minutes of meetings were posted on the webpage of the Office for Cooperation with NGOs,[1] after being adopted at the first following meeting.

In addition, thematic working meetings, championed by various council members, were held in June 2015 in order to discuss the implementation of certain key measures and reach agreement on the continuation of their implementation. All meetings included CSO representatives who stated that their input was appreciated and taken into consideration, even though it was not always accepted. All OGP Council meetings and the thematic meetings were held in Zagreb, but regional and local representation was achieved through the involvement of municipality, city, and county associations in the work of the council. The meetings are "invitation-only," but nonmembers were sometimes invited, depending on the topic discussed. They could participate in discussions; however, they could not vote on council decisions.

The OGP Council is currently inactive. No new members were appointed by the government, before it was recalled by the Parliament, aside from the Minister for Administration who is the president of the Council. It is expected that this will be done by the new government, formed after the 11 September 2016 elections. All consultations done in the second year of implementation were mostly internet-based (e-consultations), thus inviting a wide array of participants including citizens, businesses, and civil society organisations. The interviewed stakeholders confirmed that consultations were open and collaborative and that their involvement was appreciated. However, because the OGP Council's activity was thwarted during the last six months of action plan implementation, there was a loss of momentum regarding OGP action plan activities overall, including participation in consultations.

Table 2: Action Plan Consultation Process		
Phase of action plan	**OGP process requirement (Articles of Governance Section)**	**Did the government meet this requirement?**
During Implementation	Regular forum for consultation during implementation?	Yes
	Consultations: Open or invitation-only?	Open
	Consultations on IAP2 spectrum	Collaborative

---

[1] Available at: https://udruge.gov.hr/istaknute-teme/partnerstvo-za-otvorenu-vlast-271/savjet-inicijative-partnerstvo-za-otvorenu-vlast/289.

Progress in commitment implementation

All of the indicators and the method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual, available at (http://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/about-irm). One measure deserves further explanation, due to its particular interest for readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries: the "starred commitment" ( ). Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. In order to receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

1. It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have "medium" or "high" specificity.
2. The commitment's language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of access to information, civic participation, or public accountability.
3. The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented.
4. Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving a ranking of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, at the midterm report, Croatia's action plan contained four starred commitments. At the end of term, based on the changes in the level of completion, the Croatian action plan contained four starred commitments.

Commitments assessed as star commitments in the midterm report can lose their starred status if at the end of the action plan implementation cycle, their completion falls short of substantial or full completion, which would mean they have an overall limited completion at the end of term, per commitment language.

Finally, the graphs in this section present an excerpt of the wealth of data the IRM collects during its progress reporting process. For the full dataset for Croatia, see the OGP Explorer at www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer.

About "did it open government?"

Often, OGP commitments are vaguely worded or not clearly related to opening government, but they actually achieve significant political reforms. Other times, commitments with significant progress may appear relevant and ambitious but fail to open government. In an attempt to capture these subtleties and, more importantly, actual changes in government practice, the IRM introduced a new variable "did it open government?" in the end-of-term reports. This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how government practice has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This can be contrasted to the IRM's "starred commitments" which describe *potential* impact.

IRM researchers assess the "did it open government?" question with regard to each of the OGP values that this commitment is relevant to. It asks, did it stretch the government practice beyond business as usual? The scale for assessment is as follows:

- Worsened: Worsens government openness as a result of the measures taken by the commitment.
- Did not change: Did not change the status quo of government practice.
- Marginal: Some change, but minor in terms of its impact on the level of openness.
- Major: A step forward for government openness in the relevant policy area, but remains limited in scope or scale.
- Outstanding: A reform that has transformed "business as usual" in the relevant policy area by opening government.

To assess this variable, researchers establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan. They then assess outcomes *as implemented* for changes in government openness.

Readers should keep in mind limitations. IRM end-of-term reports are prepared only a few months after the implementation cycle is completed. The variable focus on outcomes that can be observed on government openness practices at the end of the two-year implementation period. The report and the variable do not intend to assess impact because of the complex methodological implications and the time frame of the report.

Table 4. Overview: Assessment of progress by commitment

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Right to Access Information Legislative Framework				✔	✔						✔			✔ (midterm) / ✔ Substantial (end of term)						✔	
2. Improving the Implementation of the Right of Access to Information Act				✔	✔		✔			✔				✔ (midterm) / ✔ (end of term)						✔	
✪3. Proactive Release of Information and Opening Data				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔		✔ Limited (midterm) / ✔ Substantial (end of term)							✔
4. Fiscal Transparency				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔			✔				✔ Substantial (midterm) / ✔ Substantial (end of term)					✔	
✪5. Improvement of Transparency and Efficiency in Public Administration Work				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔			✔ Substantial (midterm) / ✔ Substantial (end of term)						✔
6. Improvement of Transparency of Election and Referendum Campaigns		✔			✔	✔	✔	✔				✔		✔ Limited (end of term)	✔ Substantial (midterm)				✔		
7. Transparency in the Area of Youth Policy		✔			✔			✔			✔				✔ Substantial (midterm) / ✔ Substantial (end of term)				✔		
8. Media Transparency				✔	✔		✔					✔		✔ Limited (midterm) / ✔ Limited (end of term)					✔		
9. Improving Transparency of Information on Members of Parliament and Their Work				✔	✔		✔	✔	✔							✔ Completed (midterm) / ✔ Completed (end of term)		✔			

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
															End of term						
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
10. Improving Transparency of Data on Assets of Officials			✔		✔		✔	✔		✔						✔			✔		
																✔					
✪11. Improving the Consultation Process with the Interested Public in Legislative Procedures				✔	✔	✔		✔				✔			✔						✔
																✔					
12. Ensuring the Sustainability of Values and Content of the OGP Initiative			✔		✔							✔		✔			✔				
														✔							
✪13. Participation in Drafting the New Anti-Corruption Strategy				✔	✔	✔						✔				✔				✔	
																✔					
14. Regulation of Lobbying				✔		✔	✔	✔			✔		✔					✔			
														✔							
15. Improving Efficiency of the Ministry of Interior's Complaints Commission		✔				✔	✔			✔					✔		✔				
															✔						
16. Promoting Civil Participation in the Work of Civil Society Organisations				✔	✔	✔		✔			✔					✔			✔		
																✔					

General overview of commitments

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. End-of-term reports assess an additional metric, "did it open government?" The tables above and below summarise the completion level at the end of term and progress on this metric. For additional information on previously completed commitments, please see Croatia's IRM midterm progress report.

The Croatian OGP action plan consists of 16 commitments, with 49 (38 when combined) milestones and 130 implementation indicators. The IRM researcher occasionally combined milestones due to a shared theme or when their content was connected or interdependent (e.g., milestones 7.2 and 7.3 on youth councils), or where necessary for length or formatting reasons.

Following the results of the public consultations on the priorities for the 2014–2016 action plan, the main priority areas were determined to be: access to information, open data, transparency of public policy, elections and referendums, media, and participation of citizens in shaping public policy.

There are 27 specific and 4 nonspecific institutions or groups of institutions responsible for the implementations of all 16 commitments and 49 milestones, as stated in the action plan, either as leaders or co-leaders. In addition to the main public authority bodies in charge of coordinating implementation, many of the activities have co-implementing partners, sometimes identified specifically (e.g., State Asset Management Office, Education Agency, etc.) and sometimes referring simply to the group of institutions (e.g., "competent ministries," "state administration bodies," "regional self-government units"). The progress report contains a breakdown of activities per responsible institutions.[1]

---

[1] IRM Progress Report: Croatia 2014-2015, p. 21–22, available at: http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/croatia/irm.

1. Right to Access Information Legislative Framework

Commitment Text:

1.1. Amendments to the Act on the Right of Access to Information

Implementation indicators: Adoption at the Government session of the Proposal of the Act on Amendments to the Act on the Right of Access to Information, in line with Directive 2013/37/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 amending Directive 2003/98/EC on the re-use of public sector information.

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration
Supporting institutions: Information Commissioner
Start date: Not specified.............. End date: July 2015

1.2. Legal regulation of records of exclusive rights to reuse

Implementation indicators:
- *adoption of implementing regulations (Ministry of Administration)*
- *drafted and publically available records of exclusive rights for re-use (Information Commissioner)*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration, Information Commissioner
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified.............. End date: December 2015

1.3. Amendments to the Act on Data Confidentiality

Implementation indicators: Adoption at the Government session of the Proposal of Amendments of the Act on Data Confidentiality which:
- *outlines in detail the persons subject to application of the Act;*
- *further emphasises the importance of differentiating classified data from other types of confidentiality (business secrets, professional secrets, etc.);*
- *introduces centralised access to the manner of determining the criteria for data classification;*
- *clearly defines the definitions from this area, particularly in relation to unclassified data and declassification procedures;*
- *clearly defines cases in which the test of proportionality and public interest are carried out;*
- *introduction of revised rules for procedures of periodical assessments of degrees of confidentiality for classified data.*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Internal Affairs
Supporting institutions: Ministry of Justice, Office of the National Security Council
Start date: Not specified.............. End date: December 2015

1.4. Drafting the analysis of the legislative framework in the area of protecting whistleblowers

Implementation indicators: Drafted analysis of the legislative framework for the protection of whistleblowers and pursuant to this, procedures initiated to amend existing acts or draft new acts.

Lead institutions: Ministry of Justice
Supporting institutions: Ministry of Labour and the Pension System
Start date: Not specified.............. End date: December 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion (Midterm / End of term)				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Overall				✔	✔						✔		Midterm:	✔						✔	
													End of term:		✔						
1.1: Amend Access to Information Act				✔	✔						✔		Midterm:			✔					
													End of term:			✔					
1.2: Exclusive rights to reuse regulation				✔	✔						✔		Midterm:	✔							
													End of term:		✔						
1.3: Amend Data Confidentiality Act				✔	✔					✔			Midterm:	✔							
													End of term:	✔							
1.4: Whistleblower protection legislative framework				✔	✔					✔			Midterm:	✔							
													End of term:	✔							

Commitment Aim:
This commitment sought to strengthen access to information rights by amending existing legislation on access to information (milestone 1.1) and data confidentiality (milestone 1.3) and clarify regulations on rights to reuse data (milestone 1.2) and whistleblower protection (milestone 1.4).

Status
Midterm: Limited

1.1. Amendments to the Act on the Right of Access to Information (complete)

1.2. Legal regulation of records of exclusive rights to reuse (limited)
The Ordnance on the Content and Manner of Keeping Records of Exclusive Rights to Reuse Information[1] was adopted in March 2015. However, records on exclusive rights to reuse data were not issued and publically available in the foreseen period, since the identification of current contracts on exclusive rights is a long-term process that needs to be undertaken parallel with education on the right to information use and reuse by state bodies. For more information, please see the 2014–2015 midterm IRM report.

1.3. Amendments to the Act on Data Confidentiality (limited)
Since it is necessary to amend a number of other regulations (i.e., the content of the act must align with two related acts, the Information Security Act and the Safety Inspection Act) before

full implementation can start, the IRM researcher found completion for this milestone to be limited. For more information, please see the 2014–2015 midterm IRM report.

1.4. Drafting the analysis of the legislative framework in the area of protecting whistleblowers (limited)
The Ministry of Justice has collected data about whistleblower cases in Croatia and opinions on their quality from the appropriate authorities and civil society organisations. However, the draft self-assessment[2] reports that the input from public authorities and CSOs was not substantial enough for the Ministry of Justice to analyse. For more information, please see the 2014–2015 midterm IRM report.

End of term: Substantial
The implementation of milestone 1.2 is substantially completed. According to the draft self-assessment report, the adopted ordinance stipulates that all data on approval and verification of contracts granting the exclusive right to reuse are to be submitted to the information commissioner within 15 days of signing the contract. During the second year of implementation, the Commissioner's Office has created a publicly available registry of all approved exclusive rights which will be available as a separate subpage on its website. In an interview with the IRM researcher, the information commissioner[3] stated, however, that public authorities have not started submitting contracts on exclusive rights. While the effective legal provisions and Ordinance for exclusive rights to re-use were put in to place, collection of records of approved exclusive rights remained incomplete at end of the implementation period, due to the fact that the prerequisites for this are an analytical overview and an educational cycle, implemented by the State Public Administration School. The commissioner is planning to draft an analysis of the legal framework and implementation of open data during the fall in 2016 and will provide a guideline for state bodies for opening data and submitting contracts on exclusive rights. The same will be done for counties and larger cities in 2017. This is due to the fact that institutions can only fulfil their obligation by first identifying the databases and registers that could potentially have contracts on exclusive rights.

Based on government sources and media monitoring conducted by the IRM researcher, there was no further progress on the implementation of milestone 1.3. According to the Ministry of Judiciary, milestone 1.4 had limited completion in the second year of action plan implementation. However, the ministry prepared a draft version of the analysis and is awaiting consultations with state bodies and CSOs. The IRM researcher concurs with this assessment for the milestone.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Major
The protection of the right to access information is still a fairly new development in Croatia, the Law on Access to Information having been adopted in 2003, and it has undergone a significant strengthening before and during the implementation of the previous action plan. This commitment was moderately ambitious in comparison, intending to strengthen access to information rights by amending and clarifying the existing legislative framework. According to CSO representatives,[4] Croatia is now among the first five countries in the world when it comes to the quality of the legal framework regulating the right to access information. While doubts about the existence of political will—of past, current, and future governments—for implementation of that legal framework were raised, a representative from one of the leading CSOs, GONG[5], called it "an opportunity for a breakthrough." Also, the 2015 Annual Report on the Implementation of the Act on the Right of Access to Information shows an increased level of realisation of the legal provisions when compared to previous years.[6] For example, the 2015 annual report cites a slight increase in the percentage of freedom of information and reuse requests resolved in a timely manner (93.55% in 2015 compared to 92.8% in 2014) and a reduction in the overall number of pending requests (209 in 2015 versus 221 in 2014), despite a large backlog carried over from previous years.[7] However, the report identifies a dearth of

qualified staff to handle requests as a continued obstacle to the full implementation of the law.[8] Since the first two milestones were the most ambitious, with 1.1 fully and 1.2 substantially implemented, their impact on government practice was major and marginal, respectively. This resulted in the government now being obliged to disclose more information, and in an improved manner. Yet, more work is required to ensure that records of exlusive rights are collected and displayed on the public registry. Overall, however, given that this commitment addresses a key aspect to ensuring access to information—the proper formulation of legislative guidelines—this commitment has had a major impact on opening government.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests the following steps to reach a full completion of the unfinished milestones:

- Amend the Data Confidentiality Act by including a commitment to amend all three relevant legislative acts in the next action plan as a single package, making sure that the the Interdepartmental Working Group, which is responsible for drafting the commitment, is open to participation from interested civil society organisations.
- Complete the analysis of the legal framework for whistleblower protection as a prerequisite to either amending the existing legislation in order to improve the protection of whistleblowers or introducing a specific law for their protection. Also, create and disseminate a guide for citizens based on the completed analysis of existing legal provisions in order to provide structured and easily accessible information on the issue.

---

[1] See more at http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2016_03_20_582.html.

[2] The government draft self-assessment report was available for public consultations from 14 September 2016, at https://esavjetovanja.gov.hr/ECon/MainScreen?entityId=4011.

[3] Interview conducted on 6 September 2016.

[4] Statements gathered at an event organised by the information commissioner on 28 September 2016. For more information, see the Methodological Note section and http://www.pristupinfo.hr/en/povjerenik-za-etiku/.

[5] The name originates as an acronym for „Građani organizirano nadgledaju glasanje" (Citizens Organize to Supervise Elections).

[6] See the Croatian language version of the Annual Report on the Implementation of the Act on the Right of Access to Information at http://www.pristupinfo.hr/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/1-Izvje%C5%A1%C4%87e-o-provedbi-Zakona-o-pravu-na-pristup-informacijama-za-2015-finalno1.pdf.

[7] Ibid., p. 9–11.

[8] Ibid., p. 9.

2. Improving the Implementation of the Right of Access to Information Act

Commitment Text:

2.1. Develop a publically accessible database on public authorities that are subject to apply the Act on the Right of Access to Information

Implementation indicators: Drafted and publically accessible database on public authorities in excel format.

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner

Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration; Digital Information Documentation Office

Start date: Not specified...............   End date: December 2014

2.2. Conduct education in the area of the right of access to information:
a) Education of officials and civil servants on the right of access to information

Implementation indicators:

- *8 training sessions held (4 workshops per year)*
- *200 attendees per year at education sessions*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner

Supporting institutions: Digital Information Documentation Office; State Public Administration School

Start date: Not specified...............   End date: continuous

b) Developing and implementing train-the-trainer programmes for the implementation of the Act on the Right of Access to Information

Necessary resources: HRK 70,000

Implementation indicators:

- *train-the-trainer programme developed and implemented*
- *20 educated trainers*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner

Supporting institutions: Digital Information Documentation Office; State Public Administration School

Start date: Not specified...............   End date: December 2015

c) online educational programs regarding achieving the right to access of information via the portal of the Digital Information Documentation Office for attendees from public authorities and the interested public

Implementation indicators:

- execution of a webinar and other online programs
- number of programs held
- number of attendees

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner

Supporting institutions: Digital Information Documentation Office

Start date: Not specified...............   End date: continuous

2.3. Conceive and implement a citizens' campaign on the right of access to information

Necessary resources: HRK 300,000

Implementation indicators:

- *promotional materials developed (publications, audio, video)*
- *their dissemination and publication in the media*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner

Supporting institutions: None specified

Start date: Not specified...............   End date: December 2016

2.4. Execute a competition and grant awards for transparency and openness of public administration bodies at the local and regional level

Implementation indicators:

- *drafted methodology of the competition*
- *competition conducted*
- *granting of awards to public administration bodies at the local level—local and regional self-government units, companies under ownership of the local and regional self-government, and public institutions and other legal persons founded by the local and regional self-government units.*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner
Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration; Office for Societies of the Government of Croatia*
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: March 2016
Editorial note: The correct translation for the agency is the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion	Midterm / End of term			Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
2. Overall				✔	✔		✔				✔			✔						✔	
														✔							
2.1: Database of public authorities				✔	✔		✔			✔						✔					
																✔					
2.2: Education on right of access to information				✔	✔		✔			✔					✔						
															✔						
2.3: Public campaign				✔	✔					✔			✔								
													✔								
2.4: Competition and grants				✔	✔					✔					✔						
															✔						

Commitment Aim:
This commitment was aimed at improving the implementation of the right of access to information legislation by increasing the public awareness about available information (milestones 2.1 and 2.3) and the public authorities' knowledge and proactive use of that legislation (milestones 2.2 and 2.4).

Status
Midterm: Limited
2.1. Develop a publically accessible database on public authorities that are subject to apply the Act on the Right of Access to Information (completed)

2.2. Conduct education in the area of the right of access to information (substantial)
This milestone has been substantially implemented. In the first year of implementation, a total of 33 training courses were conducted throughout Croatia for almost 1,800 participants. In this regard, the activity (activity a) surpassed its implementation indicators, which required 200 attendees trained in a year. Online educational programmes (activity b) on access to information were ongoing—with 15

webinars conducted, including a total of 319 participants from public administration and other interested participants. The development of the train-the-trainer programme (activity c) is the only activity that was not started. This activity required significant financial resources that it did not receive (particularly from the Information Commissioner's Office), which caused the delay. A project financed through EU funds, "Strengthening Capacities of the Public Bodies for Effective Implementation of Act on the Right to Access to Information," which includes a training-for-trainers activity, is to be implemented between 2016 and 2018. For more information see the midterm report.

2.3. Conceive and implement a citizens' campaign on the right of access to information (not started)
The implementation of this milestone did not start due to the lack of funding from the Information Commissioner's Office. The office adopted a framework action plan in June 2014, along with an indicative budget for 2016 and 2017 as part of its 2015–2017 strategic plan,[1] which indicated that the implementation of this milestone would most likely take place during the next action plan implementation period (2016–2018).

2.4.
Execute a competition and grant awards for transparency and openness of public administration bodies at the local and regional level (limited)
Considering the period envisaged for the implementation of this measure (March 2016) and entry into force of the amended Act on the Right to Access to Information in August 2015, the IRM researcher found that preparatory work was undertaken in the reporting period. Further activities required securing human and financial capacities. See the IRM midterm report for more details.

End of term: Limited
There were no changes in the level of completion for milestones provided under this commitment. Milestone 2.1 was completed and its implementation is continuous. Milestone 2.2. also continues to be implemented, aside from the training-the-trainers programme (activity c), which was never started as a result of funding contraints and the fact that it was removed from the previously mentioned EU funded project, since the Information Commissioner intends to implement it by using online educational materials (video, webinars). According to the information commissioner, the government exceeded the implementation indicators during the two-year implementation period: a total of 72 education trainings were held for almost 2,728 participants, along with five webinars introduced in 2015 in cooperation with the Digital Information Documentation Office. Five additional webinars were planned by the end of 2016. As for milestones 2.3 and 2.4 (aside from some preparatory activity), according to the midterm self-assessment report, the public campaign, the preparation of monitoring and evaluation methodology, the appointment of the commission, the drafting of regulations for the award, and other activities were to begin in October 2015. However, this did not take place due to a lack of funding and staff.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Major
Public accountability: Did not change
The operationalization of the right to access information is a fairly new development in Croatia, and its effective implementation requires considerable effort by public, private, and civil society stakeholders as well as citizens. The government sought to improve the implementation of the legal framework by providing relevant information, education, and awareness raising. The overall ambition of this commitment was moderate, and its completion remained limited in the second year of implementation. The last two milestones were not started and thus had no influence on access to information. However, milestones 2.1 and 2.2 had an overall major impact on access to information, since the government disclosed more information and improved the quality of information. On the other hand, as implemented the commitment does not clearly include a mechanism/intervention for holding public officials accountable, and there is no clear evidence of public officials being held accountable as a result of the implementation of this commitment. Therefore, it had no effect on public accountability. CSO stakeholders[2] agreed that the database (milestone 2.1) is very useful and that information officers are now more ready to disclose relevant information (milestone 2.2).

However, citizen awareness of their rights and the methods they can use to excercise those rights is still low, so further implementation of milestones 2.3 and 2.4 is still necessary.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests the following steps to ensure full implementation:

- Further work is needed on the basic implementation of the unfinished milestones. For instance, the government should implement milestones 2.3 and 2.4 and the part of milestone 2.2 (train-the-trainers programme) that was not started during the implementation of this action plan;
- The relevant public administration bodies could also consider devising next steps on already implemented activities, such as upgrading the education modules, including more participants in online education, etc.;
- The database (milestone 2.1) needs an upgraded IT system and administrative processes in place to ensure that it is regularly maintained and updated with information. The IRM researcher recommends decentralising the process of collecting information by having individual information officers from all departments responsible for timely data collation. This could improve the input of relevant data as well as improve the effectiveness of monitoring the data;
- Start implementation of the public awareness-raising campaign, as well as competition and grant award activity; and
- In general, increase the necessary financial and human resources for the Information Commissioner's Office and other relevant administrative bodies in this commitment.

It should be mentioned that the public campaign envisaged in activity 2.3 is planned as project activity in an EU funded project, via the European Social Fund, due to insufficient funding of the Information Commissioner Office. Its implementation is planned in 2017.

---

[1] Available at http://www.pristupinfo.hr/o-povjereniku-za-informiranje/.
[2] Information commissioner event, 28 September 2016. See Methodological Note and http://www.pristupinfo.hr/en/povjerenik-za-etiku/.

3. Proactive Release of Information and Opening Data

Commitment Text:

3.1. Establish the Central state portal, www.gov.hr

Necessary resources: HRK 200,000

Implementation indicators: Establishment of the Central state portal, with services My Administration and e-Citizen; Croatian Government and at least three-quarters of ministries and government offices keeping their websites in line with the standardised Central state portal.

Lead institutions: Office of the President of the Government of the Republic of Croatia

Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration; Croatian Regulatory Authority for Network Industries

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

3.2. Issue instructions for the release and use of open data

Implementation indicators: Instructions issued on the release of open data which, in accordance with Article 10 of the Act on the Right of Access to Information, interpret the "easily searchable manner" outlining the responsibility of public authorities and public servants for information, the manner of release and technical specifications, in relation to the type of datasets that will be released, and the processes of updating and controlling compliance, including legal notes

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner

Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration; Working group for the application of open code and open standards; Digital Information Documentation Office

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

3.3. Establishment of the open data portal and continuous improvements and widening of portal contents *(Editorial note: Milestone not named in the action plan)*

Open the central state repository for data and release data for re-use on the portal data.gov.hr *(Note: List of datasets published within the first six months of adoption of the action plan is found in the document appendix (Appendix 1))*

Implementation indicators:

- *on the portal data.gov.hr, databases are released in accordance with the issued instructions for the publication and use of open data*
- *the number of published databases on the portal data.gov.hr*
- *reports submitted by the Ministry of Administration and Digital Information Documentation Office to the OGP Council.*

Lead institutions: Office of the President of the Government of the Republic of Croatia

Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration; Working group for the application of open code and open standards; Digital Information Documentation Office; OGP Council; Information Commissioner

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014; continuous

Hold a public debate with the interested public on the priorities of publishing open data in regular six-month intervals

Align the priorities and draft a list of priorities for the publication of open data

Implementation indicators:

- *number of public debates held (3)*
- *drafting a list of priorities (3)*
- *number of published databases with lists of priorities*

Lead institutions: OGP Council

Supporting institutions: None specified

Start date: July 2014.....................   End date: every six months

3.4. Prepare an education module on open data

Implementation indicators:

- *development of an education module on open data*
- *preparation of education materials*

- *holding education for the first group of public servants responsible for information in public authorities*
- *drafted education plan for public servants responsible for information*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner; Digital Information Documentation Office
Supporting institutions: State Public Administration School, Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: March 2015; continuous

3.5. Develop instructions and a manual for the proactive publication of information

Necessary resources: HRK 20,000
Implementation indicators:

- *instructions for the proactive publication of information drafted and published*
- *manual for the proactive publication of information drafted and published*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner
Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: July 2015

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion / Midterm–End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
✪3. Overall				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔		✔							✔
															✔						
3.1: Establish central state portal				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔				✔					
																✔					
3.2: Instructions for the release and use of open data				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔		✔							
															✔						
3.3: Open the central state repository and hold public debates				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔		✔							
															✔						
3.4: Open data education module				✔	✔		✔	✔			✔			✔							
																✔					
3.5: Manual for information publication				✔	✔		✔	✔				✔		✔							
														✔							

Commitment Aim:

This commitment sought to improve the proactive release of data and opening data through the establishment of the central state portal (gov.hr). This commitment was carried over from the first OGP action plan, and its component, data.gov.hr, enables the searching, linking, downloading, and reusing of public-sector information for commercial and noncommercial purposes via a metadata

catalogue (milestones 3.1 and 3.3). It also envisaged the adoption of provisions on the release and use of open data (milestone 3.2), the opening of the central state repository, holding public debates on the priorities for releasing data (3.3), the open data education module (3.4), and the drafting instructions and the manual for the proactive release of data (3.5). This milestone was carried over from the first year of the initiative implementation (2012–2013), when it was not implemented in the manner envisioned for unspecified technical reasons.

Status

Midterm: Limited

3.1. Establish the central state portal, www.gov.hr (completed)

3.2. Issue instructions for the release and use of open data (limited)
This milestone had a limited completion rate and was behind schedule. However, according to government officials, the implementation started at the end of 2015, and the envisaged activities were to be implemented in 2016, since they directly depended on the adoption of the new legal framework and the corresponding bylaws.

3.3. Establishment of the open data portal and continuous improvements and widening of portal contents (limited)
The implementation of this milestone was limited and behind schedule. The Croatian open data portal was established on 19 March 2015[1] and is available at data.gov.hr. According to research conducted by the IRM researcher, there were 113 datasets available in early September 2015 at the portal[2], none of which are the six mentioned in Appendix 1 of the action plan (although, some of them are available on other relevant public authorities' domains). The second activity—the data.gov.hr portal—also enables all interested users to propose datasets to be published. This can be done through the e-Citizen system or via e-mail. Only one such proposal was received by 30 June 2015. In early 2016 after the period assessed by the midterm report, a futher 23 suggestions were added.[3]

In order to respond to user demand, the action plan envisaged holding a public debate every six months for the purpose of defining priorities for data publication in the following period. A conference, a public discussion, a guest expert lecture, and other smaller meetings were held in that regard. The instructions for the release and use of open data were published on 18 June 2015.[4]

3.4. Prepare an education module on open data (limited)
The IRM researcher found limited implementation on this milestone. The Ministry of Administration held a training seminar on open data, the first in a planned series of seminars, which was attended by 60 information officers and other employees of public authorities.[5] However, an educational module could only be developed after the adoption of secondary legislation related to the Act on the Right to Access Information which was expected to be passed by Februay 2016 at the latest.

3.5. Develop instructions and a manual for the proactive publication of information (limited)
Similar to milestone 3.4, the adoption of the Act on the Right to Access Information in August 2015 delayed the drafting of the first version of the manual and instructions. The information commissioner is also obliged to monitor and analyse the implementation of the act, and according to the commissioner, specialised analyses are carried out regarding the application of certain articles (Article 10) for certain groups of public authorities, which serve as the basis for drafting instructions and manuals.[6]

End of term: Substantial
The gov.hr portal is set up and constantly updated with new information, and new public institutions are joining the platform—with 18 public bodies (14 out of 20 ministries and 4 out of 6 state offices) housed on the platform. According to government sources, the only concern is that each body has to finance its own transition to the portal, so other bodies may follow the example of the Ministry of Interior, which recently used student developers and open technology to build a new website affordably and separate from the gov.hr portal.

The government drafted Instructions for the release and reuse of open data, and the instructions went through a primary consultation with the responsible institutions (Ministry of Administration, Digital Information-Documentation Office), according to the information commissioner. Therefore, the IRM researcher found the implementation of milestone 3.2 to be substantial.

According to interviews with the information commissioner, representatives of the Office for Cooperation with NGOs and the draft self-assessment report the activities in milestone 3.3 were also completed at the subnational level. For example, the open data portal had almost 180 available datasets from 40 institutions (publishers) at the end of 2015. The portal was also presented at several national and international events. In February and September 2015 the information commissioner held roundtable discussions on the topic of reassessing the use of public administration information and open data (social support and innovative economy). The discussion results were used for collecting proposals for priorities for publishing open data.[7]

Milestone 3.4 was completed. According to the draft self-assessment report report and the Information Comissioner, in cooperation with the Ministry of Administration and the State Public Administration School, the information commissioner developed an educational module and held the three of the five and scheduled trainings in 2016. Information officers, web content managers, and public relations officers participated. Also, both to educate and encourage awareness on reuse and the priorities of open data publication, three debates were held—the first on 17 May 2016 in Zagreb and the next two on 2 and 9 June in Osijek—with about 100 participants.

According to the draft self-assessment report and the interviewed government representatives, the first version of the manual and instructions is still being drafted. The IRM researcher concluded that the completion of milestone 3.5 remains limited.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Outstanding
Civic participation: Major
Public accountability: Did not change
The Croatian government has recognized the release of open data as one of the priorities for the two-year period of the action plan. This is due to the assumption that open data contributes to a deepening democracy and strengthens the implementation of legal provisions. Innovation is boosted when the private sector uses available datasets to, for example, develop applications like providing weather information, a list and location of public services, etc. Legal provisions are strengthened because public authorities are more likely to be held accountable if it is obvious that data released are incomplete or missing, Accountability can also be increased since data released can provide a basis for a policy analysis. Thus, the inclusion of this commitment in the OGP action plan is the result of 15 years of systematic work of enthusiastic CSOs, media representatives, academia, and public officials interested in achieving openness, transparency, and effectiveness of Croatia's democratic system.

The overall ambition of this commitment was transformative, with only milestones 3.4 and 3.5 having a moderate or no potential impact. With the exception of the last milestone's limited completion and respective lack of influence on government practices, the first three milestones had an outstanding effect on opening government in the area of access to information. Milestone 3.4 had a marginal influence on opening government in that sense, since two educations and 3 public discussions on open data and its re-use were held with 100 participants were held during the action plan implementation. Civic participation was also majorly affected by these changes, especially by activities in milestone 3.3, since the data.gov.hr portal and discussions on priorities for release of open data both require significant participation from the interested public. CSO representatives[8] mentioned that these changes were not easy to introduce in a country emerging from a history marked by a lack of transparency in government-citizen interactions and which still uses arcane methods of administration. However, as implemented, the commitment does not clearly include a mechanism/intervention for holding public officials accountable, and there is no clear evidence of public officials being held accountable as a result of the implementation of this commitment.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests the following steps to reach full completion of the unfinished milestones:

- Make an effort to incorporate all state authorities in the gov.hr portal as soon as possible (allocating the necessary funds to public bodies that have yet to transfer) and to include as many datasets in the data.gov.hr portal, while making sure they are using the most favourable formats for reuse;
- Finalise the milestones that have not been implemented during this action plan;
- Amend the Public Procurement Act in order to ensure all IT infrastructure used by the government enables data export and connectivity;
- Make headway into a data-driven economy by using big data technology and services, in accordance with the European Commission strategy on big data;[9] and
- Aside from the existing plan to fund open data use through the European Social Fund during the implementation of this action plan, in the next action plan the government may consider increasing support to the sustainability and further growth of this commitment (e.g., big data) through additional funding (state or EU funds, other donors, etc.) and increased human resources for competent public authorities (information commissioner, Ministry of Administration, Digital Information Documentation Office, etc.).

---

[1] Available at https://vlada.gov.hr/vijesti/potpredsjednica-opacic-portalom-otvorenih-podataka-data-gov-hr-dodatno-otvaramo-drzavnu-i-javnu-upravu/16571 and http://www.netokracija.com/predstavljanje-data-gov-hr-100301.

[2] Available at http://data.gov.hr/data/search.

[3] Available at http://data.gov.hr/data-request.

[4] Available at http://data.gov.hr/sites/default/files/library/Preporukezaobjavu.pdf.

[5] Available at http://www.pristupinfo.hr/pregled-edukacijskih-i-promotivnih-aktivnosti-sijecanj-srpanj-2015/.

[6] Available under *Studije* at http://www.pristupinfo.hr/dokumenti-i-publikacije/.

[7] Available at http://www.pristupinfo.hr/okrugli-stol-ponovna-uporaba-informacija-i-otvoreni-podaci-javne-uprave-potpora-drustvenom-i-inovativnom-gospodarstvu-zagreb-29-9-2015/.

[8] Information commissioner event, 28 September 2016. See Methodological Note and http://www.pristupinfo.hr/en/povjerenik-za-etiku/.

[9] Available at http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/towards-thriving-data-driven-economy.

4. Fiscal Transparency
Commitment Text:
4.1. Timely publication of the proposal of the State Budget
Implementation indicators: In 2014, publication of the proposal of the State Budget and substantiation of the proposal of the State Budget for 2015, with projections for 2016 and 2017, in the following periods for the appropriate forthcoming time periods, supplemented with the listed elements such that it contains the following:

- *information that outlines how the proposals of new legislative solutions impact the revenues and expenditures of the budget year in comparison to existing solutions;*
- *functional classification of expenditures for the budget year and the year preceding the budget year;*
- *state of the public debt for the preceding budget year and projections of public debt for the mid-term period;*
- *structure of the public debt for the budget and previous year;*
- *information on the conditional obligations for the budget year (guarantees);*
- *information on where to find data on the impacts of macroeconomic assumptions on the budget revenues, expenditures and the public debt (sensitivity analysis).*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Finance
Supporting institutions: Competent ministry
Start date: Not specifiedEnd date: November 2014/2015/2016

4.2. Timely publication of the monthly reports on execution of the State Budget according to the national methodology of the calculation plan and according to the GFS 2001 methodology
Implementation indicators:

- *Published monthly reports on the execution of the state budget, which include the most important categories of revenues and expenditures of the state budget according to the national methodology of the calculation plan, and the monthly reports by the organisation classifications of the state budget and accounts 3 and 4 economic classifications, no later than one month after the expiry of the period to which they pertain, except the report for December which may be published with preliminary data in late February at the earliest.*
- *Monthly report on the execution of the state budget and financial plans of extrabudgetary users expressed according to the GFS 2001 methodology published no later than two months after the expiry of the period to which they pertain, except the report for December which may be published with preliminary data in March at the earliest.*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Finance; Information Commissioner
Supporting institutions: Competent ministry
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: continuous

4.3. Publication of the report on the execution of the budget, monthly statistical overviews of the Ministry of Finance and the annual report of the Ministry of Finance
Implementation indicators:

- *published reports, statistical overviews and annual reports on the website of the Ministry of Finance under the category "Statistics and Reporting"*
- *reports according to the national methodology of the calculation plan supplemented by data on achieved revenues and published no later than one month after the completion of the period to which it pertains, except the report for December, which may be published with preliminary data at the end of February at the earliest*
- *unification of all reports on the execution of the budget under the category "Statistics and Reporting" on the website of the Ministry of Finance*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Finance
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: continuous

4.4. Publication of the Annual Report on execution of the state budget, with supplements

Implementation indicators: Annual report on the execution of the state budget published within the legal deadlines, with supplements explaining the differences between the original macroeconomic projections for the budget year and the actual macroeconomic indicators.
Lead institutions: Ministry of Finance
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified............... End date: continuous

4.5. Draft and publish a guide for citizens for key budget documents

Implementation indicators: Guide for citizens, drafted and published in due time, with simple and easy to understand summaries for the key budget documents: guidelines of economic and fiscal policy, proposal of the state budget and projections, state budget and projections adopted by Croatian Parliament, semi-annual and annual reports on the execution of the state budget.
Lead institutions: Ministry of Finance
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified............... End date: continuous

4.6. Draft and publish instructions for publication of annual reports on operations of companies in majority ownership of the state, or local or regional government units

Implementation indicators:
- *drafted instructions on the manner, form and deadlines for publication of the annual report on the operations of companies in majority ownership of the state, or local or regional government units*
- *deadline for publication of reports is 30 October*
- *instructions drafted, sent to companies and published on the website of the Information Commissioner, Ministry of Finance and State Asset Management Office*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner
Supporting institutions: State Asset Management Office
Start date: Not specified............... End date: September 2014

4.7. Monitor the regularity and compete publication of annual reports on the operations of companies under majority ownership of the state, or local or regional government units ....

Implementation indicators:
- *develop the monitoring methodology*
- *publish the results of monitoring on the website of the Information Commissioner*

Lead institutions: Information Commissioner
Supporting institutions: State Asset Management Office
Start date: Not specified............... End date: end of calendar year; continuous

4.8. Draft and publically release a searchable database on the execution of payments from the single state budget account

Implementation indicators:
- *developed and released publically searchable database on executed payments from the single state budget account in line with the prescribed budget classifications*
- *publically accessible data on direct payments to suppliers from the single state budget account*

(A portion of the budgetary users in the state treasury system (17 users) who have a large number of accounts and requests for payment execute liabilities via the 632 special purpose accounts in the deposit of the Croatian National Bank. These users issues payment requests in the state treasury system and transfer funds from the state budget account to the 632 account from which they execute payments of liabilities towards suppliers. For all payments executed via the special purpose account, the budgetary users in the state treasury system, it is not possible to search by supplier).
Lead institutions: Ministry of Finance
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified............... End date: September 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion / Midterm / End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
4. Overall				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔			✔				✔					✔	
(End of term)															✔						
4.1: State budget proposal, reports, and annual report				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔			✔				✔						
(End of term)															✔						
4.2: Budget execution report, statistical overviews, and Ministry of Finance annual report				✔			✔	✔			✔				✔						
(End of term)															✔						
4.3: Citizen guide for key budget documents				✔	✔	✔	✔				✔				✔						
(End of term)															✔						
4.4: Guidelines and monitoring for state-owned companies local and regional authorities				✔	✔		✔					✔		✔							
(End of term)																✔					
4.5: State budget account payments database				✔	✔		✔	✔				✔				✔					
(End of term)																✔					

Editorial note: In order to simplify the evaluation of the milestones, milestone 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4 were condensed into a single one (4.1) and milestone 4.6 and 4.7 into 4.4. Because of that, all other milestones in the table and text below were attributed a different number from the one found in the action plan: 4.3 thus became 4.2, 4.5 is 4.3, and 4.8 is 4.5.

Commitment Aim:

In Croatia, there is a lack of fiscal information that the public can easily access and understand. Most of the data available are highly technical and can essentially only be interpreted by experts. Additionally, most of the data available do not follow a uniform standard, and when the data include input from public authorities other than the ministries, that information is not reported to the Ministry of Finance on time, even though the ministry has a reporting obligation to disclose this information. The main feature of all the activities within this commitment is to secure timely and

accurate information on the state budget at various stages of the budgetary process and to serve as a guideline to help citizens navigate the published documents (milestones 4.1–4.3). Other milestones include disclosing information on companies with majority ownership of the public sector (4.4) and payments from the state budget account (4.5).

Status
Midterm: Substantial
4.1 Timely publication of the state budget proposal, reports, and the annual report, with supplements (substantial)
4.2 Timely publication of the budget execution report, statistical overviews, and the Ministry of Finance annual report (substantial)
4.3 Drafting and publishing citizen guides for key budget documents (substantial)
The completion level for the activities envisaged under the first three milestones were found to be substantial by the IRM midterm report. The reasons they were not assessed as complete include the following:
- the data published was incomplete;
- the data was published in a different place from the one specified by the commitment; and
- the data was not published in a timely manner, etc.

For a more detailed analysis, please refer to the 2014–2015 IRM midterm report.

4.4 Draft and publish instructions and monitor the regularity of publication of annual reports on the operations of companies under majority ownership of the state, or local or regional government units (limited)
Both implementing activities for this milestone were intended to help develop a register to identify and monitor with the operations of majority state-owned companies as well as local and regional units. According to the self-assessment report, the implementation of the first activity—meetings between the two lead implementing agencies—took place, but the actual creation of the register was only started, not completed. Creating a register to monitor the regular and complete publication of the operations of state-owned companies is the more critical component of this milestone. Companies with majority public ownership have been identified and included in the list of public authorities, but the first draft of the instructions (in cooperation with the Institute of Public Finance) was developed after the reporting period.

In addition, an analytical report on the transparency of work for 43 mostly state-owned companies was drafted, regarding their compliance with the legal obligation to proactively publish information. According to government officials, the distribution of the instructions was expected in June 2016. Therefore, the IRM researcher found there was sufficient progress in the implementation of the necessary activities that this milestone achieved limited completion.

4.5. Draft and publically release a searchable database on the execution of payments from the single state budget account (completed)

End of term: Substantial
No activities, other than the ones already being executed at midterm and described in the 2014–2015 IRM report, were implemented by the Ministry of Finance with regard to milestones 4.1–4.3 and 4.5, and their completion levels remain unchanged at substantial. The IRM researcher found that milestone 4.4 is now completed. According to the information commissioner, the State Office for State Property Management, the Institute of Public Finance, and the Ministry of Finance cooperated to complete instructions for the majority of publicly owned companies. The instructions, developed in May 2016, compel companies to disclose information and detail the manner, form, and deadlines for publication of their annual reports.

The instructions for information disclosure were published at the information commissioner's website[1] and distributed twice to all relevant companies that are on the list of public authorities (milestone 2.1). According to the interviewed stakeholders and the draft self-assessment report, the instructions also stated that the publication of annual reports will be monitored in the period from

June to October 2016 (for data from 2013, 2014, and 2015). This information is now available for available for 721 companies for 2013, 2014, and 2015.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Major
Civic participation: Did not change
Public accountability: Did not change
The first OGP action plan integrated the indicators from the Open Budget Index (OBI) in order to focus on areas where Croatia achieved lower scores. However, the indicators were not implemented in accordance with international standards or in the time period envisaged by the action plan.

Items that were incomplete during the previous action were included in the current action plan, but their requirements and indicators were less strict than recommended by the OBI's Open Budget Survey (OB Survey). As for the OBI, the 2012 survey showed slight improvement for Croatia (61 out of 100, compared to 57 in 2010). The 2015 OB Survey,[2] however, showed a sharp decline for Croatia, from 61 to 53, indicating that the Ministry of Finance has limited itself to traditional forms of financial transparency (such as publishing the state budget (proposal) and monthly and annual reports). This change can be seen in lowered expectations when comparing the second action plan commitments to the first action plan.

The Ministry of Finance was reluctant to include some of these activities, such as supplements to annual reports or expanded guides for citizens, because they felt that they were already providing the necessary data. In addition, resource constraints further impeded expansion of the annual reports; the department did not have the staff or funding capacity needed for expanding on what they were already publishing. This led to a reduction in the scope of activities included in the commitment, compared to the OBI requirements and indicators, resulting in a limited completion of those requirements.

The overall potential impact of this commitment was moderate, aside from milestones 4.4 and 4.5, which were potentially transformative. Regarding milestones 4.1–4.3, since the Budget Act already mandates most of the commitment activities, their implementation did not transform "business as usual" for the government in any of the observed areas. However, the two completed milestones did have a major influence on access to information. Namely, the publication of annual reports by government-owned companies is now monitored, with a list of the respective annual reports now housed as a database on a single website. Also, the searchable database on the execution of payments from the single state budget account is a major step forward in the area of access to information and would even be transformative if certain technical issues were improved. For more details on this, see the 2014–2015 IRM midterm report.

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule.

The IRM researcher recommends further work on the implementation of milestones 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. These milestones commit to providing information on several different aspects of economic and budgetary data. It may facilitate the implementation of the next action plan if:
- Considering the personnel and financial constraints of the Ministry of Finance, only the activities which are realistic in scope are included in the next action plan, so progress is achieved through smaller but more achievable steps;
- This complex commitment is revised to consist only of the activities that were not implemented in the assessed period, while leaving out activities that are a regular part of the work done by the Ministry of Finance; and
- Activities are added, as suggested by the interviewed stakeholders, to increase administrative capacity (e.g., education of existing employees, new employment, partnering with civil society organisations on projects and other activities, a more mobile and flexible organisation of

work, etc.) An effort can then be made to involve other competent actors in the implementation of the OGP action plan activities or to adjust the level of ambition to the existing capacities (next action plan);

- The data available was published in a format other than PDF in order to facilitate the reuse and additional analysis by researchers and other interested audiences. In addition, citizens are certainly interested in budgetary documents, but special effort needs to be made in clarifying and simplifying the manner in which they are delivered; and
- The new commitments include public reporting mechanisms and feedback mechanisms for citizens to monitor and challenge budget allocations.

The IRM researcher also recommends improving the self-reporting process of the Ministry of Finance so that the challenges in implementation are clearly identified and articulated in the form of lessons learned and recommendations for the next action plan.

The researcher also recommends that work be continued on improving the database for milestone 4.5 (e.g., setting a new activity in the next action plan in order to build on existing implementation of the milestone):

- Amend the existing database in order to increase searchability of data. Consider using the following parameters: name of the supplier, year (all data pertaining to a year), etc.;
- Include data on the 17 largest public bodies and extra budgetary users that are not included in the existing database, if technically and financially possible, as well as data on suppliers who are physical persons; and
- Include an analysis of the data, such as a "top list" of suppliers.

---

[1] Available at http://www.pristupinfo.hr/uputa-za-objavu-godisnjeg-izvjesca-o-poslovanju-trgovackih-drustava-u-vecinskom-vlasnistvu-drzave-lokalnih-i-regionalnih-jedinica/.
[2] Available at http://survey.internationalbudget.org/#profile/HR.

✪5. Improvements of Transparency and Efficiency in Public Administration Work

Commitment Text:

5.1. Develop the e-Citizen system in components that will enable secure and advanced communication between citizens and the public sector

Implementation indicators:

- *establishment of technological solutions for the publication of information on public services for citizens (My administration, in the framework of the Central state portal)*
- *all state administration bodies have educated persons and use the components of My Administration for the release of public information*
- *establishment of an organisation system within the state administration for regulating the components of My Administration*
- *establishment of a basic system for electronic exchange of data in the possession of public sector bodies in one place*
- *establishment of a user box in the framework of the Central state portal for personal access to information of that person kept by state administration bodies*
- *number of e-services available to citizens*
- *number of users*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration
Supporting institutions: State administration bodies
Start date: June 2014 .... End date: continuous

5.2. Publish strategic documents of the Government of the Republic of Croatia in one place

Implementation indicators: list of strategic documents adopted by the Government, with links to entire documents, published on the Central state portal
Lead institutions: Government of the Republic of Croatia, Public Relations Service
Supporting institutions: State administration bodies
Start date: June 2014 .... End date: continuous

5.3. Publish annual work plans and annual reports on the work of state administration bodies

Implementation indicators:

- *published annual work plans for all state administration bodies, with clearly listed specific goals and activities associated with public policies and strategic goals in their competent, and planned resources for their implementation*
- *published annual reports on the work of all state administration bodies based on the monitoring of implementation of strategic plans through the process of (self-)evaluation*

Lead institutions: Government of the Republic of Croatia, Public Relations Service
Supporting institutions: State administration bodies
Start date: June 2014 .... End date: continuous

5.4. Increase transparency in the area of employment and advancement in the civil service

Implementation indicators:

- *establish clear criteria and procedures for admittance and advancement in the civil service, based on competences and real needs of institutions*
- *establishment of a well-conceived work evaluation system for civil servants that will have a direct impact on advancement, an individual professional development plan, and salaries for individual civil servants*
- *drafted analysis of application of institutes of the right of privilege during recruitment in public administration*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration

Supporting institutions: State administration bodies
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: June 2015

5.5. Increase the transparency of activity of agencies, institutes, funds and other legal persons founded by the Republic of Croatia

Implementation indicators: On the websites of agencies, institutes, funds and other legal persons founded by the Republic of Croatia, the following are regularly published:

- *information on their work*
- *reports which those bodies are required to submit to the line ministries pursuant to special regulations*

Lead institutions: Agencies, institutes, funds, and other legal persons founded by the Republic of Croatia
Supporting institutions: Ministries having competence over such legal persons
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

5.6. Publish comprehensive versions of environmental impact studies on the websites of the competent bodies

Implementation indicators: proposal of amendments of relevant acts that commit public authorities to publish comprehensive versions of all conducted strategic and environmental impact studies in their area of competence on their website in a timely manner

Lead institutions: Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection
Supporting institutions: Regional self-government units, county administrative bodies/administrative bodies of the City of Zagreb competent for environmental protection
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

Editorial note: In order to simplify the evaluation of the milestones, milestone 5.2 and 5.3 were combined into a single one (5.2). All subsequent milestones in the table and text below were attributed a smaller number (e.g., 5.4 instead of 5.5 as found in the action plan).

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion / Midterm End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
✪5. Overall				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔			✔						✔
															✔						
5.1: e-Citizen system				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔			✔						
															✔						
5.2: Publish strategic documents of state administration bodies				✔	✔		✔	✔		✔					✔						
															✔						
5.3: Transparency in civil service				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔	✔								
														✔							
5.4: Transparency in agencies, institutes, funds, legal entity activities				✔	✔		✔	✔		✔				✔							
														✔							
5.5: Environmental impact studies on websites				✔	✔		✔	✔				✔				✔					
																✔					

Commitment Aim:

This commitment sought to improve transparency and efficiency in the work of public administration. This would be achieved through the development of a secure and advanced platform for communication between citizens and the public sector (milestone 5.1); the publishing of strategic documents and annual work plans of state administrative bodies (5.2); increased transparency in public employment and advancement (5.3); the work of different agencies, institutes, and funds founded by the Republic of Croatia (5.4); and the publishing of environmental impact studies online (5.5).

Status

Midterm: Substantial

5.1. Develop the e-Citizen system in components that will enable secure and advanced communication between citizens and the public sector (substantial)

The e-Citizen system had been in the works for several years, and the first version of the system was launched in June 2014 as envisaged by the action plan, resulting in a substanial level of completion. Personnel from 53 public administration bodies using the portal were trained. In addition, an

organisational system within the state administration responsible for the administration of the portal was established. For more information on organisational structure, the e-services available, and data on users, please refer to the IRM midterm report.

5.2. Publish strategic documents of the Government of the Republic of Croatia and annual work plans of state administration bodies in one place (substantial)
The IRM researcher found substantial implementation of this commitment within the deadline set by the action plan. In that regard, a unique location (URL) was set up where all strategic documents of the Croatian government[1] and the ministries[2] are published along with other relevant documents. However, the IRM researcher found that it was somewhat difficult to find the webpage containing the ministries' strategic documents because the preceding webpage[3] did not provide a direct link to it. Instead, only the drop-down header menu contains the link.

All government bodies also have a legal obligation to draft and publish on their home website: a) the annual work plan for the following year (the deadline for publication is 31 December of the current year) and b) the annual report for the previous year (deadline for publication is 30 April of the current year). However, the IRM researcher found it difficult to ascertain whether all the public administration bodies did this, since they each have unique websites and not all of them are user friendly. For that purpose, the researcher used the search function of the Digital Information Documentation Office's Central Catalogue,[4] finding over 120 results when searching for "annual work plans" (for 2015) and over 70 results for "annual reports" (for 2014), depending on the search words used. It is clear that the numbers are high, but what is missing is a verification mechanism ensuring that each public administration body actually drafted its report and made it public.

5.3. Increase transparency in the area of employment and advancement in the civil service (not started)
Due to frequent reports of nepotism and corruption regarding employment and advancement in the civil service, this milestone was included in the action plan. During the midterm evaluation, the IRM researcher found that no actual implementation on this milestone was started. The work on amendments to the Civil Servant Act began in 2014. The Ministry of Administration sent the draft to state administration bodies for observation and commenting (in September 2014, January 2015, and June 2015). In accordance with the procedural provisions, each time comments and opinions were collected, the ministry prepared a draft of amendments on the Civil Servants Act. However, this only indirectly contributed to the implementation indicators stated in the action plan, as the self-assessment report does not comment on the content of the drafted law.

5.4. Increase the transparency of activity of agencies, institutes, funds, and other legal persons founded by the Republic of Croatia (limited)
During the midterm evaluation, the IRM researcher found limited implementation for this milestone, resulting in it falling behind the schedule set by the action plan. Article 12 of the Budget Act[5] provides for the obligation to publish annual financial statements of budgetary and extra-budgetary users on the respective websites no later than eight days from the date of submission of the report to the competent institution. In addition to the publication of financial reports, this milestone required a provision that delegates clearly defined responsibilities to all respective competent administrative bodies to regularly and uniformly publish relevant information.

5.5. Publish comprehensive versions of environmental impact studies on the websites of the competent bodies (complete)

End of term: Substantial
There were no changes in the level of completion for any of the milestones, aside from milestone 5.3, which registered a limited level of completion. More specifically, in March 2016, the Ministry of Public Administration prepared the draft amendments to the Civil Servants Act and proposed amendments to regulation of civil service employment and advancement procedures. Both regulations contain measures that simplify and speed up the recruitment process, in addition to improving transparency. These amendments were adopted by the government and submitted to the Parliament. The Parliamentary Legislation Committee supported their adoption. On 12 May 2016, the Croatian Parliament held the first reading and debate of amendments to the Law on Civil Servants. Just before the Parliament dismissed the government in June 2016, the final draft had been

submitted to the Croatian government for the second reading. Additionally, in May 2016 the information commissioner drafted and distributed to all public authorities guidelines on access to information in the implementation of public tender procedures for recruitment, selection, and appointment procedures. There is a risk that the new Croatian Parliament will not adopt the final draft of the Civil Servants Act due to the changing priorities and opinions of the new ruling majority, which might oppose the act as it was envisioned in the action plan.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Outstanding
Civic participation: Major
Public accountability: Major
Croatian citizens, prior to the implementation of these milestones, had no access to e-services and had to navigate dozens of websites in order to find strategic documents. In addition, there were cases where documents, including annual work plans, environmental impact studies, and other relevant information from public institutions, were not published. The potential impact of three milestones was transformative, while milestones 5.2 and 5.4 were marked as potentially minor. Even though limited implementation of two milestones, 5.3 and 5.4, led to no visible changes in government practices, the substantial completion of milestone 5.2 and full completion of milestone 5.5 led to marginal and major effects, respectively, with regard to disclosing information and improving opportunities for citizens to influence decisions and to hold officials to account.

However, the most impactful milestone in this commitment, and one of the most important activities envisaged in the second action plan overall, was the development of the e-Citizen system. The system had an outstanding impact in two areas and a major impact on civic participation, while using technology and innovation for transparency and accountability. According to the draft self-assessment report and IRM research, there are now 29 e-services available in the system and 57 e-mail message services that can be delivered to users through their personal user box. From its introduction to the beginning of 2016, 230,415[6] users signed up at least once for e-services. All e-services have been used a total of 4,051,354 times in the same period.[7] Personal user boxes were opened by 160,421[8] users (12 percent of whom are using a mobile application on Android, iOS, and Windows Phone operating systems). The total number of messages sent to all users is about 4.5 million.

Also, components of the system have been adapted for use by businesses as part of a pilot e-Business project. It should be mentioned that the e-Citizens system won the best European e-Government services project award at the OGP Global Summit, held on 28 October 2015 in Mexico City, in the category "Open government for improving public services."

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher recommends further work on completing the implementation of milestones 5.3 and 5.4 in particular. Should the government continue implementation on those or other milestones in this commitment in the next action plan, the commitment should include the following components that could be achieved in a two-year span:
- Top priorities should be establishing the meta-register system, including new electronic services from all public-sector institutions and expanding the technical solutions to other users of public services, such as CSOs, private enterprise, foreign and domestic investors, local and regional self-governments where possible, etc.;
- The Ministry of Administration should continue basic implementation on all the envisaged implementation indicators in milestone 5.3, not just drafting legislation (existing and next action plan);
- The OGP Council should name specific (co-)leader(s) for implementing milestone 5.4 and continue basic implementation. A clear responsible administrative body or bodies and human and financial resources need to be dedicated to this activity in the next action plan; and
- The Ministry of Administration should analyse whether the regional self-government bodies are impementing the milestone fully and on time.

[1] Available at https://vlada.gov.hr/pristup-informacijama/strategije-planovi-i-izvjesca/14636.

[2] Available at https://vlada.gov.hr/pristup-informacijama/strategijeplanovi-i-izvjesca/strateski-dokumenti-vlade-rh/17683.

[3] Available at https://vlada.gov.hr/pristup-informacijama/strategije-planovi-i-izvjesca/14636.

[4] Available at http://www.digured.hr/.

[5] Available at http://www.zakon.hr/z/283/Zakon-o-prora%C4%8Dunu.

[6] According to data found on the e-Citizen webpage, there were 318,033 unique users on 5 September 2016. Available as XML at https://gov.hr/UserDocsImages//Data%20za%20datagov.hr/MURHeGradjaniStat//C_KorisniciSustavaEgradani.xml.

[7] According to data found on the e-Citizen webpage, all e-services were used 6,599,477 times by 5 September 2016. Available as XML, with a breakdown of the total number per e-service, at https://gov.hr/UserDocsImages//Data%20za%20datagov.hr/MURHeGradjaniStat//D_Koristenje_usluga.xml.

[8] According to data found on the e-Citizen webpage, the total number a personal user box was used was 2,405,584 times by 5 September 2016. Available as XML at https://gov.hr/UserDocsImages//Data%20za%20datagov.hr/MURHeGradjaniStat//D_Koristenje_usluga.xml.

6. Improvement of Transparency of Election and Referendum Campaigns

Commitment Text:

6.1. Regulate the legislative and institutional framework of transparent financing of election campaigns

Implementation indicators: Proposal of amendments to the Act on Financing Political Activities and Election Campaign on issues that proved to be insufficient during implementation of the Act drafted and adopted at the Government session.

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration
Supporting institutions: State Electoral Commission
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

6.2. Regulate the legislative and institutional framework of transparent financing of referendum campaigns

Implementation indicators: Proposal of amendments to the Act on Financing Political Activities and Election Campaign which would regulate the transparent financing of referendum campaigns drafted and adopted at the Government session.

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration
Supporting institutions: State Electoral Commission
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

6.3. Improve the manner of collecting and publishing data on financing political activities and election campaigns

Implementation indicators:

- *develop an application solution for a single manner of collecting data from participants of election campaigns and from participants of regular financing of political activities*
- *development of permanently accessible and searchable databases of Annual financial reports of political parties, independent representatives and bodies (editorial note: members) of representative bodies of local and regional self-government elected from the voter group ballot, and financial reports on the financing of election campaigns of political parties, independent ballot leaders, or leaders of the voter group ballot and candidates, which enables simple searching on various grounds.*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Administration
Supporting institutions: Digital Information Documentation Office; State Electoral Commission
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2016

6.4. Improve the process of election of members of voter committees at elections and referendums

Necessary resources: HRK 2 million

Implementation indicators:

- *online available application for conducting education of persons for work in voter committees*
- *upon completion of the executed modules of the application for the education of persons for work in voter committees, the creation of an automatic database with the results of the e-exam and other relevant data on education participants (experience, party affiliations, etc.)*
- *priority appointment of the chairperson and deputy of voter committees based on their rank in the database*

Lead institutions: State Electoral Commission
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: September 2015

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion — Midterm / End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
6. Overall (Midterm)			✔		✔	✔	✔	✔				✔			✔				✔		
6. Overall (End of term)														✔							
6.1: Transparent financing of election campaigns (Midterm)		✔					✔				✔				✔						
6.1 (End of term)														✔							
6.2: Transparent financing of referendum campaigns (Midterm)		✔					✔					✔			✔						
6.2 (End of term)														✔							
6.3: Data on financing political activities and election campaigns (Midterm)			✔		✔		✔	✔				✔		✔							
6.3 (End of term)														✔							
6.4: Improving the process of election of voter committee members (Midterm)			✔		✔	✔	✔	✔				✔		✔							
6.4 (End of term)																✔					

Commitment Aim:

Continuing the previously achieved progress in the area of transparency of election campaign financing, this action plan envisaged amendments to the current legislation in the areas that have proven to be insufficiently regulated, in cases of elections (milestone 6.1), referenda (milestone 6.2), and campaigns related to them (6.3). The commitment also aimed at improving the selection process for voter committee members (6.4).

Status

Midterm: Substantial

6.1. Regulate the legislative and institutional framework of transparent financing of election campaigns (substantial)

6.2. Regulate the legislative and institutional framework of transparent financing of referendum campaigns (substantial)

Milestones 6.1 and 6.2 are at a substantial level of implementation, according to the goals and deadlines set out in the action plan. More specifically, the interviewed stakeholders and the self-assessment report state that the Croatian government adopted the draft law on financing of political activities, the electoral campaign, and the referendum at its session held on 26 March 2015. The draft

law regulates issues that proved insufficiently regulated under provisions of an earlier law. Parliament discussed the law on 13 May 2015 and voted on the law on 17 May 2015, accepting the proposal of the law. Any comments suggestions and opinions expressed in the discussion were sent to the Ministry of Administration for proposal of a final draft[1]. According to the officials at the Ministry of Administration, the final proposal was made and is being harmonized with the opinions of the competent authorities. However, since the Parliament was no longer in session and was dissolved as of 28 September 2015 due to parliamentary elections held in November 2015, there was a risk of postponing the adoption of the amended legislation.

After the first year of action plan implementation, CSO representatives stated that there is not enough political will to push for the proposed amendments, and that the efforts of the Ministry of Administration were only perfunctory. The Ministry of Administration first assessed this milestone as "complete" in the draft midterm self-assessment report. However, after receiving comments from GONG and other stakeholders, the ministry ammended the final version of the midterm self-assessment report, evaluating this milestone as having achieved "limited" completion.

6.3. Improve the manner of collecting and publishing data on financing political activities and election campaigns (limited)
Interviewed representatives of the Digital Information Documentation Office stated that the annual financial reports and the financial reports on financing of electoral promotion are continually published and can be searched on the office's website.[2] However, the legislative amendments demanding publication of annual financial reports on the office's website, as envisaged by the milestone, were not completed during the first year of implementation.

6.4. Improve the process of election of members of voter committees at elections and referendums (limited)
The implementation of this milestone was limited and behind schedule. However, evidence indicated that substantial strides had been made in the period after 1 July 2015. According to the government, the start of the planned activities has been delayed due to the fact that amendments to the Register of Voters Act had yet to be finalised, thus negatively affecting implementation. Amendments on the Register of Voters Act were subsequently adopted by the Parliament on 25 September 2015.[3] Additionally, the Constitutional Court was reviewing certain provisions of the Law on Election of Members of the Croatian Parliament, and the provisions were adopted on 24 September 2015.[4] Due to this, pending activities concerning implementation had to be postponed until these processes had been finalised. The IRM researcher therefore noted that at the end of the first year of implementation, this issue was at a standstill, resulting in the completion level being evaluated as limited.

End of term: Limited
The IRM researcher changed the assessment regarding completion for milestones 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, since the protracted legislative procedure had delayed implementation. The delay was in part caused by the dissolution of the newly appointed government in June 2016, in addition to the general ineffectiveness of Parliament while in session. To be more specific, November 2015 marked the end of the six-month deadline for submitting the final draft proposal to the Parliament, meaning that, according to its Rules of Procedure, the legislative process is thus suspended and the draft must be re-proposed. Since this is a step back from where implementation was at the end of the first year, both milestones 6.1 and 6.2 are now marked for limited instead of substantial completion, and milestone 6.3 remains marked as limited.

In regard to the limited level of completion, the then Croatian government adopted its Annual Plan for Normative Activities in April 2016, with the legislation originally scheduled for adoption in the third trimester and later rescheduled for after the 11 September elections. The next steps, as envisaged by the Ministry of Administration in the draft self-assessment report, are conducting online consultations with the interested public, referring the proposed law to be tabled in government proceedings, adopting it in Parliament, and adopting secondary, implementing regulations.

According to the self-assessment report, the e-learning and training programmes were effective for the Croatian parliamentary elections on 8 November 2015, in accordance with the Law on Election of Members of the Croatian Parliament. It was enacted following a decision by the Constitutional Court in late September 2015. Government officials stated that since the goal of the activity was to have it implemented at regular elections and possible referendums from 2015 onwards, the State Election Commission took all necessary measures to implement the activity. The online educational module was published on the commission's website. The educational material consisted of educational tests and video materials, which covered all aspects of the committees' work, with a possibility of accessing online tests. Those who solved the tests were ranked in accordance with the results achieved. This milestone is therefore completed.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal
Civic participation: Major
Public accountability: Did not change
In order to increase the integrity of the election and referenda campaigning and voting process, the action plan envisioned measures to regulate elections, referenda, and their respective campaigns; to collect and publish data; and to improve the appointment process of members of voter committees by establishing online education and testing modules. The potential impact of this commitment was transformative; however, since very limited progress was made on the first three milestones, the commitment registered a marginal impact on improving government openess. The interviewed CSO representatives[5] stated that there was not enough political will to push for the proposed amendments and that the efforts of the Ministry of Administration were only perfunctory. Only milestone 6.4 was completed in the two-year period. Voting committees administer the implementation of an election, making sure that everything runs smoothly, that the rules are upheld and democratic procedures followed, and that the results are tallied after the voting is done. It had a major effect on civic participation, people approached the online training program without any limits, received the necessary training and took the requisite test. The test results gave a possibility to the electoral commissions of constituencies to appoint presidents and deputy presidents of the voting committees among people who achieved better test results. The simple fact that this is now an online process, which is more transparent and less prone to outside influence or favoritism, makes citizens more apt to apply.

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests including this commitment's unfinished milestones in the next action plan for full completion.

---

[1] The minutes of meeting are available at http://www.sabor.hr/fgs.axd?id=43455, and the details on the Conclusion of the Parliament can be found in Point 38.
[2] Available at http://www.digured.hr/Politicke-stranke-i-izbori.
[3] Available at http://www.zakon.hr/z/558/Zakon-o-registru-bira%C4%8Da.
[4] See more at http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/ustavni-sud-o-izmjenama-zakona-o-izborima-zastupnika-nedopustivi-su-komentari-pojedinih-saborskih-zastupnika---410067.html.
[5] The interviews were conducted in the period from September to October 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

7. Transparency in the Area of Youth Policy

Commitment Text:

7.1. Improve the content of the website of the initiative Guarantee for Youth

Implementation indicators:

- *review of contracted projects and funds granted and spent for the implementation of initiatives conducted*
- *Annual implementation report published*
- *statistical overview of site hits*
- *section containing information on the work and conclusions of the expert bodies responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Guarantee for Youth created and regularly updated (Intersectoral working group for monitoring the implementation of the Guarantee for Youth; Intersectoral supervisory board for monitoring the Guarantee for Youth)*
- *information on the scope, manner of work and division of authority between the abovestated two bodies, published to the set deadline*
- *number of published conclusions/session meetings in relation to the number of sessions held*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Labour and the Pension System

Supporting institutions: None specified

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: October 2014

7.2. Improve the transparency of the work of the Council for Youth of the Government of the Republic of Croatia

Implementation indicators:

- announcements and minutes from the sessions of the Youth Council of the Government of the Republic of Croatia regularly posted on the official website of the MSPY
- number of published announcements and session minutes in relation to the number of held sessions of the Youth Council of the Government of the Republic of Croatia

Lead institutions: Ministry of Social Policy and Youth

Supporting institutions: None specified

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: continuous

7.3. Improve the transparency of the work of the Youth Council

Implementation indicators:

- *instructions drafted for local and regional self-government units to develop separate columns on their official websites that will contain all the relevant information in the work of the Youth Council*
- *list of established Youth Councils published and regularly updated on the official MSPY website*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Social Policy and Youth

Supporting institutions: None specified

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: 2014 and continuous

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion / Midterm End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
7. Overall			✔		✔			✔			✔				✔				✔		
															✔						
7.1: Youth Guarantee initiative website			✔		✔			✔			✔			✔							
														✔							
7.2: Transparency in work of Government Council for Youth			✔		✔			✔			✔					✔					
																✔					
7.3: Transparency in Youth Council work			✔		✔			✔			✔				✔						
																✔					

Commitment Aim:

Croatia has a decade-and-a-half-long tradition of youth policy-related interventions. It is one of the first policy areas where access to information and civic participation were encouraged and fostered. The aim of the commitment was to increase transparency in youth policy, by providing information on the Youth Guarantee program (milestone 7.1) and by increasing the transparency of work of the Council for Youth (milestone 7.2) and youth councils at local and regional levels (milestone 7.3).

Status
Midterm: Substantial
7.1. Improve the content of the website of the initiative Guarantee for Youth (limited)
The Youth Guarantee is a new approach to tackling youth unemployment that ensures that all young people under the age of 25—whether registered with employment services or not—get a good-quality, concrete job offer within four months of them leaving formal education or becoming unemployed.[1] Since this is a new initiative with significant funding, especially in countries with high youth unemployment such as Croatia, the action plan envisaged activities aimed to ensure transparency of the initiative. In order to oversee the initiative, the government established an interdepartmental working group (IWG) in February 2014. The implementation of this milestone was limited and behind schedule in the midterm report because only two out of five envisaged results were met. In July 2014, the Council for the implementation of the

Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan was established; the Youth Guarantee initiative website[2] was started in November 2014; and the Annual Implementation Plan Report for 2014 was adopted and published in July 2015.

7.2. Improve the transparency of the work of the Council for Youth of the Government of the Republic of Croatia (complete)

This milestone was completed by the midterm evaluation point.

7.3. Improve the transparency of the work of the Youth Council (substantial)
The Ministry of Social Policy and Youth contacted all counties on 27 October 2014, requesting aggregated data for each county (including information on local government units) on established youth councils. The collected data was published on the official website.[3] However, the published data tables turned out to be mostly empty, except for a few exceptions. The ministry subsequently started recollecting the data and planned to publish an annual report, and it also sent recommendations to cities, municipalities, and counties to create a separate section on their official website with relevant information concerning youth councils, in accordance with Article 23 of the Act on Youth Councils. There is, however, no information available on the number of local and regional self-government units (576 of them) that publish such information on their official websites.

End of term: Substantial
According to the draft self-assessment and research by the IRM researcher, milestone 7.1 remains limited in implementation. The Youth Guarantee website now contains information on contracted projects and funds,[4] the implementation plan, and the annual report on the scope and methods of the council's work.[5] An email was set up for queries (gzm@mrms.hr), and a reported 46,021 people accessed the website, visiting 181,605 pages for an average of 2 minutes and 40 seconds, since the website was established in November 2014. However, there is still no information on the results of implemented activities, minutes from the IWG or council sessions, scope of other activities, or any news published since late 2015.

Milestone 7.3 is reported as complete in the self-assessment draft. According to sources from the Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, data on youth councils now available on the ministry's website have been published in the form of a report in early July 2016[6] and will be suplemented with a new annual report on the number of established (and active) youth councils in Croatia, for 2015, as well as a list of active county, city, and municipal youth councils in 2015. The documents have been prepared and contain information on youth councils in 149 local and regional units, including links to local and regional websites with information about their work. The ministry plans to continually collect and publish this information.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal
Making information about the work of the Youth Council publicly accessible is a significant step forward since data on youth participation in decision-making processes was not readily available before. The same can be said of youth councils and advisory bodies that include youth representatives at the regional and local levels: Their activities are even less well known, and in some cases the youth councils themselves have difficulty understanding what they should do.

Youth issues in the form of youth policy were included in the OGP action plan for the first time. Out of the three milestones, one is related to a specific European Union-related policy (Youth

Guarantee), and two are related to collecting and publishing information on youth councils at the national, regional, and local levels.

The impact of the implemented activities could have moderate effects in setting standards and making relevant information available to the public. However, the language of the commitment is very narrow in scope. The government committed to improving transparency on the Youth Guarantee Initiative website and transparency in the work of the Government Council and local and regional youth councils. However, transparency might be an important prerequisite for effective implementation of the programme, but as noted by GONG,[7] the actual uptake is quite limited. Namely, all three milestones have a moderate potential impact. Milestone 7.1, which had limited completion, and milestones 7.2 and 7.3, which were fully completed, thus had a marginal influence regarding information disclosed to the public and improving the quality of that information.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests that the Ministry of Labour and the Pension System pick up activities regarding the Youth Guarantee website and publish all relevant information on activities that took place since 2015, as well as the programme's future plans.

In addition, the IRM researcher recommends the following activities, regarding milestones 7.2 and 7.3, be discussed for inclusion in the next action plan:

- Create an application to be used for collecting and publishing all the relevant data about local and regional councils (their statutes and rules of procedure, who their members are, their contact data, agendas for council meetings, minutes of meetings, activities, projects, events of youth councils, etc.), which local and regional bodies would update regularly; and
- Discuss the benefits of conducting a public campaign aimed at increasing youth's interest and use of information on youth councils on every administrative level. This could be a good educational tool in order to increase youth civic participation.

---

[1] See more at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1079.

[2] Available at http://www.gzm.hr.

[3] Available at http://www.mspm.hr/djelokrug_aktivnosti/mladi/godisnji_izvjestaj_osnovanih_savjeta_mladih_pri_lokalnim_i_regionalnim_podrucnim_samoupravama.

[4] Available at http://www.gzm.hr/sto-je-garancija-za-mlade/kako-ce-se-financirati/.

[5] Available at http://www.gzm.hr/sto-je-garancija-za-mlade/ plan-implementation/.

[6] Available at http://www.mspm.hr/istaknute-teme/mladi-1683/savjeti-mladih/izvjesca-o-savjetima-mladih/2240.

[7] The interview was conducted on 22 September 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

8. Media Transparency

Commitment Text:

8.1. Improve the legislative framework for transparency and independent work of the media

Implementation indicators:

- *Proposal of amendments to the Media Act drafted and adopted at the Government session which enables:*
- *strengthening of the implementation mechanisms for Article 6 (accessibility of public information in a "reasonable" timeframe)*
- *regulation of the status of journalists in the sense of their protection if they speak out about censure within their editorial offices*
- *defining the terms on the networking of concession holders and publishers*
- *transparency of data on the owners of all media to the level of the natural person (register in reusable and easily searchable open code format)*
- *transparency of annual financial reports of media*
- *data on publishers that are easily accessible on the publisher's website (impressum), including: ownership structure with shares/associations in other publishers and other types of companies (e.g. co-ownership/close persons/familial relations) and official functions and/or holding functions in a political party by an owner of media; revenue from media activities; editorial office statute; contact information of the editorial office.*
- *The proposed amendments of the relevant legislative framework will enable decision-making on state subsidies and breaks for individual publishers (Media Act, Electronic Media Act, Value Added Tax Act, etc.).*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Culture
Supporting institutions: Information Commissioner
Start date: Not specified...............   End date: June 2015

8.2. Improving the legislative framework for the transparency of electronic media

Implementation indicators: Establishment of legal obligations for the timely release of complete and accurate information on the website (impressum) of the electronic media publisher that includes:

- *programme basis, included concession obligations, concession area and broadcast area*
- *programme scheme, including daily and weekly broadcasting schedule*
- *contract on the networking of concession holders, including data on responsible editors and network programme schemes*
- *contact information and/or viewer/listener feedback form*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Culture
Supporting institutions: Information Commissioner; Council and Agency for Electronic Media
Start date: Not specified...............   End date: December 2014

8.3. Increasing transparency and improvement of managing conflicts of interest in the work of Cultural councils

Implementation indicators:

- *published records of Cultural councils at the level of the Ministry and local government bodies*
- *ensuring the application of mechanisms to manage conflicts of interest (e.g. obligation to declare a conflict of interest in records, instrument of self-exclusion from the decision-making process, drafting of a code of ethics, amended decision-making procedures in the case of a declared conflict of interest, etc.)*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Culture
Supporting institutions: Information Commissioner; Digital Information Documentation Office; Conflict of Interest Commission
Start date: Not specified...............   End date: December 2014

8.4. Publish concession contracts for the provision of television and radio media services, with tender documentation

Implementation indicators: published concession contracts on the provision of television and radio media services, with tender documentation
Lead institutions: Agency for Electronic Media
Supporting institutions: Ministry of Culture
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: continuous

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion / Midterm / End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
8. Overall				✔	✔			✔				✔		✔				✔			
														✔							
8.1: Legislative framework for transparent and independent media				✔	✔							✔	✔								
													✔								
8.2: Legislative framework for transparent electronic media				✔	✔			✔				✔	✔								
													✔								
8.3: Cultural councils conflict of interest disclosure				✔	✔			✔			✔			✔							
														✔							
8.4: Television and radio concession contracts				✔	✔						✔				✔						
															✔						

Commitment Aim:

This commitment sought to ensure and improve upon the independence and transparency of the media. Milestones 8.1 and 8.2 sought to improve the legislative framework and to improve transparency for traditional media and electronic media sectors, including amendments to the Media Act, the Electronic Media Act, and the Value Added Tax Act. Miletone 8.3 aimed to increase transparency and improve conflict of interest management in cultural councils, and milestone 8.4. aimed to increase transparency of concession contracts for the provision of television and media services.

Status
Midterm: Limited

8.1. Improve the legislative framework for transparency and independent work of the media (not started)

8.2. Improving the legislative framework for the transparency of electronic media (not started)
The IRM researcher found the implementation of milestones 8.1 and 8.2 was not started during the first year of implementation. Namely, the Ministry of Culture envisaged that all the legislative changes should result from a unified media policy, the adoption of which was not included in the OGP action plan commitments. Of the activities planned in creating such a policy, the ministry only published the National Report on the Media[1] and other working materials[2] for public media policy discussions and conducted a series of roundtables. This unified media policy was never finalized and stalled the implementation of both milestones.

8.3. Increasing transparency and improvement of managing conflicts of interest in the work of cultural councils (limited)
The IRM researcher found limited implementation for this milestone, putting it behind schedule. According to the self-assessment report, the minutes of the meeting concerning the cultural councils and commissions are available on the official website of the Ministry of Culture.[3] The interviewed ministry representative,[4] however, stated that, although the ministry is obligated to keep full records, it only partially publishes meeting minutes. There is also no sanction for violating the legal obligation to publish minutes of meetings. Likewise, the instrument of self-exclusion from a debate in the case of a declared conflict of interest was introduced and implemented, but the interviewed CSO representatives[5] stated that the change replaced a strict conflict-of-interest prevention mechanism with a soft legal institute, the self-exclusion mechanism.

8.4. Publish concession contracts for the provision of television and radio media services, with tender documentation (substantial)
The IRM researcher found substantial implementation for this milestone. All concession agreements are made public on the Agency for Electronic Media's website[6] along with the basics of programming for every broadcaster. However, according to the self-assessment report, tender-related documentation has not been released to the public, due to the large volume of documents. Additionally, all media organisations and publishing houses responsible for the publication of tenders were erronously asked to act as gatekeepers of classified information and to notify the agency if any parts of the to-be-published tender documents contained confidential material. However, this was an erorr in judgement and in assigning authority, since, according to the Act on the Right of Access to Information, the Information Commissioner is the only administrative body, aside from the judiciary, that can order the release of documentation to the public (regardless of what the publishers might believe is confidential data).

End of term: Limited
The Ministry of Culture has still not started implementing milestones 8.1 and 8.2, nor does the Plan of Normative Activities anticipate any amendments to media legislation in 2016. The completion of milestone 8.3 remains limited. According to the draft self-assessment report, the ministry publishes summaries of minutes, rather than comprehensive minutes, from cultural council meetings, and the conflict of interest policy is being implemented. The ministry stated that it plans to further improve and enhance the work of cultural councils by amending the Law on Cultural Councils. There was also no progress made in the implementation of milestone 8.4 compared to the midterm report. All concession agreements were published along with the basics of programming for each publisher. However, the draft self-assessment report states that due to the large number of tender documents (nearly 170 radio and TV publishers) full completion of this milestone has not yet been achieved but will be shortly.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Did not change
The self-assessment report and the interviewed representative from the Ministry of Culture[7] both noted that the provisions on media transparency did not prove particularly controversial for the government. However, the media policy creation process stalled the implementation of milestones 8.1 and 8.2. According to several interviewees from both the state administration and CSOs, this policy has been "in the works" for three years, only to have its launch postponed for an unspecified amount of time due to parliamentary elections held in November 2015. CSO representatives[8] in

particular emphasised the fact that journalists' rights are poorly regulated in the current legislation, and highlighted the need for its urgent amending. Although the potential impact of these milestones was transformative, there was no change in the government information disclosure practices due to a limited level of implementation.

Concerning milestone 8.3, the Ministry of Culture establishes cultural councils for certain areas of artistic and cultural creativity; members are cultural workers and artists who contribute to the realisation of the objectives of cultural policy and propose measures for its implementation. Cultural councils have in the past been opaque in their conduct, and their members were often unaccountable for any conflict of interest. This milestone was aimed at transforming the existing situation and ensuring transparency and better access to information to the interested public. The cultural councils would have to publish minutes of meetings and establish a mechanism for managing conflicts of interest through declarations of conflicts of interest and self-exclusion from the decision-making process. Milestone 8.3 had moderate potential impact at the midterm review. However, its implementation was limited, and the disclosure of information suffered a setback because the strict conflict-of-interest prevention mechanism was replaced with a soft legal institute: namely, the self-exclusion mechanism.

Concerning milestone 8.4., given that concessions mean the use of limited public goods, the publication of concession agreements on the agency's official website,[9] allows the interested public to monitor the compliance of broadcast and programme principles with those mentioned in the tender documents. The public has long been interested in knowing how concession contracts are awarded, especially for television and radio media services (electronic media). This makes the implementation of this milestone moderately ambitious and marginally successful in increasing transparency and the right to access information on the use of a public good.

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests the following steps to reach a full completion of the unfinished milestones:
- Demonstrate political will to improve the legislative framework for transparency and independent work of the media by adopting the media policy or abandoning it in favor of earlier regulation;
- Make the meetings of the cultural councils public;
- Because they participate in public decision making, expand the definition of officials to other appointed members of public bodies, such as the cultural councils, so that they may be under the competence of the Committee for Preventing Conflicts of Interest;
- Publish full minutes of meetings of all cultural councils in accoradance with the Act on the Right of Access to Information, which requires all public authorities to publish their work meetings (agendas and dates) and a way to publicly follow their meetings; and
- Include the information commissioner in the implementation of the final milestone, led by the Agency for Electronic Media, and publish the tender-related documentation according to the commissioner's input.

---

[1] Available at http://www.min-kulture.hr/userdocsimages/NAJNOVIJE%20NOVOSTI/Izvjestaj%20-%20Radni%20materijal%201%20-%20Rad%20u%20medijima.pdf.

[2] Available at http://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=12069.

[3] Available at http://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=13.

[4] The interview was conducted on 30 September 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[5] The focus group with CSO representatives was held on 22 September 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[6] Available at https://pmu.e-mediji.hr/Public/PregledTvNakladnici.aspx.

[7] The interview was conducted on 30 September 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[8] Information commissioner event, 28 September 2016. See Methodological Note and http://www.pristupinfo.hr/en/povjerenik-za-etiku/.

[9] Available at https://pmu.e-mediji.hr/Public/PregledTvNakladnici.aspx.

9. Improving Transparency of Information on Members of Parliament and Their Work

Commitment Text: *9.1. Improvement of the content of the website of the Croatian Parliament*

Necessary resources: HRK 2 million

Implementation indicators: Established technological solution for the website of the Croatian Parliament, such that it includes:

- *regular and timely release of complete data on the voting by members of parliament*
- *overview of voting on laws and acts with total votes and display for each member of parliament with their vote - for plenary sessions*
- *record for the sessions of boards which should contain alphabetical lists of board member names and indications of how they voted, with information on who attending voting and in the case of voting in the manner that one member deposits his vote with the board chairperson, instead of voting during the time of concluding the discussion at the board, it is necessary to state that person's name, if such a case is stated in the record*
- *information on the budget and expenditures of the Croatian Parliament*
- *under information on individual members of parliament, provide insight into the asset record and decision of the Conflict of Interest Commission via a link to the website of the Conflict of Interest Commission (www.sukobinteresa.hr) where the asset records are provided, together with the Commission decision, with the obligatory note that the Parliament is not accountable for the content of that website.*

Lead institutions: Croatian Parliament

Supporting institutions: Conflict of Interest Commission (pertaining to the issue of asset records and decisions on conflict of interest for members of Parliament)

Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion	Midterm End of term			Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
																✔					
				✔	✔		✔	✔	✔							✔		✔			

Commitment Aim

For the purpose of greater transparency of the Croatian Parliament, this commitment envisaged steps to improve the Parliament's website. A significant step forward was to be the publication of members individual voting records after each plenary session as well as information on the parliamentary budget and expenditures. Furthermore, information about individual members of Parliament, their asset records, and possible conflict-of-interest decisions made by the Conflict of Interest Commission was to be made available on the website.

Status
Midterm: Complete

According to the self-assessment report, the Croatian Parliament already has established webpage technology which includes:
- Regular and timely publication of complete data on MPs' votes;
- Review of an act's voting process with total votes expressed for each MP—at the plenary session; and
- Information on the budget and expenditures of the Croatian Parliament.

The report states that the Parliament plans to fulfil the remaining two implementation indicators (publication of all committee meeting minutes and the addition of links to the MP's assets on the Commission for the Resolution of Conflict of Interest's webpage) by the end of the action plan implementation period in December 2016.

The IRM researcher found that this commitment describes an activity (the publication of parliamentary information on the parliamentary website) that was already completed before the start of the action plan implementation period and does not represent a "stretch" in government practice. Therefore, while this commitment was evaluated as "complete," it was found to have no potential impact.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Did not change
Public accountability: Did not change
For the purpose of greater transparency of the Croatian Parliament, this commitment envisaged steps to improve the Parliament's website. However, no additional information or changes were made to the parliamentary website, resulting in the commitment not having any impact on opening governmment. The parliamentary website already held all the required information before action plan implementation, excluding the publication of committee meeting minutes and links to the MP's assets on the Commission for the Resolution of Conflict of Interest's webpage. According to the draft self-assessment report, conclusions from every committee meeting are published in the committees' reports, which are then published in real time on the website. The Parliament's Secretariat states in the report that Croatian citizens are aware that all information on parliamentarians' assets is published on the website of the Conflict of Interest Commission, making it unnecessary to publish the same information on the website of the Croatian Parliament. As such, this commitment had no potential impact and was not a "stretch" in the existing practice, affecting neither access to information nor public accountability. Additionally, the interviewed stakeholders[1] found that no actual new improvement was made to the website. For instance, according to the comment sent by GONG in the public consultation phase for the 2014–2015 self-assessment report, this commitment was "not started."

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests undertaking the following steps to increase the potential impact of the commitment:
- Planning for inclusion of a "legislative footprint" for each MP, linked with lobbying activities in Croatia and in line with the planned preparations regarding legislation on lobbying (see commitment 14); and
- Increasing the Parliament's budget in order to mitigate the technological constraints for collecting and using available data.

---

[1] The interviews were conducted in the period from September to October 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

Commitment Text:

10.1. Computerisation of the work of the Conflict of Interest Commission

Necessary resources: HRK 300,000

Implementation indicators: Through the computerisation of the work of the Commission, tools will be developed allowing the interested public to more easily access information on the assets of officials.

Lead institutions: Conflict of Interest Commission

Supporting institutions: None specified

Start date: Not specified.............   End date: June 2015

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion	Midterm End of term			Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
			✔		✔		✔	✔		✔						✔			✔		
																✔					

Commitment Aim

The aim of this commitment was to develop tools, allowing easier public access to information regarding the assets of public officials. Electronic submission of public officials' financial reports allows the Conflict of Interest Commission and the public to better verify the accuracy of the submitted information. This, in turn, allows for greater transparency regarding officials' property.

Status

The Conflict of Interest Commission already had a publicly accessible website[1] with information on public officials' asset declarations, and it also included information on public servants in management positions in state administration bodies. The IRM researcher found the implementation of this milestone to be completed on time, based on the schedule set by the action plan.

Did it open government?

Access to information: Marginal

Public accountability: Marginal

The Conflict of Interest Commission already had a publicly accessible website[2] with information on public officials' asset declarations, and the website also included information on public servants in management positions in state administration bodies. The aim of this commitment was to develop new tools, allowing easier public access to information on the assets of public officials. Electronic submission of public officials' financial reports allows the Conflict of Interest Commission and the public to better verify the accuracy of the submitted information. This, in turn, allows for greater transparency of officials' property and increases their public accountability. According to the draft self-assessment report, after the introduction of the computerised system, consistency in the presentation of information, as well as the completeness of the data, has improved, increasing transparency. This was confirmed by the interviewed CSO representatives.[3] The IRM researcher concludes that the introduced changes made a small but important step in opening government practice, both in improving the quality of information accessible to the public and in improving opportunities to hold officials answerable to their actions. According to the self-assessment report,

after the introduction of the computerised system, consistency in presentation of information as well as the completeness of the data has improved, which has increased transparency. As a result, interested parties, such as CSOs and the media, have used the available information to increase public scrutiny and point out conflict-of-interest situations involving officials. For example, in January 2016 a minister in the former government had to resign after spending one week in office due to false data about his residence on his asset declaration.[4]

Carried forward?

The commitment has been completed within the evaluation period. The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests that the commission consider upgrading the searchability of its decisions published on the website by including topics, locations, articles of the corresponding laws, etc. as search variables, which would increase transparency and accountability and improve access to information about assets held by public officials.

---

[1] https://www.sukobinteresa.hr/.

[2] Available at https://www.sukobinteresa.hr/.

[3] The interviews were conducted in the period from September to October 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[4] For illustration on this example, see the following media reports: http://net.hr/danas/hrvatska/afera-ne-staje-crnoja-je-prekrsio-ugovor-s-gradom-samoborom-dobio-je-kredit-i-zemljiste-da-sagradi-kucu/; http://www.telegram.hr/politika-kriminal/ovo-je-7-najvaznijih-stvari-o-aferi-s-laznim-prebivalistem-ministra-branitelja-mije-crnoje/; and http://www.express.hr/top-news/konacna-odluka-crnoja-dao-ostavku-3743#.

✪11. Improving the Consultation Process with the Interested Public in Legislative Procedures

Commitment Text:

11.1. Establishment of a single interactive Internet system for consultations with the public in procedures of adopting new laws, other regulations and acts

Implementation indicators:

- *establishment of a single Internet system for public consultations*
- *draft acts, other regulations and documents for which consultation procedures are held are published in a timely manner on the Internet system for consultations prior to forwarding to the Government adoption procedure*
- *publication of reports on conducted consultations on the Internet system for consultations*
- *publication of annual reports on the implementation of Code of Consultations on the Internet system for consultations*

Lead institutions: Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs

Supporting institutions: Ministry of Administration; Information Commissioner; Digital Information Documentation Office; Government of Croatia—Public Relations Office

Start date: Not specified.............. End date: December 2014

11.2. Conduct education of state officials and civil servants in state administration bodies and civil servants in local and regional self-government units on the efficient reporting on consultation results

Necessary resources: HRK 20,000

Implementation indicators:

- *annually at least two workshops/seminars on conducting consultations held*
- *number of state officials and civil servants attending workshops/seminars*

Lead institutions: Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs

Supporting institutions: State Public Administration School

Start date: Not specified.............. End date: continuous

11.3. Draw up and publish annual reports on efficiency of application of the Code of Consultation with the interested public in the adoption of new laws, other regulations and acts

Implementation indicators: Drafted and publicly released annual report on the application of the Code of consultation.

Lead institutions: Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs

Supporting institutions: State administration bodies

Start date: Not specified.............. End date: February 2015/2016

11.4. Publish the composition of working groups and committees for drafting laws, other regulations and acts on the Central state portal

Implementation indicators: Regularly updated list and composition of all working groups on the Central state portal (on the Internet system for consultation)

Lead institutions: Government of Croatia—Public Relations Office

Supporting institutions: Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs; State administration bodies responsible for the drafting of laws, other regulations, and acts

Start date: December 2014......... End date: continuous

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion	Midterm / End of term			Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
✪11. Overall				✔	✔	✔		✔				✔			✔						✔
																✔					
11.1: Online legislative procedures consultation				✔	✔	✔		✔				✔				✔					
																✔					
11.2: Educate officials and civil servants reporting on consultation results				✔	✔	✔	✔					✔				✔					
																✔					
11.3: Annual reports on efficiency of the Code of Consultation application				✔	✔	✔	✔				✔					✔					
																✔					
11.4: Central portal for groups working on legislation				✔	✔		✔					✔	✔								
																✔					

Commitment Aim:

The aim of the commitment was to improve the existing, ineffective system of public consultations in legislative procedures by further strengthening the implementation of the Code of Consultation and the provisions of the Act on the Right of Access to Information, which deal with public consultations. The action plan committed to doing this by introducing an online consultation system (milestone 11.1), educating officials and civil servants on its use (milestone 11.2), annually reporting on the efficiency of the system (milestone 11.3), and publishing information of working groups drafting the proposed legislation (milestone 11.4).

Status

Midterm: Substantial

11.1. Establishment of a single interactive internet system for consultations with the public in procedures of adopting new laws, other regulations, and acts (complete)

11.2. Conduct education for state officials and civil servants in state administration bodies and civil servants in local and regional self-government units on the efficient reporting of consultation results (complete)

11.3. Draw up and publish annual reports on efficiency of application of the Code of Consultation with the interested public in the adoption of new laws, other regulation,s and acts (complete)

11.4. Publish the composition of working groups and committees for drafting laws, other regulations, and acts on the central state portal (not started)
For the purpose of greater transparency in the entire decision-making process, the government planned to publically release via a single portal the composition of working groups and committees in charge of the drafting of laws, other regulations, and documents. This information was scattered on different webpages, depending on the policy sector in question. This would be a major step towards increasing transparency; however, civic participation might not be affected as strongly since existing legislation already requires that working groups be composed of a diverse group of stakeholders. The responsibility for this commitment was transferred from the Public Relations Office of the Government of Croatia to the Office for Cooperation with NGOs, which worked with a private company on developing the database. However, no visible results regarding this milestone were included in the midterm report.

End of term: Complete
According to the draft self-assessment report, milestone 11.4 was completed in December 2015. The Office for Cooperation with NGOs established a database on the required information, and the database was built with a clear and searchable format. The office started gathering information on working group members from other state bodies in April 2015, and the data collected is now available at the website[1] with occasional updates.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Outstanding
Civic participation: Outstanding
Public accountability: Outstanding
Previously, the consultation process on legislative proposals was up to each individual agency, which reduced access to information, potential civic participation in the proceedings, and public accountability. This commitment was transformative in its ambition as it was meant to empower citizens to monitor the course of drafting an individual document—from the working group phase to its adoption and publication in the Official Gazette. The public can now become directly involved during the public consultation procedure by providing comments to the proposed text. The e-consultation system has yielded outstanding results because it has simplified the consultation procedure, and it has also made the competent authorities more accountable since they are now obliged to answer each (publically available) comment in a timely manner. For example, in comparison to 2013, there were 63 percent more consultations held in 2015 (608 held in total), and 12 percent more than in 2014.[2] Although they mentioned there was room for improvement regarding certain technical aspects and the need for more public promotion of the online tool, the interviewed CSO stakeholders[3] stated that the e-consultation process works well and that local and regional self-government units should also consider implementing this procedure. As for civic partcipation, the number of participants and comments grow each year: there were over 15,000 comments received in 2015[4] with a total of 5,863 participants (more than 4,100 of whom are individuals).[5] Since the government is now obliged to disclose more information in a timely and higher-quality manner and since it created opportunities for the public to influence decisions and for officials to be accountable for their actions, this commitment was outstanding in its bid to open government.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests the following steps to build on the current achievements:

- Work on upgrading the e-consultation application in accordance with the needs of users, both citizens and civil servants;
- Also, provide follow-up information on the e-consultation process within the online tool: how many comments, which were accepted by the competent body proposing the draft law, were actually adopted by the Parliament in the legislative procedure, how meaningful are the explanations given to comments, how valid and true, etc. This would include a improving on the process of justification for rejecting some comments, thus eliminating simple statements such as "not possible" or "irrelevant";
- Create tools for stimulating greater participation from local and regional self-government bodies (at least for the bigger cities and/or counties) and carry out training sessions for employees who are in charge of the consultation procedure. . It should be noted that the Office for Cooperation with NGOs has insufficient human and financial resources to provide assistance to an additional number of bodies that would use the application for publishing their reports. However, the Office has contacted the Croatian County Association regarding a possibility of handling consultations for local (556) and regional governments (20);
- Train civil servants to work in the system and provide technical support in the implementation of consultation to users. A notable example, already in action, is the regular monthly training for civil servants on the use e-Consultations, offered by the Office for Cooperation with NGOs. The Office also organizes general trainings on consultations, in cooperation with the State Public Administration School; and
- The activity described in milestone 11.4 should be amended to become a more long-term or systematic solution, such as using the existing e-consultation portal to update information on working groups for proposed draft legislation.

---

[1] Available at https://savjetovanja.gov.hr/baza-savjetodavnih-tijela/1118.

[2] More data on e-consultations is available at https://savjetovanja.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/slike/savjetovanja-2015%20(1).png and in the 2015 government report on the procedure, available at https://savjetovanja.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/dokumenti/Izvje%C5%A1%C4%87e%20o%20provedbi%20savjetovanja%202016.pdf.

[3] The interviews were conducted in the period from September to October 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[4] Government Report on e-Consultations, p. 11.

[5] Ibid., p. 9.

12. Ensuring the Sustainability of Values and Content of the OGP Initiative

Commitment Text:

12.1. Inclusion of the values and content upon which the initiative Open Government Partnership is based in the Curriculum programme for civil education

Implementation indicators: The values and content upon which the initiative Open Government Partnership is based included in the curriculum for civil education, particularly in the area of anti-corruption, achieving the right of access to information, and the inclusion and participation of citizens in decision-making processes.

Lead institutions: Ministry of Science, Education and Sport
Supporting institutions: Education Agency; National OGP Council
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: 31 December 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion	Midterm / End of term			Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
			✔			✔						✔		✔			✔				
														✔							

Commitment Aim:

The issue of civic education in Croatia has been a highly debated topic for years. Civil society organisations dealing with human rights, anti-discrimination, anti-corruption, openness, and transparency advocated for civic education to be introduced into schools as soon as possible.[1] This commitment aims to include OGP values and content into the curriculum programme for civic education, including anti-corruption, right of access to information, and civic participation in decision-making processes.

Status

Midterm: Limited

The government launched pilot projects and used good practice examples to improve the proposed curriculum. The programme was expected to be used as a new school subject in September 2014, but with a change of leaderships at the Ministry of Science, Education, and Sport in June 2014, this process was halted. The topics intended to be taught as a single subject are now cross-curricular, while a final decision on the method of implementation was pending. This has delayed the implementation of this commitment, resulting in a limited completion level. For more details, please refer to the IRM midterm report.

End of term: Limited

The draft self-assessment report states that the decision on the adoption of cross-curricular and interdisciplinary content of civic education for primary and secondary schools (Official Gazette, No. 104/2014) determined that the contents and themes of civic education should be conducted in the framework of cross-curricular implementation. In July 2015, an expert working group was formed for drafting the Curriculum of Cross-Curricular Topics in Civic Education. Civic education in the 2015/2016 school year was implemented cross-curricularly as an experimental elective programme in

the eighth grade of primary school. The draft self-assessment report proceeds to list the steps undertaken in implementing this commitment, and states that the draft for this cross-curricular topic was published on 22 February 2016.[2]

However, mass protests were held in several cities in Croatia, with more than 25,000 participants in Zagreb alone, under the name "Croatia can do better" (*Hrvatska može bolje*).[3] Their purpose was to express dissatisfaction with the new education minister's decision to dismiss the expert working group at the moment public consultations were being held on the content of the draft curriculum. This controversial decision, according to the initiative "GOOD,"[4] heralded by several prominent Croatian CSOs, was contrary to the decisions of the Croatian Parliament, to adopted strategic documents and democratic procedures, as well as standards set by the Code for Consultation with the Interested Public in Legislative Procedures.[5]

Did it open government?
Civic participation: Worsens
For a country with limited experience with civic education as well as open governance values and principles, the impact of this commitment could potentially have been transformative. The current inactivity regarding implementation and the highly controversial decisions by the technical minister for science, education and sport (for example, suspending the expert working group before its mandate was over and tampering with established public consultation procedures) means the actual impact of this commitment has worsened the status quo regarding open government. Furthermore, civil society is concerned that the process may have been stopped for the foreseeable future, which points to the conclusion that the government's actions have led to a deterioration in opportunities and capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions on this topic in the second year of implementation. The initiative "GOOD" stated in one of its announcements:[6] "We strongly condemn the actions of the technical Minister [of Science, Education and Sport], who … is behaving contrary to the decisions of the Croatian Parliament. … We therefore urge the Minister to refrain from violating the decision of the Croatian Parliament and doing further damage to education reform."

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests undertaking the following steps to reach full completion:
- The government should implement this commitment as envisaged, while striving to uphold all achieved democratic standards regarding transparent decision making, respect for legal procedures, and the value of civic participation and accountability.

---

[1] Agencija za odgoj i obrazovanje, Kurikulum građanskog odgoja i obrazovanja, kolovoz 2012., http://bit.ly/Wv7rRD [Agency for Education, Civic Education Curriculum, August 2012].
[2] The draft version of the document was submitted for public consultations and is open for commenting until 1 December 2016: https://esavjetovanja.gov.hr/ECon/MainScreen?entityId=3715.
[3] See more at http://hrvatskamozebolje.org/5542/reuters-thousands-of-croatians-protest-for-education-free-of-politics/.
[4] GOOD is an initiative established in 2008 by several civil society organizations engaged in informal education and human rights, committed to systematically and efficiently introduce education for human rights and democratic citizenship in the educational system.
[5] See more at http://goo.hr/good-inicijativa/.
[6] See more at http://goo.hr/aktualna-rasprava-o-kurikulumima/.

✪13. Participation in Drafting the New Anti-Corruption Strategy

Commitment Text:

13.1. Develop a new anti-corruption strategy

Necessary resources: HRK 50,000

Implementation indicators:

- *decision of the Government/Ministry of Justice on the establishment of a working group/coordination body for managing the process of drawing up the Draft strategy*
- *detecting corruption risks in all sectoral areas encompassed by the Draft of the strategy*
- *formation of sectoral teams for drawing up the draft strategy*
- *public consultation conducted on the draft strategy*
- *number of staff of public authorities included in the process of drawing up the draft strategy*
- *number of civil society organisations included in the process of drawing up the draft strategy*
- *draft strategy drawn up before 30 September 2014*
- *strategy adopted by the Government before 30 December 2014*

Lead institutions: Ministry of Justice

Supporting institutions: Information Commissioner; Conflict of Interest Commission; Ministries

Start date: Not specified.............   End date: December 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion Midterm End of term				Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
				✔	✔	✔						✔				✔				✔	
																✔					

Commitment Aim:

This commitment aimed to develop a new Anti-Corruption Strategy, including the allocation of necessary resources. The previous Anti-Corruption Strategy was in place since 19 June 2008 and had several action plans aimed at achieving its goals.[1] The previous strategy was a time-limited strategic document that passed through several previous administrations. In early 2013, the Ministry of Justice announced that a new Anti-Corruption Strategy was to be drafted;[2] however, the drafting process did not start until June 2014 when a working group was constituted.

Status

Midterm: Complete

The IRM researcher found that this commitment was completely implemented within the requisite time frame.

The draft strategy and the accompanying form for participation in the consultation were published on the website of the Ministry of Justice.[3] During the public consultation, there were two thematic roundtables (one on 19 November 2014[4] and the other on 9 December 2014). In addition, other thematic meetings were held on this topic in November and December 2014. After the proposed strategy was finalised and the strategy was adopted on 27 February 2015 (Official Gazette, No. 26/2015), the next step was the development of the accompanying action plan. It also went through a period of public consultation (from 22 May to 21 June 2015) on the e-consultation portal[5] and was adopted on 16 July 2015.[6] A total of 20 comments were received during the consultation process, all of which were commented on by the competent authority and three of which were declined.

The interviewed stakeholders all stated that the described process was open and participative and that the finalised documents represented an example of good practice.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal
Civic participation: Outstanding
This commitment included activities intended to shepherd the new Anti-Corruption Strategy from the drafting phase through adoption by the government. Its potential impact was transformative, since creating this type of cross-sectoral document meant that the government had to significantly extend its established procedures in order to provide more information and encourage civic participation. The interviewed stakeholders[7] all stated that the described process was open and participatory and that the finalised documents represent an example of good practice.

The effect on improving the quality of available information was marginal since most of the information required for creating the strategy was available, though it had to be gathered and analysed by the sectoral working groups. On the other hand, the government created outstanding opportunities for the public to inform and influence decisions in the creation of the document, setting the standard for other such strategic decision making. For example, the representatives of GONG emphasised[8] that the Ministry of Judiciary mostly worked in line with GONG's proposal for a participative approach to the creation and adoption of the strategy.

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule.

---

[1] Strategija suzbijanja korupcije, Narodne novine, 19. lipnja 2014., http://bit.ly/1qyilm4 [Anti-Corruption Strategy, Official Gazette, 19 June 2014].

[2] Ministarstvo pravosuđa, www.antikorupcija.hr, http://bit.ly/1xuSyjF [Ministry of Justice].

[3] https://pravosudje.gov.hr/pristup-informacijama-6341/savjetovanja-sa-zainteresiranom-javnoscu/okoncana-savjetovanja/okoncana-savjetovanja-2014-godine-7897/7897.

[4] https://pravosudje.gov.hr/vijesti/odrzan-okrugli-stol-na-temu-strategije-suzbijanja-korupcije/7601.

[5] https://esavjetovanja.gov.hr/ECon/MainScreen?entityId=1155.

[6] http://www.propisi.hr/print.php?id=13679

[7] The participants were interviewed in the period between September and October 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[8] The interview was conducted on 22 September 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

14. Regulation of Lobbying

Commitment Text:
14.1. Drafting the analysis of the legislative framework in the area of lobbying
Implementation indicators:
Drafted analysis of the legislative framework in the area of lobbying and accordingly, procedure of amending the existing act or drafting of a new one initiated.
Lead institutions: Ministry of Justice
Supporting institutions: Information Commissioner
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: December 2014

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion	Midterm / End of term			Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
				✔		✔	✔				✔		✔					✔			
														✔							

Commitment Aim:

There currently exists no law regulating lobbying in Croatia. Adopting the law on lobbying has been on the political agenda for years, with most stakeholders supporting its adoption but with only a few actually pushing for ratification. The aim of this commitment was to provide an analysis of the legislative framework on lobbying as a basis for amending existing acts or drafting a new one.

Status

Midterm: Not started

At the begining of 2014, the Ministry of Justice announced that it would start drafting an analysis of the existing legislative framework and pursue further action, such as either amending the existing legislation or drafting a new law dedicated specifically to lobbying. However, in the self-assessment report by the government, this activity was marked as "not started." The interviewed stakeholders from the Ministry of Justice stated that the delayed start of this activity is related to the adoption of strategic documents in the field of combating corruption (the aforementioned Anti-Corruption Strategy, commitment 13). This was also confirmed by the interviewed ministry representative,[1] who stated that its implementation was planned for the fourth quarter of 2015 in the anti-corruption action plan.

End of term: Limited

According to the draft self-assessment report, this commitment is substantially implemented. However, even though an analysis of the legal framework in the area of lobbying was drafted, the Ministry of Judiciary still needs to carry out further consultations with other public bodies and interested stakeholders. According to the ministry, the analysis sets out the regulation, self-regulation, and legislative frameworks for lobbying in the European Union and beyond. It

analyses the recommendations and guidelines of national and international organisations for the regulation of lobbying practices and sets out the conditions, needs, and reasons for regulating lobbying activities in Croatia. The analysis makes recommendations regarding possible regulation of lobbying practices, thus deciding whether there is a need for a special law to regulate lobbying. However, this draft is still not available to the interested public. Therefore, the IRM researcher finds the commitment completion to be limited.

Did it open government?
Civic participation: Did not change
Public accountability: Did not change

Regulating lobbying activities in Croatia has been a contentious issue for years. This commitment sought to provide a basis for making a policy decision on regulating lobbying by providing a comprehensive analysis of the issues, in addition to including the comparative policies in other countries. On that note, GONG published a press release stating that "it is necessary to regulate the activities of lobbyists in order to make information about who lobbies in Croatia and in whose interest, available to the public in a single registry."[2] This opinion was reiterated by other CSO representatives,[3] who noted that the time has come for lobbying regulation to finally be adopted in Croatia, following the standards set by the European Parliament. Since the implementation of the commitment was limited in the observed two-year period, the IRM researcher finds that the government is yet to have a comprehensive lobbying framework. Thus, the commitment did not improve government openness.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The Ministry of Judiciary did not include any next steps in the draft self-assessment report. The IRM researcher, therefore, suggests the following steps to reach a full completion of the unfinished milestones:

- Carrying out a public consultation with all interested stakeholders;
- Finalising and disseminating the results of the analysis; and
- Initiating the process of amending existing laws or drafting a new law accordingly.

---

[1] Interview conducted on 30 September 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

[2] Available at http://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/gong-zahtjeva-obavezno-objavljivanje-informacija-o-sastancima-duznosnika/922275.aspx.

[3] Information commissioner event, 28 September 2016. See Methodological Note and http://www.pristupinfo.hr/en/povjerenik-za-etiku/.

15. Improving Efficiency of the Ministry of Interior's Complaints Commission

Commitment Text:

15.1. Amend the Police Act

Implementation indicators: Drafted proposal of amendments to the Police Act in the part of provisions of the Act regulating the work of the Complaints Commission of the Ministry of the Interior.

Lead institutions: Government of Croatia, Ministry of the Interior
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: June 2015

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion		Midterm End of term		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
		✔				✔	✔			✔					✔		✔				
															✔						

Commitment Aim:

This commitment sought to strenghten the civil supervision over police work and to ensure greater efficiency of the Complaints Commission of the Ministry of Interior. The commitment, however, did not explicitly specify how civil supervision over police work would be improved or what revised role the Complaints Commission would have in this aspect.

Status

Midterm: Substantial

The envisaged amendments to the Police Act are described in detail in the IRM midterm progress report. The IRM researcher concluded that the commitment was substantially completed, even though the implementation indicator, limited to amending the Police Act,[1] was fully implemented. This is because the actual application of the act never took place (the new commissions' members were not appointed), so efficiency did not improve.

End of term: Substantial

There were no changes in the implementation of the act. The draft self-assessment report states that the Ministry of Interior expected more efficient functioning and control over police enforcement with the creation of several new complaints commissions, compared to the previous centralised Complaints Comission. However, the ministry stated[2] that the risks foreseen in the self-assessment progress report have been justified: stakeholders from the general public are not interested in participating in the commissions, making it effectively impossible to appoint commissioners.

Did it open government?
Civic participation: Did not change
Public accountability: Worsens

The purpose of the commitment was effective civil oversight over police enforcement in local police units instead of using the centralised Complaints Commission. However, this can only be achieved once all the commissioners are appointed. Since there is a lack of interested stakeholders who wish to work in the envisaged commissions, there is no increase in civic participation. In addition, the state of public accountability in police enforcement has worsened, since there are no commissions to hold it responsible.

Due to this, the ministry is proposing a return to the previous legal solution—the centralised Complaints Commission—but with more commissioners, each of whom would receive compensation for their work and be appointed by the Croatian Parliament.

Interviewed CSO stakeholders,[3] though, believe that a stronger public campaign to increase stakeholder interest in the commissions would be a better step forward and that the government should not abandon this attempt to decentralise public services and make them more accessible to every citizen.

Carried forward?

The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. However, in the draft self-assessment report, the Ministry of Interior has expressed its intention to amend the existing Police Act, with the following provisions:
- Establishing a single Complaints Commission;
- Increasing the number of its members and providing compensation for their work;
- Making the Croatian Parliament the responsible body for appointing commission members, at the proposal of the Committee for Human Rights and National Minorities; and
- Issuing a public invitation for candidates, whose pledge would be submitted by CSOs, experts, and professional organisations, or by personal expression of interest.

The IRM researcher also recommends putting effort into realising the current decentralised system and following up on this commitment in the next action plan, especially regarding the openness and transparency of the commission's work. This can be accomplished by publishing:
- Clear and accessible data on appointments; and
- Clear and accessible data on the work of the commissions (sessions, number and type of cases worked on, annual reports, etc.).

The implementation of this commitment would also benefit from a public campaign that would be aimed at stimulating participation and increasing the number of candidates for commission seats, as well as awareness raising regarding the functioning of the complaints commissions in general.

---

[1] Available at http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2015_03_33_678.html.
[2] See p. 79 of the draft self-assessment report: https://esavjetovanja.gov.hr/ECon/MainScreen?entityId=4011.
[3] Information commissioner event, 28 September 2016. See Methodological Note and http://www.pristupinfo.hr/en/povjerenik-za-etiku/.

16. Promoting Civil Participation in the Work of Civil Society Organisations

Commitment Text:

16.1. Develop a mobile telephone application for the purpose of information citizens of the possibility of participating in the work of civil society organisations in the local community

Necessary resources: HRK 40,000

Implementation indicators:

- *development of a mobile telephone application that enables citizens to search which societies are in their vicinity and provides information on their work and activities, and the possibilities of inclusion, and their contact information, and how to get involved in their work*
- *number of application users*

Lead institutions: Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs[1]
Supporting institutions: None specified
Start date: Not specified..............   End date: March 2015

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential impact				Completion				Midterm / End of term	Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed		Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
				✔	✔	✔		✔			✔					✔				✔		
																✔						

Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to inform citizens about the possibilities of becoming involved with civil society organisations through a mobile application, available across all platforms, which would allow citizens to quickly and easily obtain information on associations' activities in their local communities.

Status

Midterm: Completed

The IRM researcher found this commitment to be fully implemented, although slightly behind schedule based on the timeline in the action plan. According to the commitment language, the application was supposed to be released by 31 March 2015 but instead was not made available until 27 May 2015. However, since the application was available before the end of the first year of implementation (30 June 2015), the IRM researcher still considers this commitment to be complete.

Did it open government?
Access to information: Marginal
Civic participation: Marginal
There are over 50,000 registered civil society organisations that have extremely varied activities and scope of citizen involvement, and this commitment aimed to bring more information about CSO activities to citizens through a mobile telephone application. This allows citizens a quick and easy way to obtain information on associations' activities in their local communities. By implementing this commitment, government practice in the area of access to information and civic participation was marginally opened since most of the information on CSOs' activities are entered by the organisations themselves, with the government providing technical support on the application. So far, according to the draft self-assessment report, 551 organisations have been using the application, but the number of citizens accessing it to find information on local associations is unknown. The interviewed CSO representatives[2] stated that the application is functional and user-friendly. However, limitations of the potential reuse of data gathered through the application prevent this commitment from truly transforming the status quo in this area.

Carried forward?
The next action has not been drafted or released by the government in accordance with the OGP schedule. The IRM researcher suggests the following steps be undertaken in the next action plan:

- Monitoring and evaluating the application's overall take-up;
- Promoting the application to the wider public and encouraging more CSOs to use the application and to enter as much data on their activities as possible; and
- Opening the data collected through this application, and all such applications, for reuse.

---

[1] Editorial note: The leading body was named the Office for Societies in the OGP Action Plan; the correct translation is the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs.
[2] The participants were interviewed in the period between September and October 2015. For more information, see the IRM midterm report.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Commitments are clustered based on the original OGP action plan. However, the IRM researcher made certain changes in the clustering of some activities within commitments, as noted in the progress report and in the previous text. This report is based on a desk review of governmental programmes, draft laws and regulations, governmental decrees, review of the government draft self-assessment report, and analysis of the commitments, as well as on monitoring the development of the third action plan. The IRM researcher also relied upon face-to-face interviews with the information commissioner and officials from the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs. The IRM researcher attended a panel discussion organised by the Information Commissioner's Office in celebration of the International Right to Know Day on 28 September 2016.[1] In addition, the IRM researcher utilised written consultation with the information commissioner, the Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, and reports from the Croatian media to evaluate completion of the action plan.

Ivona Mendeš is an independent researcher and consultant in the field of public administration and management and management and public policy. Her fields of special interest include strategic planning and management, project management, social policy, and youth policy. Mrs. Mendeš has a B.A. in political science and an M.S. on the Croatian political system and management, both from the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Zagreb.

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.

Open Government Partnership

[1] The event was titled "Achievements and challenges of transparent governance" and held on Wednesday, 28 September 2016 in Zagreb. It focused on the progress of implementing the new legal framework for the creation of access to information in three years since the establishment of the independent institution of the Information Commissioner's Office, as well as on an assessment of challenges in full achievement of a transparent and open government. The panel discussion was primarily focused on beneficiaries—the civil sector, the media, and the academic community—in order to highlight their assessment of the progress and of the challenges encountered in the exercise of their rights. In addition, several tools to help beneficiaries achieve their rights were presented: a search engine for the information commissioner's decisions and opinions and the High Administrative Court's decisions; the list of public authorities; the *Guide to Citizens' Right to Access to Information*; the *Manual for Officials in Public Authority Bodies*; and the English version of the commissioner's website.