

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2014-2015: Sweden

Table of Contents

Executive Summary: Sweden	2
I. National participation in OGP.....	6
II. Action plan development.....	8
III. Action plan implementation	11
IV. Analysis of action plan contents	12
1: Putting citizens at the centre (eGovernment) of government administration reforms	16
2: A step further on the re-use of public administration documents	21
3: Increased access to Swedish aid information	26
4: Improved opportunities for dialogue and transparency in aid management and implementation	31
5: Increased aid transparency at the global level.....	37
V. Process: Self-Assessment.....	41
VI. Country Context.....	43
VII. General recommendations.....	48
VIII. Methodology and Sources	52



Executive Summary: Sweden

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2014-2015

Sweden has made progress in improving access to information and public accountability related primarily to the development assistance sector. More could be done to increase the scope of future commitments by adopting a more holistic approach to open government. This could be achieved by including more government departments as well as improving the degree of stakeholder participation in the implementation of the commitments.

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. Sweden began its formal participation in September 2011.

The Department for Aid Management (UDSTYR) at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is the leading office responsible for Sweden’s OGP commitments. The mandate of UDSTYR is limited to foreign aid and it does not have the power to enforce policy changes on other departments within the government. As a result, the national action plan focuses on transparency and open data in the field of development aid.

OGP PROCESS

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

The MFA has organized one OGP-specific consultation meeting concerning the development of Sweden’s second OGP national action plan. Sixteen civil society organizations (CSOs) and two academic institutions were invited. Four organizations took part: the International Council of Swedish Industry, MyRight, We Effect and Action Aid. Several consultations on specific commitments have taken place in other, non-OGP-specific forums.

No consultations were held during the implementation of the action plan.

At a glance

Member since:	2011
Number of commitments:	5
<i>Level of Completion:</i>	
Substantial:	3 of 5
Limited:	2 of 5
<i>Timing:</i>	
On schedule:	3 of 5
<i>Commitment Emphasis:</i>	
Access to information:	4 of 5
Civic participation:	1 of 5
Public accountability:	4 of 5
Tech. & innovation for transparency & accountability:	3 of 5
<i>Number of Commitments that were:</i>	
Clearly relevant to an OGP value:	4 of 5
Of transformative potential impact:	0 of 5
Substantially or completely implemented:	3 of 5
All three (★):	0 of 5

COMMITMENT IMPLEMENTATION

As part of OGP participation, countries make commitments in a two-year action plan. The Swedish action plan contains five commitments. For each commitment, the table below summarizes the level of completion, the potential impact, whether it falls within Sweden's planned schedule and the key next steps for the commitment in future OGP action plans.

The IRM methodology includes starred commitments. These commitments are measurable, clearly relevant to OGP values as written, of transformative potential impact, and substantially or completely implemented. Sweden's action plan contains no starred commitments. Note that the IRM updated the star criteria in early 2015 in order to raise the bar for model OGP commitments. In addition to the criteria listed above, the old criteria included commitments that have moderate potential impact. Under the old criteria, Sweden would have received one starred commitment (Commitment 3). See (<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/node/5919>) for more information.

Table 1: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

COMMITMENT SHORT NAME	POTENTIAL IMPACT				LEVEL OF COMPLETION				TIMING
	NONE	MINOR	MODERATE	TRANSFORMATIVE	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	COMPLETE	
1. Putting citizens at the centre (eGovernment) of government administration reforms: This commitment aims to continue the implementation of the Swedish e-Government strategy.									On Schedule
2. A step further on the re-use of public administration documents: This commitment aimed at improving the re-use of public administration documents in Sweden.									On Schedule
3. Increased access to Swedish aid information: This commitment aims to increase transparency in the field of development aid.									On Schedule
4. Improved opportunities for dialogue and transparency in aid management and implementation: This commitment focuses on communication and dialogue in the field of development aid.									Behind Schedule
5. Increased aid transparency at the global level: This commitment aims to promote transparency in development aid among other development actors.									Behind Schedule

Table 2: Summary of Progress by Commitment

NAME OF COMMITMENT	SUMMARY
<p>1. Putting citizens at the centre (eGovernment) of government administration reforms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Substantial 	<p>This commitment aims to continue the implementation of the Swedish eGovernment strategy with initiatives ranging from eGovernment, open data, and electronic identification. Substantial progress has been made on the commitment. The commitment could be improved upon in future plans by more clearly distinguishing how the varied online initiatives will make government more transparent, participatory, and accountable to citizens.</p>
<p>2. A step further on the re-use of public administration documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>This commitment encourages the re-use of public administration documents in Sweden by facilitating various government agencies' efforts in this area. Notably, the commitment included adoption of the European Union's Public Sector Information Directive into Swedish law and its implementation into policy. Without further information from various agencies, it is unclear how much of the work will make government more open to the public.</p>
<p>3. Increased access to Swedish aid information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Substantial 	<p>This commitment seeks to advance Sweden's efforts to increase aid transparency in financial reporting in the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) format, among peer countries, and among donor organizations. Sweden is already a top performer in these areas and progress was substantial, with IATI compliance faring the best. One-third of the aid expenditure (mainly refugee and unspecified costs) remains traceable only on a generic level, and the milestone to publish anti-corruption reports remains of minor potential impact due to the limited potential for usage.</p>
<p>4. Improved opportunities for dialogue and transparency in aid management and implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>This commitment focuses on communication and dialogue in the field of development aid and includes six milestones. The milestones seek to advance civic participation and improve the level of public accountability of aid policy development and oversight by improving coordination between Swedish non-profits and the relevant aid agencies. The completion level has been evaluated as limited. One highlight was the series of "compact dialogues" which saw high participation by civil society actors implementing aid projects. Beyond this, elements of the commitment suffered from lack of clarity in the text, limiting the overall impact of the commitment.</p>
<p>5. Increased aid transparency at the global level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited 	<p>This commitment aims to promote transparency in development aid by promoting International Aid Transparency Initiative reporting standards among development actors. The completion level has been evaluated as limited.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS

Sweden has made progress in furthering the OGP values of improving access to information and public accountability, primarily related to development aid funding transparency. However, there remains a need to include a greater scope of commitments beyond the current focus area, as well as a need to include civic participation commitments. Further improvements to the quality and scope of dialogue during action plan development and implementation are also recommended. Based on the challenges and findings identified in this report, this section presents the principal recommendations.

TOP FIVE 'SMART' RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Broaden the transparency guarantee beyond aid-specific data to government transactions in general. As a first step in this direction, Sweden could apply IATI standards to data in at least one government area closely related to development cooperation, such as trade.
2. Apply the principles of the Policy for Global Development (PGU) to government decisions about arms exports by adopting concrete steps proposed in Section VII: "General Recommendations."
3. Enhance public participation by allowing early and deeper involvement of citizens and civil society in decision-making processes, by implementing a citizen-centred approach to eGovernment and by including CSOs in recipient countries in decision making on aid strategies and budgets.
4. Adopt a systematic approach to open data by developing a roadmap setting out what data should be open and when, and by designing a funding model for joint solutions across government entities.
5. Improve the OGP consultation process by developing a formal mechanism for dialogue, by involving a broader range of stakeholders and by improving the transparency of the consultation process.

Eligibility Requirements: To participate in OGP, governments must demonstrate commitment to open government by meeting minimum criteria on key dimensions of open government. Third-party indicators are used to determine country progress on each of the dimensions. For more information, see Section IX on eligibility requirements at the end of this report or visit: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/eligibility-criteria>.

Alina Ostling is an independent researcher in Sweden.

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 (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.



I. National participation in OGP

History of OGP participation

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

Sweden began its formal participation in September 2011, when Gunilla Carlsson, Sweden's Minister for International Development Cooperation, declared her country's intention to participate in the initiative.¹

In order to participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of (minimum) performance criteria on key dimensions of open government that are particularly consequential for increasing government responsiveness, strengthening citizen engagement, and fighting corruption. Objective, third party indicators are used to determine the extent of country progress on each of the dimensions, with points awarded as described below.

Sweden entered into the partnership exceeding the minimum requirements for eligibility, with a high score in each of the criteria. At the time of joining, the country had the highest possible ranking for open budgets (2 out of a possible 2),² an access to information law,³ the highest possible rankings in asset disclosure for senior officials,⁴ and a score of 10 out of a possible 10 on the Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index Civil Liberties subscore.⁵

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

Sweden developed its second national action plan from April 2014 to June 2014. The effective period of implementation for the action plan submitted in July 2014 was officially 1 July 2014 through 30 June 2016. At the time of writing (September 2015), the government had not published its self-assessment.

This Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) report evaluates Sweden's second national action plan, covering the period of implementation from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015. In order to meet OGP requirements, the IRM of OGP has partnered with Alina Östling—an independent researcher with expertise in governance and ICT—who carried out this evaluation of the development and implementation of Sweden's second national action plan. It is the aim of this report to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. Methods and sources are dealt with in a methodological annex in this report.

Basic institutional context

The Department for Aid Management (UDSTYR) at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is the leading office responsible for Sweden's OGP commitments. The mandate of UDSTYR is limited to foreign aid, and it does not have the power to enforce policy changes on other departments within government. As a result of the limited mandate, the national action plan is oriented toward transparency and open data in the field of development aid. Thus, the current institutional setting is not ideal for interdepartmental coordination and implementation of open government initiatives. Despite the recommendation of the first IRM report to assign the OGP coordination role to an agency with broader oversight, the change has not taken place.

The coordination of the OGP action plan would be better placed in the hands of a government entity with an overarching remit—the Prime Minister's Office or the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation (which is in charge of eGovernment and has a crosscutting mandate in the field of ICT). Given the current coordinating body's limited mandate, and recognizing that open government touches all spheres of government, effective development and implementation of OGP commitments requires a more holistic approach and the involvement of multiple ministries and state agencies.

Methodological note

The IRM partners with experienced, independent national researchers to author and disseminate reports for each OGP participating government. As noted above, in Sweden, the IRM partnered with Alina Östling, an independent researcher with strong expertise in new media, democracy and evaluation. Alina reviewed the relevant literature and media reports related to OGP commitments in Sweden, gathered the views of civil society actors, and interviewed relevant government officials and civil society stakeholders. OGP staff and a panel of experts reviewed the report.

This report follows on an earlier review of OGP performance, "Independent Reporting Mechanism Sweden: Progress Report 2012-13,"⁶ which covered the development of the first national action plan as well as its implementation from 1 July 2012 to 30 June 2013.

To gather the voices of multiple stakeholders, Alina Östling organized a stakeholder meeting with nine civil society and four government representatives in Stockholm. The detailed list of attendants is available in Section VIII: "Methodology and Sources." She also carried out a literature review of a variety of government, civil society and media publications, including relevant documents prepared by the government, such as reports on Sweden's first action plan.⁷

Summaries of the stakeholder meeting and more detailed explanations are given in the annex.

¹ <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/sweden>.

² International Budget Partnership, "Open Budgets Transform Lives," *2010 Open Budget Index*, <http://bit.ly/1hTd9TQ>.

³ <http://www.right2info.org/laws/constitutional-provisions-laws-and-regulations#sweden>.

⁴ Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, "Disclosure by Politicians" (working paper, Tuck School of Business, 2009-60, 2009), <http://bit.ly/19nDefK>; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level Of Transparency," in *Government at a Glance 2009* (OECD, 2009), <http://bit.ly/13vGtqS>; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries" (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009), <http://bit.ly/1clokyf>.

⁵ "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat," *The Economist Intelligence Unit* (London, 2010), <http://bit.ly/eLC1rE>.

⁶ http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Sweden_final_2012.pdf.

⁷ <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/sweden/action-plan>.

II. Process: Action plan development

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) organized a consultation focused on the aid transparency commitments during the preparation of the second national action plan on 11 April 2014.¹ No specific consultation was held concerning the entire national action plan, either during its development or during implementation. Only four NGOs participated in the consultation meeting. However, participants found that the meeting was meaningful and the MFA was open to suggestions.²

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1: Action Plan Consultation Process

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the government meet this requirement?
During Development	Were timeline and process available prior to consultation?	Yes
	Was the timeline available online?	No
	Was the timeline available through other channels?	Yes
	Was there advance notice of the consultation?	Yes
	How many days of advance notice were provided?	4
	Was this notice adequate?	No
	Did the government carry out awareness-raising activities?	Yes

	Were consultations held online?	No
	Were in-person consultations held?	Yes
	Was a summary of comments provided?	No
	Were consultations open or invitation-only?	Invitation-only
	Place the consultations on the IAP2 spectrum. ³	Consult
During Implementation	Was there a regular forum for consultation during implementation?	No
	Were consultations open or invitation-only?	N/A
	Place the consultations on the IAP2 spectrum.	N/A

Advance notice and awareness-raising

In March 2014, at the meeting of CONCORD Sweden’s Steering Group for Aid Effectiveness, the MFA informed 10 civil society organizations (CSOs) in attendance about the work on the second OGP national action plan and about a forthcoming consultation. The information was not available online or through any other channels. Overall, the MFA carried out awareness-raising about the forthcoming consultation only through individual meetings and telephone calls with a few civil society stakeholders.

The MFA sent the invitation of the consultation meeting held on 11 April 2014 only four days in advance of the meeting (on 7 April 2014). The invitation letter also asked the addressees to submit written comments or to get in touch in-person with any questions. No written comments were submitted however.⁴

Depth and breadth of consultation

For the actual consultation meeting on OGP, the MFA invited 16 CSOs and two academic institutions.⁵ Four organizations took part: the International Council of Swedish Industry, MyRight, We Effect and Action Aid. There was a good gender balance between participants (three women and three men). The MFA also met with representatives from the University of Stockholm, CONCORD Sweden and Akvo Sweden individually to discuss OGP. All of the organizations consulted are based in Stockholm. Considering that only a handful of organizations participated in the consultation and included those primarily involved in international aid and development, the diversity of views was somewhat limited.

Participants in the consultation meeting interviewed by the IRM researcher generally felt that the consultation was meaningful and that the MFA shared decision-making power with the stakeholders. The MFA representatives were reportedly open to suggestions and comments. However, one of the participants felt that the consultation was more of an occasion to inform rather than to involve stakeholders. According to the participant, the MFA should have made it clearer that the purpose of the meeting was consultation and should have provided more information about the OGP and the relevant national action plan processes. Another interviewee mentioned that the meeting was not very dynamic; the participants remained rather passive.⁶

The MFA consultation can be placed on the level of “Consult” on the IAP2 spectrum since the MFA held a meeting in order to obtain feedback on alternatives included in the draft national action plan. The consultation falls short of the next level of “Involve” since, according to the CSOs, the MFA did not provide the adequate time and sufficient background information for CSOs to develop meaningful input for the action plan. CSOs were also concerned that the MFA did not indicate how CSO inputs influenced the national action plan, if at all.

¹ Anna Centerstig (MFA), interview by Alina Östling, Skype, 14 August 2014.

² Peter Sörbom (CONCORD Sweden), interview by Alina Östling, 7 September 2015; Maria Lagus (My Right), interview by Alina Östling, 9 September 2015.

³ "IAP2 Spectrum of Political Participation," *International Association for Public Participation*, <http://bit.ly/1kMmlYC>.

⁴ Anna Centerstig (MFA), email to Alina Östling, 29 August 2014.

⁵ The 16 invited organizations were: (i) CSOs: ActionAid, Plan International, Diakonia, Concord, International Council of Swedish Industry (NIR), Transparency International, My Right, Hand in Hand, Red Cross, LO/TCO aid committee, We Effect, Swedish Mission Council, the Swedish Church, Save the Children, Without Borders, Forum Syd; (ii) academic institutions: the Swedish Institute of International Affairs and the University of Stockholm.

⁶ Consultation meeting held on 11 April 2014.

III. Process: Consultation during implementation

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

Regular multi-stakeholder consultation

Sweden has not held any OGP-specific consultation during the implementation of the second national action plan. However, the MFA underlines that several consultations concerning national action plan commitments have taken place in other, non-OGP-specific forums.¹ For example, the civil society organization (CSO) compact (covered in Milestone 4.3) saw regular and wide attendance at meetings from both CSOs and the government, and both parties endorsed the compact as a result. Similarly, consultations with civil society also took place regarding the government strategy for aid information and communication activities (see Milestone 4.1).² On the other hand, some commitments did not see similar consultation with stakeholders.

While consultation during implementation is a requirement of OGP, it can take many forms. Nonetheless, it should allow for ongoing monitoring of progress and mid-term course correction for OGP commitments. Without a wider range of participation from a greater variety of agencies and members of the public, it is unclear that, under current circumstances, OGP is adequately well known enough to affect a broader range of topics important to Swedish society.

¹ Anna Centerstig (MFA), interview by Alina Östling, Skype, 14 August 2014.

² Anna Centerstig (MFA), email to Alina Östling, 29 August 2014.

IV. Analysis of action plan contents

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

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's unique circumstances and policy interests. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP participating countries. The IRM uses the following guidance to evaluate relevance to core open government values:

Access to information

Commitments around access to information:

- Pertain to government-held information, as opposed to only information on government activities. As an example, releasing government-held information on pollution would be clearly relevant, although the information is not about "government activity" per se;
- Are not restricted to data but pertain to all information. For example, releasing individual construction contracts and releasing data on a large set of construction contracts;
- May include information disclosures in open data and the systems that underpin the public disclosure of data;
- May cover both proactive and/or reactive releases of information;
- May cover both making data more available and/or improving the technological readability of information;
- May pertain to mechanisms to strengthen the right to information (such as ombudsman's offices or information tribunals);
- Must provide open access to information (it should not be privileged or internal only to government);
- Should promote transparency of government decision making and carrying out of basic functions;
- May seek to lower cost of obtaining information; and
- Should strive to meet the 5 Star for Open Data design (<http://5stardata.info/>).

Civic participation

Commitments around civic participation may pertain to formal public participation or to broader civic participation. They should generally seek to "consult," "involve," "collaborate," or "empower," as explained by the International Association for Public Participation's Public Participation Spectrum (<http://bit.ly/1kMmlYC>).

Commitments addressing public participation:

- Must open up decision making to all interested members of the public; such forums are usually "top-down" in that they are created by government (or actors

empowered by government) to inform decision making throughout the policy cycle;

- Can include elements of access to information to ensure meaningful input of interested members of the public into decisions;
- Often include the right to have your voice heard, but do not necessarily include the right to be a formal part of a decision making process.

Alternately, commitments may address the broader operating environment that enables participation in civic space. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Reforms increasing freedoms of assembly, expression, petition, press, or association;
- Reforms on association including trade union laws or NGO laws;
- Reforms improving the transparency and process of formal democratic processes such as citizen proposals, elections, or petitions.

The following commitments are examples of commitments that would **not** be marked as clearly relevant to the broader term, civic participation:

- Commitments that assume participation will increase due to publication of information without specifying the mechanism for such participation (although this commitment would be marked as “access to information”);
- Commitments on decentralization that do not specify the mechanisms for enhanced public participation;
- Commitments that define participation as inter-agency cooperation without a mechanism for public participation.

Commitments that may be marked of “unclear relevance” also include those mechanisms where participation is limited to government-selected organizations.

Public accountability

Commitments improving accountability can include:

- Rules, regulations, and mechanisms that call upon government actors to justify their actions, act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and accept responsibility for failure to perform with respect to laws or commitments.

Consistent with the core goal of “Open Government,” to be counted as “clearly relevant,” such commitments must include a public-facing element, meaning that they are not purely internal systems of accountability. While such commitments may be laudable and may meet an OGP grand challenge, they do not, as articulated, meet the test of “clear relevance” due to their lack of openness. Where such internal-facing mechanisms are a key part of government strategy, it is recommended that governments include a public facing element such as:

- Disclosure of non-sensitive metadata on institutional activities (following maximum disclosure principles);
- Citizen audits of performance;
- Citizen-initiated appeals processes in cases of non-performance or abuse.

Strong commitments around accountability ascribe rights, duties, or consequences for actions of officials or institutions. Formal accountability commitments include means of formally expressing grievances or reporting wrongdoing and achieving redress. Examples of strong commitments include:

- Improving or establishing appeals processes for denial of access to information;
- Improving access to justice by making justice mechanisms cheaper, faster, or easier to use;
- Improving public scrutiny of justice mechanisms;
- Creating public tracking systems for public complaints processes (such as case tracking software for police or anti-corruption hotlines).

A commitment that claims to improve accountability, but assumes that merely providing information or data without explaining what mechanism or intervention will translate that information into consequences or change, would **not** qualify as an accountability commitment. See <http://bit.ly/1oWPXdl> for further information.

Technology and innovation for openness and accountability

OGP aims to enhance the use of technology and innovation to enable public involvement in government. Specifically, commitments that use technology and innovation should enhance openness and accountability by:

- Promoting new technologies that offer opportunities for information sharing, public participation, and collaboration.
- Making more information public in ways that enable people to both understand what their governments do and to influence decisions.
- Working to reduce costs of using these technologies.

Additionally, commitments that will be marked as technology and innovation:

- May commit to a process of engaging civil society and the business community to identify effective practices and innovative approaches for leveraging new technologies to empower people and promote transparency in government;
- May commit to supporting the ability of governments and citizens to use technology for openness and accountability;
- May support the use of technology by government employees and citizens alike.

Not all eGovernment reforms improve openness of government. When an eGovernment commitment is made, it needs to articulate how it enhances at least one of the following: access to information, public participation, or public accountability.

Key Variables

Recognizing that achieving open government commitments often involves a multiyear process, governments should attach time frames and benchmarks to their commitments that indicate what is to be accomplished each year, whenever possible. This report details each of the commitments the country included in its action plan, and analyzes them for their first year of implementation.

All of the indicators and 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 between 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 "moderate" or "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, Sweden’s action plan contained no starred commitments.

Note that the IRM updated the star criteria in early 2015 in order to raise the bar for model OGP commitments. Under the old criteria, a commitment received a star if it was

measurable, clearly relevant to OGP values as written, had moderate or transformative impact, and was substantially or completely implemented.

Based on these old criteria, Sweden's action plan would have received one starred commitment:

- Commitment 3: Increased access to Swedish aid information

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 Sweden, see the OGP Explorer at www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer.

General overview of the commitments

The second national action plan has five commitments. Three of them are focused on aid transparency, while the other two are about eGovernment and the re-use of public sector information. The aid transparency commitments are about increased access to Swedish aid information, improved opportunities for dialogue between government and civil society, and increased aid transparency at the global level. The other commitments aim at enhancing eGovernment efficiency, at supporting digitization efforts, and release and re-use of public sector information.

The scope of the Swedish OGP action plan is limited. Overall, the potential impact of the OGP action plan has been largely diminished due to the fact that its scope was narrow and did not include commitments on some of the important issues in Sweden which would benefit from more openness and transparency. To the best of the knowledge of the IRM researcher, all of the commitments are pre-existing to the second national action plan. Section VI: "Country Context" reflects on the major issues of open government in Sweden and the scope of the action plan relative to the issues. The assessment of several milestones was made difficult by the fact that they were formulated vaguely. Additionally, the action plan separated objectives, activities, and milestones between the main text of the plan and the annex. Every effort was made to match these elements of the plan, although in some cases, ambiguity remained.

Clustering

In Commitment 4, the IRM researcher combined Milestones 4.3 and 4.4 into one (Milestone 4.3) since Milestone 4.4 focused on the organization of an aid dialogue and was closely connected to Milestone 4.3 concerning the civil society organization (CSO) compact.

1: Putting citizens at the centre (eGovernment) of government administration reforms

Commitment text:

This commitment aims at making everyday life easier, open up administration in order to support innovation and participation, and increase operational quality and effectiveness as stated in the eGovernment strategy "Putting the citizen at the centre". The strategy has three objectives:

- 1. Simplicity, in order to develop easy and user-friendly solutions;*
- 2. Transparency and innovation, in order to take advantage of digital opportunities to increase transparency, strengthen democracy, and contribute to increased economic growth through open data;*
- 3. Efficiency through digitisation.*

Transparency and openness are crucial to democratic accountability. Therefore transparency and access to information about government administration are vital. Supplying public sector information and digital services in standardised formats allows businesses and organisations to re-use it and to develop their own services. These services can supplement the range of services delivered by government agencies and meet diverse civic needs. The commitment will mainly be achieved through continuing the implementation of the eGovernment strategy including strengthening the governance of the digitisation efforts of the government administration.

Main Activities:

- Develop a multi-annual reform-programme to be presented in Budget Bill for 2015, called the Digital move in order to achieve the objectives of the Putting the citizen at the centre strategy, as well as support other public digitisation efforts.*
- Appoint an inquiry to investigate how an improved governance of public digital information can improve the efficiency, transparency and innovation in the public sector, as a part of the eGovernment reform-programme.*
- Promote the use of open data and agencies to release more data.*
- Promote and coordinate electronic identification and signature for the public sector e-services.*

Milestones:

- 1.1. A multi-annual implementation plan for the eGovernment strategy is presented in the Budget Bill for 2015.*
- 1.2. A national eGovernment project portfolio is launched in 2014.*
- 1.3. An inquiry is launched by the Government to explore how improved governance can increase efficiency, transparency and innovation in the public sector.*
- 1.4. A web platform for collecting and promoting open government data is developed by VINNOVA on the Government's mandate.*
- 1.5. A flexible solution for electronic identification (eID) is developed, based on international standards and procured in a way that meets legislative requirements.*

Lead institution: Ministry of Energy and Communications¹

Supporting institution(s): Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems (VINNOVA); The Swedish E-identification Board; The eGovernment Delegation; The Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions

Start date: 2011

End date: 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
OVERALL			✓		Unclear						✓				✓	
1.1. eGovernment plan in Budget Bill 2015				✓	Unclear						✓					✓
1.2. Launch national eGovernment portfolio			✓		Unclear					✓				—		✓
1.3. Launch inquiry on improved e-governance			✓		Unclear					✓			✓			
1.4. Develop open data platform			✓		✓			✓			✓					✓
1.4. Develop eID solution			✓		Unclear						✓		✓			

What happened?

Commitment 1 aims to continue the implementation of the Swedish eGovernment strategy. The eGovernment strategy, launched in December 2012, focuses mainly on the government’s internal digitization efforts.² The strategy has three key goals: (1) an easier everyday life for the citizens, (2) a more open government that supports innovation and participation, and (3) a higher quality and efficiency of government operations.³

Milestone 1.1—the presentation of a multi-annual reform programme for the 2015 Budget Bill—was the most innovative of the milestones and was achieved. The programme, adopted by Parliament in December 2014, addresses the weaknesses of the eGovernment strategy noted in the first IRM report, which pointed out that it lacked the appropriate budget for implementation and that, as a policy strategy document, it was rather weak. The reform programme entitled, “the digital move,” stretches over four years (2015-2018) and has a budget of SEK 45 million per year (SEK 180 million or USD 21 million in total).

In the framework of the programme, the government planned to launch a digital development initiative in 2015 called “My Sweden,” with the purpose of developing an application to give citizens and businesses access to a collective range of mobile e-services, such as personal identification information, contacting government

representatives and crisis communication. The aim is to simplify the everyday use of digital solutions for public services. The development of My Sweden will be managed by an institute, yet to be established, which will develop innovative solutions in the field of mobile e-services. As written, it is unclear what information will be made more accessible or public as a result of this reform. Thus, while laudable, the milestone does not clearly aim to open government to the public.

Milestone 1.2 was completed. The national eGovernment portfolio website was launched in June 2014 by the Swedish eDelegation, before the implementation of the OGP action plan started. The eGovernment portfolio aims to improve the efficiency of public data use and to avoid duplication. The main target audience is government authorities.⁴ The website provides data on sectors in which government initiatives are carried out (e.g., education or health), what goal they contribute to (government efficiency or the ease of using open data), and what economic or qualitative benefits they bring about.

The government inquiry to explore how improved governance can increase efficiency, transparency and innovation in the public sector, envisaged in Milestone 1.3, is yet to be launched.

Milestone 1.4—a web platform for collecting and promoting open government data—has been fulfilled. Over the past three years, Sweden's Innovation Agency, VINNOVA, has developed an open data platform—Öppnadata.se⁵—which was launched in December 2012 and re-launched again in June 2015.⁶ The overarching objective is to standardize the way government authorities publish information about open data sources.⁷ The portal is one of the first of its kind to automatically retrieve open data made available by Swedish authorities. The portal displays links to public data sources (e.g., a vulnerability analysis of oil spills in Swedish sea areas, provided by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency). The links are displayed in accordance with DCAT Application Profile for data portals (DCAT-AP) recommendations for metadata (see Milestone 2.3 for further information).

Milestone 1.5, which envisaged a flexible solution for electronic identification (eID) for public sector e-services, is under development. The eID is used for online identification and for signing documents electronically, which could be used, among other things, to declare income and to notify of a change of address. The Swedish E-identification Board, a public authority under the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, is in charge of promoting and coordinating the work on eID. The current Swedish eID system is already quite successful; more than 50% of citizens have an eID and over one billion transactions were made through e-services during 2014.⁸

These reforms are justified to increase efficiency and to lay the groundwork for future eID regulation across the European Union (EU). The present eID is issued by the private sector (i.e., banks and large telecommunication providers) and the public sector purchases validation control of the eID issuers on a commercial basis. The new solution with a federated architecture, expected in 2016, will be more flexible and will be based on gradual development of the infrastructure and the introduction of a standardized identity assertion (using SAML 2), and will take into account the EU's electronic identification and trust services regulation.⁹

Did it matter?

Overall, the relevance of several of the milestones within this commitment to OGP values is unclear. The overall potential impact of the commitments is moderate.

The reform programme for eGovernment (Milestone 1.1) is expected to be innovative and have significant impact.

The programme has been carefully prepared over the last two years. The detailed content of the programme was being developed with the support of a team of external consultants in August 2015. According to the interviewee from the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation, the institute that will be created within the framework of the programme is expected to become an innovation hub for eGovernment in Sweden.¹⁰ If the expectations about the reform programme are realized, it will give a well-needed lift to eGovernment in Sweden.

According to the Network Readiness Index 2015, Sweden lags behind many countries on ICT policies and on the number of government online services (“government usage,” place 20 out of 143), as well as on the quality of services (“Government Online Service Index,” place 28 out of 143).¹¹

It is difficult to assess whether Milestone 1.2 has had or will have any impact. The IRM researcher has not found any evidence on the actual use of the eGovernment portfolio data by government authorities. At the time of writing, no such reports that would tie the development of portfolios with changes in government performance are available, and the government mid-term self-assessment report does not mention changes in this area. Milestones 1.3, if implemented, would probably have a minor impact given that it would only be an incremental step within existing efforts concerning digitization.

Milestone 1.4 was vaguely formulated making it difficult to ascertain potential impact. However, the portal has registered an increased number of datasets and variety of formats, from 100 in October 2013¹² to 280 datasets available in different formats (e.g., XLS, HTML, and Shape). However, the number of data sources is still limited and much development remains to be done.¹³ The Open Data Barometer 2015 places Sweden as one of the world leaders on open data (third place).¹⁴ Nevertheless, although Sweden keeps the same rank as in the last barometer, its score is slightly lower.¹⁵ The main reason seems to be that open data licensing in Sweden is still applied inconsistently.

The introduction of a new eID system under Milestone 1.5 is an important reform initiative as it can open up more private sector competition and lower prices for the use of eID.¹⁶ Given that the new eID system will adapt to the EU’s eIDAS regulation, it will also allow other EU citizens to access online public services in Sweden with their national eIDs (e.g., to ask for official documentation). It is, however, not clearly relevant to any of the OGP values since it is concerned with an internal government reform, and it is unclear as written how this will serve to make government more open.

Moving forward

The IRM researcher recommends that future commitments in the area of eGovernment include more public-facing elements to better address the need for improved access to public information and citizen participation.

It is laudable that the “open innovation” approach will be applied to eGovernment. However, to keep up with the spirit of citizen-centred governance, the government could genuinely engage with a variety of civil society organizations and citizens. This would also be in line with the title of the Swedish eGovernment strategy: “Putting citizens at the centre.” To implement the citizen-centred approach, the innovation process needs to be gradual and support learning, awareness-raising and mutual trust-building.¹⁷ The Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation should improve the innovation and communication skills of public servants and create mechanisms for dialogue with the civil society to facilitate civic participation.¹⁸ There are many approaches for that, including consultation, community building, and co-production of public services (see for example, the literature recommended by Arnkil et al., 2010).¹⁹ A plan for engaging with the civil society could be elaborated and initiated before the end of the national action plan or built into future commitments on eGovernment reform.

Moreover, there are still few public authorities that publish open data in Sweden.²⁰ According to VINNOVA's final report on the Öppnadata.se portal, to achieve transparency and innovation there is a critical need for a systematic approach to open data across government agencies and a model for funding of joint solutions. This would raise awareness about the importance of open data and improve cost efficiency and the quality of open data sources. Moreover, government authorities also need to provide support and resources (i.e., personnel, knowledge and technology) to make data available.²¹

¹ Now the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation.

² Link to eGovernment strategy in Swedish: Med medborgaren i centrum, Regeringens strategi för en digitalt samverkande statsförvaltning Diarienummer: N2012.37, <http://www.regeringen.se/informationsmaterial/2012/12/n2012.37/>.

³ Ibid.

⁴ National Development portfolio, <http://nationellautvecklingsportfoljen.se/om-oss/>.

⁵ <http://oppnadata.se/>.

⁶ <http://ckan.org/2015/08/05/beauty-behind-the-scenes/#sthash.6SowsMWp.dpuf>.

⁷ VINNOVA, "Slutrapport av regeringsuppdrag om den tekniska plattformen öppnadata.se - en portal för innovation," Öppnadata.se, 25 June 2015.

⁸ The Swedish E-identification Board,

<http://www.elegnamnden.se/omoss/theswedisheidentificationboard.4.3aa8c78a1466c584587cfe.html>.

⁹ The Regulation (EU) N°910/2014 on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market (eIDAS Regulation) was adopted by the co-legislators on 23 July 2014. It is a milestone to provide a predictable regulatory environment to enable secure and seamless electronic interactions between businesses, citizens and public authorities. <http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/trust-services-and-eid>.

¹⁰ Magnus Enzell (Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation), interview by Alina Östling, 29 August 2015.

¹¹ World Economic Forum, *The Global Information Technology Report (2015). Network Readiness Index*, <http://reports.weforum.org/global-information-technology-report-2015/economies/#economy=SWE>.

¹² For comparison with the information about the portal in 2013, see Alina Östling, *Independent Reporting Mechanism Sweden: Progress Report 2012–13* (2013). <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/files/sweden-ogp-irm-public-comments-engpdf/download>.

¹³ <http://oppnadata.se/about>.

¹⁴ *Open Data Barometer* (2015), <http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/report/analysis/rankings.html>.

¹⁵ Ibid. Sweden scored at 83.7 in 2015 compared to 85.75 out of 100 in 2013.

¹⁶ Jonas Ryberg, "Ny örfil mot kritiserad e-legitimation," (IDG, 17 December 2014), <http://www.idg.se/2.1085/1.602452/ny-orfil-mot-kritiserad-e-legitimation>.

¹⁷ Arnkil et al., "Exploring Quadruple Helix: Outlining user-oriented innovation models," Institute for Social Research Working Papers 85 (University of Tampere, 2010).

¹⁸ A recent report co-authored by the author found that one of the current challenges in several OGP countries is to build the capacity of civil servants to carry out effective and responsive consultations with different types of stakeholders. For more details, see Mary Francoli, Alina Östling, and Fabro Steibel, "From Informing to Empowering: Improving Government-Civil Society Interactions within OGP," Open Government Partnership (OGP)/Hivos (2015), www.opengovpartnership.org/blog/mary-francoli-alina-ostling-and-fabro-steibel/2015/09/01/improving-government-civil-society#sthash.fAOAozsR.dpuf.

¹⁹ See Arnkil, "Exploring Quadruple Helix," p. 104.

²⁰ Tryggvi Björgvinsson, "Beauty behind the scenes," CKAN (5 August 2015), <http://ckan.org/2015/08/05/beauty-behind-the-scenes/#sthash.6SowsMWp.dpuf>.

²¹ VINNOVA, "Slutrapport av regeringsuppdrag."

2: A step further on the re-use of public administration documents

Commitment text:

The commitment on a step further on the re-use of public administration documents aims to enhance economic growth, greater openness and better service for citizens. Various estimates point to considerable value for society when the re-use of public administration documents is increased. When information from the public sector is being re-used, compiled, processed and made available, the ability of citizens to gain insight and make demands on government activities increases. A more open government can increase its legitimacy among citizens and their willingness to participate in the development of the service level, efficiency and quality of public services. The commitment will mainly be achieved through changes in Swedish legislation, actions to promote and monitor the re-use of public administration documents, and an evaluation of the re-use of public data.

Main activities:

- Prepare for changes in the Act on the re-use of public administration documents (2010:566) in order to implement the Directive 2013/37/EU (Public Sector Information Directive).
- Support initiatives related to the project 'Application profile for data portals in Europe' (DCAT-AP), where Sweden participates.
- Continue to facilitate actions in order to promote agencies' re-use of public administration documents at different levels.
- Improve comprehensive follow-up and monitoring, including continuing to systematically give missions to agencies to report on their work on re-using public administration documents.

Milestones:

- 2.1. Full implementation of the Public Sector Information Directive (PSI).
- 2.2. Systematic reports of agencies' work on re-using public information.
- 2.3. Participation in the European Commission's work on DCAT-AP.
- 2.4. Continued actions to facilitate agencies' work on re-using public administration documents.
- 2.5. An evaluation of the re-use of public administration documents by the Swedish Agency for Public Management.

Lead institution: Swedish Ministry of Health and Social Affairs

Supporting institution(s): The National Archives; The Swedish National Financial Management Authority; Swedish Competition Authority; Swedish Government Agency for Innovations Systems; The Swedish Agency for Public Management

Start date: 2011

End date: 2018

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
OVERALL			✓		✓		✓	✓		✓				✓		

2.1. PSI Directive implementation			✓	✓					✓			✓			
2.2. Agency reports on work on re-use of information		✓			Unclear				✓			✓			
2.3. Participation in the EC's work on DCAT-AP		✓		✓			✓		✓					✓	
2.4. Facilitation of agencies' work on re-use of documents		✓			Unclear				✓			✓			
2.5. Evaluation of the re-use of documents			✓		Unclear				✓				✓		

What happened?

The commitment aimed at improving the re-use of public administration documents in Sweden.

According to the government mid-term self-assessment:

There has not yet been any measure of results. The Agency for Public Management has the governments mandate (S2014/3536/SFÖ) to monitor the effects of how the national and local authorities are working to make information available. The result will be presented in January 2018.

Consequently, most of the activities will not be completed during this action plan cycle.

The most important achievement was the transposition of the EU Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive¹ into Swedish law (Milestone 2.1). Between October 2014 and June 2015, the Ministry of Finance prepared the proposal for new legislation and the draft bill about the re-use of public sector information. The government bill was approved by Parliament in May 2015, and the changes to the law entered into force on 1 July 2015. The main legislative changes include: (i) covering university libraries and cultural institutions, such as archives, libraries and museums (previously not covered by the law); (ii) obliging authorities to state on their website what information can be re-used, and the fees that authorities charge to reproduce, provide and disseminate public documents may henceforth not exceed their marginal costs; and (iii) the criteria for the fee calculation now have to be published in advance, instead of revealing them on request. Moreover, individuals can now ask for a written justification from authorities if their requests on the re-use of data are refused or come with conditions.²

Milestone 2.3 concerning participation in the European Commission's working group on the DCAT Application Profile for data portals (DCAT-AP), is an ongoing activity that is done on a voluntary basis by the EU Member States. The DCAT-AP³ enables a cross-data portal search for datasets and makes public sector data better searchable across borders and sectors.⁴ Sweden is represented by VINNOVA, Sweden's innovation agency, in the working group on DCAT-AP. In order to promote the use of DCAT-AP, VINNOVA put out

a call on open data sources in 2014, where organizations could apply for grants to implement projects on DCAT-AP. As a result, VINNOVA funded 18 projects with grants ranging between SEK 50,000-400,000 (USD 5,800-46,000).⁵ Moreover, to increase Swedish expertise on the specification, VINNOVA held a free training course geared toward developers.⁶

The evaluation of the re-use of public administration documents by the Swedish Agency for Public Management planned in Milestone 2.5 is still ongoing.⁷ It consists of a comprehensive evaluation on the state and municipal authorities' efforts to make data available for re-use. According to the agency, the first report will be published on 3 October 2015, while the final report is not due until 19 January 2018.

The IRM researcher did not manage to ascertain any information regarding Milestone 2.2 "Reporting on agencies' re-use of public information" and Milestone 2.4 "Facilitating agencies' work on re-use of documents" from the relevant government contact. These milestones were vaguely formulated and thus, it was not possible to assess their level of accomplishment. Given this, and the government self-assessment report, these milestones were coded as "not started."

Did it matter?

The level of ambition and likely impact for all milestones of this commitment is minor. The most important milestone is the implementation of the EU PSI Directive, which had to be transposed into Swedish legislation by 18 July 2015.⁸ The EU Directive provides a push for the promotion of open data but falls short of being a major step in opening up the government. According to the Open Knowledge Foundation blog, the directive is not a tool for more openness "by default and by design" as it lacks the detail to make it citizen centred. Even with redress mechanisms introduced by the directive, "getting your rights acknowledged and acted upon will remain a long and arduous path as before."⁹

According to a government interviewee, the legal changes introduced in Sweden on the basis of the EU PSI Directive are not very progressive. The new law will not automatically contribute to opening up more data. One of the main problems with the Swedish Act on the Re-use of Public Administration Documents (2010:566) is the excessive fees charged for data.¹⁰ Although the costs for collection of information are now replaced by a general rule of marginal costs incurred by authorities, exceptions are still allowed.¹¹

Overall, Swedish authorities have high quality data and the potential of its re-use is therefore strong.¹² At the same time, the re-use is currently limited and the benefits for businesses, citizens and the public sector are far from being realized. In terms of implementation of the law, according to VINNOVA, only about 24% of government websites fulfil the basic PSI recommendations.¹³ Although the situation has improved considerably over a short time period (up from 3% in 2014), the level of achievement is still quite low.¹⁴ Municipalities seem to be specifically lagging behind. In a recent debate article, a private sector commentator emphasized that many of the municipalities do not have a plan or a strategic mindset regarding open data and called for a comprehensive open data strategy for the public sector as a whole.¹⁵

Regarding Milestone 2.2, DCAT-AP should play an important role towards realizing the objectives of a pan-European Data Portal,¹⁶ and it is laudable that VINNOVA takes part in the working group and supports DCAT-AP initiatives in Sweden.

The evaluation of the re-use of public data (Milestone 2.3) could be an important step in the government's efforts to encourage authorities in creating more favourable conditions for re-use of their data.

Moving forward

The most important challenge ahead for the re-use of PSI in Sweden is the implementation of the EU PSI Directive by the national and local authorities.¹⁷ Experience from the frontrunners in open data, such as the UK and Denmark, demonstrate that laws need to be complemented by efforts to promote the re-use of data and by giving the issue political priority.¹⁸

In order to speed up the re-use of PSI, an open data expert interviewed by the IRM researcher suggested several options that the government could implement:

- To complement the PSI law by a roadmap setting out what data should be opened up and by when;
- To develop a ranking system, which would allow assessing progress of authorities, and to promote the leading public authorities in the field of open data, which could be featured as best practice cases;
- To make a political decision on the ministerial level to open up data for re-use in a specific area of government;
- To develop a model for funding joint solutions across government authorities to diminish the costs of data.

In addition, the IRM researcher recommends that the government consult a broad range of stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector, when planning future activities in the field of PSI.

¹ European Parliament and of the Council, Directive 2013/37/EU, 26 June 2013 amending Directive 2003/98/EC on the re-use of public sector information, *Official Journal of the European Union*.

² "Re-use of information from the public administration," Report 2014/15: FiU14. ("Vidareutnyttjande av information från den offentliga förvaltningen," Betänkande 2014/15:FiU14.), <http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Utskottens-dokument/Betankanden/Arenden/201415/FiU14/>.

³ It is based on the Data Catalogue vocabulary (DCAT).

⁴ EC, "DCAT application profile for data portals in Europe" (2014), https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/asset/dcat_application_profile/asset_release/dcat-application-profile-data-portals-europe-final.

⁵ See VINNOVA's call: <http://www.vinnova.se/sv/Ansoka-och-rapportera/Utlysningar/Effekta/Oppna-datakallor-2014/>.

⁶ The course was held on 26 September 2014. Information about the course is available at: <http://lankadedata.se/dcat-utbildning/#!index.md>.

⁷ "Request to perform a comprehensive follow-up of state and municipal authorities' efforts to make documents available for re-use" ("Uppdrag att genomföra en samlad uppföljning av statliga och kommunala myndigheters arbete med att tillgängliggöra handlingar för"), Diarienummer: S2014/3536/SFÖ, www.regeringen.se/regeringsuppdrag/2014/04/s20143536sfo/.

⁸ As stated by Karina Alden at the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, the specific intention was to implement the European Parliament and Council Directive 2013/37/EU of 26 June 2013 amending Directive 2003/98/EC on the re-use of public sector information (PSI Directive).

⁹ K. Jansen and T. Zijlstra, "The new PSI Directive: As good as it seems?" *OKFN blog*, 19 April 2013, <http://blog.okfn.org/2013/04/19/the-new-psi-directive-as-good-as-it-seems/#sthash.Z1AXTj4D.dpuf>.

¹⁰ E. Eklund and O. Jansson, "A new PSI Directive for more and cheaper re-use of information," (Delphi, September 2013), <http://www.delphi.se/>.

¹¹ Exceptions are still allowed in cases when the public sector bodies "are required to generate revenue to cover a substantial part of their costs relating to the performance of their public tasks," and for cultural institutions.

¹² <http://www.edelegationen.se/Pa-gang-inom-e-forvaltning/Regeringen-overlamnar-proposition-om-vidareutnyttjande-av-offentlig-information/>.

¹³ 158 out of 655 government websites fulfil the PSI recommendation of the Swedish e-Delegation. The recommendation is for authorities to state on their website what information can be re-used. Hence, it is only about fulfilling part of the current PSI Directive. Vinnova's control service, [Psidatakollen.se](http://psidatakollen.se),

automatically detects if a government website fulfils the recommendations of the Swedish e-Delegation.
<http://www.psidatakollen.se/>.

¹⁴ In February 2014, 19 out of 600 government websites fulfilled the PSI recommendations of the Swedish e-Delegation. <http://computersweden.idg.se/2.2683/1.548152/myndigheter-usla-pa-oppna-data>.

¹⁵ Johan Salenstedt, "Dagens Samhälle," 28 September 2015,

<http://www.dagensamhalle.se/debatt/kommuners-information-maste-vara-tillgaenglig-18648>.

¹⁶ Legal Aspects of Public Sector Information (LAPSI), "Participate in the public review of the DCAT Application Profile for Data Portals in Europe!" 31 May 2013, <http://www.lapsi-project.eu/participate-public-review-dcat-application-profile-data-portals-europe>.

¹⁷ "Re-use of information from the public administration," Report 2014/15: FiU14.

¹⁸ "Data-driven innovation through public service information" ("Datadriven innovation genom offentligägd information"), 26 June 2015, <http://www.vinnova.se/sv/Aktuellt-publicerat/Kalendarium/2015/150630-Datadriven-innovation-genom-offentligagd-information/>.

3: Increased access to Swedish aid information

Commitment text:

The commitment on increased access to Swedish aid information aims to increase the transparency of aid spending and performance. Transparent information is a prerequisite for open debate and public participation, and facilitates accountability to citizens and organisations in partner countries and to Swedish taxpayers. More accessible information also provides a better basis for decisions and visibility of aid results, and limits the scope for corruption and misuse of resources. The commitment will be achieved mainly through further development of the Openaid.se platform and improved IATI reporting.

Main activities:

- Follow up the implementation of the transparency guarantee in Swedish aid in order to ensure that relevant routines are in place.
- Update Sweden's Common Standard implementation schedule in order to further extend and broaden Sweden's IATI reporting.
- Further develop the Openaid.se platform in order to extend and improve data quality, accessibility and usability.

Milestones:

1. Full implementation of the Swedish aid transparency guarantee
2. Full implementation of the Common Standard on Swedish development cooperation.
3. Substantial improvements made in the Openaid.se platform.
4. Anti-corruption reports are published in an IATI format at Openaid.se.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)

Supporting institution(s): Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Start date: 2010

End date: 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
OVERALL				✓	✓		✓	✓			✓				✓	
3.1 Implement aid transparency guarantee				✓	✓		✓				✓				✓	
3.2. Implement the Common Standard on development cooperation				✓	✓		✓			✓					✓	

3.3. Improve the Openaid.se platform			✓		✓		✓	✓			✓				✓	
3.4. Publish anti-corruption reports in IATI format				✓	✓		✓	✓		✓					—	✓

What happened?

This commitment aims to increase transparency in the field of development aid by implementing the Swedish aid transparency guarantee (Milestone 3.1). The implementation of the transparency guarantee is carried out through the improvement of the Openaid.se platform (Milestone 3.2), as well as by broadening Sweden’s International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) reporting.

The transparency guarantee is a policy document introduced into Swedish development assistance in January 2010. It guarantees the following:¹

- Aid information should be made available online in an open format;
- Tax revenue used for development cooperation should be traceable;
- It should be possible to follow the whole chain of aid information (i.e., decision, implementation, and monitoring);
- In the long term, aid information should be made available in each partner country and should, when possible, be published in both Swedish and English;
- Other development partners, including multilateral organizations and civil society organizations (CSOs), should be encouraged to improve their level of transparency.

Sweden has made significant progress on aid transparency over time. In the 2012 edition of the Aid Transparency Index, Sweden showed “fair” progress. It showed “good” progress in the 2013 edition, and now shows “very good” progress, which is the highest level.² Sweden is in fact one of the top performers on the 2014 Aid Transparency Index,³ occupying the sixth place overall (across countries and organizations such as the UNDP) and ranking third of 50 bilaterals. Sweden was also one of only three bodies in the 2014 index to publish all activity and organization level indicators to the IATI Registry.⁴

Despite good progress, Milestone 3.1 on aid transparency guarantee is not yet fulfilled. About one-third of the aid expenditure (mainly refugee and unspecified costs) is traceable only on a generic level. It is not possible to follow this particular aid stream through the whole chain of information (i.e., decision, implementation, and monitoring).

Milestone 3.2 commits to full implementation of the Common Standard⁵ for Swedish development cooperation. According to the Publish What You Fund (PWYF) 2015 EU Aid Transparency Review, Sweden is on track in meeting the December 2015 deadline to publish information to the IATI standard.⁶ Currently, Sweden already publishes over 95% of development aid information according to the IATI standard.⁷ The PWYF’s review mentions that during the second half of 2015, Sweden will work both on data quantity and quality to better fulfill its Busan commitments.⁸ The focus will be on traceability by increasing the amount of data from Swedish CSOs and from Sweden’s missions abroad. Sweden is also planning to improve procedures and awareness of data quality among staff involved in the project management process.⁹

Milestone 3.3 on the improvement of the Openaid.se platform is substantially completed. Sweden has already made substantial improvements on making aid information openly available and tax revenue traceable on the Openaid.se platform. The information is available both in Swedish and English. In September 2014, a new version

of the portal driven by IATI data was launched.¹⁰ The portal is built as an open source WordPress theme where any dataset from the IATI Datastore can be added. Sida's purpose of developing web interfaces and their underlying software with open source code is to encourage sharing and use by others and to stimulate more users to adopt the IATI standard.¹¹ The new version of Openaid.se is more focused on the professional user, as opposed to citizens in general (i.e., people who work within the aid sector and/or with aid data as well as researchers and journalists with a special interest in the topic).¹² The current version of Openaid.se is still a prototype and will be developed further.

Milestone 3.4 on publishing anti-corruption reports on the portal was achieved, with over 200 anti-corruption reports published in IATI format on Openaid.se since October 2014.¹³ The reports are published online once an investigation is completed and no grounds for confidentiality exist. They contain the name of the organization investigated, the name of the investigator, dates of reporting and closing the case, the grounds for suspicion of corruption, and actions taken. The reports relate mainly to cases of suspected crime and to cases where one of Sida's cooperation partners is suspected to have been using funds beyond the agreed purposes.¹⁴

Did it matter?

The full implementation of the transparency guarantee (Milestone 3.1) is both a relevant and ambitious commitment. The transparency guarantee has helped Sweden make significant progress on aid transparency. Sweden is today, together with the UK, among the two leading countries to implement IATI, which means that it is publishing timely and comprehensive information to IATI for the majority of aid activities. In particular, Sweden is a top performer on frequency and timeliness of reporting, which means that it updates data at least monthly and has a maximum of one month of time lag in information available. Timely information is important because it impacts the ability of recipients to plan ahead and to monitor development projects effectively.¹⁵

Sweden is also a top performer on added value information, including "Project documents" and "Results." Data on results is particularly important given that it enables the impact of development activities to be measured and outcomes to be evaluated, and facilitates accountability between different stakeholders.¹⁶ Sweden also provides forward-looking activity budgets, which is again important for planning by recipient countries.¹⁷ However, the coverage of activities described in the budgets remains low.¹⁸

Overall, the potential impact of Milestone 3.1 is assessed as moderate. The transparency guarantee is an important advancement in aid transparency; however, there is still room for improving the scope in order to enable following the full chain of all aid streams (i.e., decision, implementation and monitoring).

Milestone 3.2 on the implementation of the Common Standard on Swedish development cooperation is important for transparency and traceability of aid flows. However, since Sweden had already made substantial progress in this area before the launch of the current OGP national action plan, this commitment would have only minor impact.

Milestone 3.3 has a moderate potential impact as it envisages important improvements in data accessibility to increase the usability of the new Openaid.se platform. The new interface is simple and user-friendly and enables users to export data to other formats (CSV, XLS, PDF, and as embedded code). The data can be filtered, grouped and sorted and allows comparisons with other data on the website. Openaid.se was built specifically so it would work for any individual who publishes IATI data and would like to visualize the data on their own tracker. According to Sida, this means that any aid donor or recipient can make a quick WordPress installation, add the theme and their own data, and be up and running with an aid tracker within hours.¹⁹ Some

organizations, such as United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), have already started re-using parts of Openaid.se.²⁰

However, Openaid.se does not contain the full documentation about Swedish aid. Documents are unavailable for a variety of reasons, including technical causes, secrecy of certain materials, and separate archiving systems of Swedish embassies/authorities abroad. What is even more important, one-third of the aid (approximately SEK 13 billion or USD 1.5 billion in 2014) is not detailed. This includes refugee costs in Sweden and “unspecified” aid, which is mainly non-earmarked money that goes to multilateral organizations that decide themselves how to use the funds.²¹

Publication of anti-corruption reports on the Openaid.se portal in IATI format (Milestone 3.4) is a positive development. There is evidence that at least one major newspaper in Sweden has used this service for reporting purposes.²² The value added by making reports available as open data is that it may allow for the discovery of interesting patterns by journalists or civil society organizations. However, the reports were already publicly available, and there has been little evidence of their widespread use. Consequently, however useful, this milestone carries only minor potential impact.

Moving forward

The IRM researcher recommends that the level of detail of Swedish aid financing information should increase to guarantee a better level of transparency. Sida is aware of the gaps in documentation and is already planning to address some of them in 2015. Examples include increasing available data from Swedish CSOs and missions abroad and improving procedures and awareness of data quality in the project contribution management process among the staff.²³ However, Sweden could advance transparency on aid-related information even further by:

- Further specifying information on aid flows, in particular the refugee costs in Sweden and “unspecified” aid, which makes up a large share of the aid budget;²⁴
- Providing more and better detailed data on forward spending, as stressed by both government and civil society interviewees. This would allow comparison with what other donors are planning in a specific country if other countries provide data on forward spending;
- Improving reporting procedures and continuing to move towards the publishing of data in IATI format, not only by the government, but also CSOs. This is a joint commitment that could be made between government and civil society.

¹ MFA, “A transparency guarantee in Swedish development assistance,” 11 June 2010, <http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/12656/a/147849>.

² In the 2013 edition of the Aid Transparency Index, Sweden scored 60 out of 100; in the 2014 edition, 83.

³ 2014 Aid Transparency Index, <http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/>.

⁴ <http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/donor/sweden/>.

⁵ According to the OECD-DAC:

The common standard combines three complementary systems and processes: the DAC's Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and the Forward Spending Survey (FSS) - two reporting instruments of the OECD with comprehensive statistical information - plus the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), a self-publishing system with notifications to a registry that provides current management information on donors' activities.

http://www.oecd.org/dac/aid-architecture/Common%20Standard%20Communications%20Note_ENG.pdf.

⁶ For more information on the IATI Standard: www.aidtransparency.net.

⁷ Carl Elmstam (Sida), email to Alina Östling, 28 September 2015.

⁸ The Busan commitments were agreed upon in 2011 at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in Korea. They offer a framework for continued dialogue and efforts to enhance the effectiveness of development cooperation. These are the key principles at the basis of the commitments: (i) ownership of development priorities by developing countries, (ii) a focus on results—having a sustainable impact should be the driving force behind investments and efforts in development policy making—(iii) partnerships for

development—development depends on the participation of all actors, and recognises the diversity and complementarity of their functions—(iv) transparency and shared responsibility.

⁹ PWYF, *2015 EU Aid Transparency Review*, <http://roadto2015.org/progress>.

¹⁰ The data visualized comes directly from Sweden's IATI xml-file in the [IATI Datastore](#).

¹¹ <http://www.openaid.se/for-developers/>.

¹² Sida, "Sneak preview of the new Openaid.se," 23 May 2014, <http://www.sida.se/English/press/current-topics-archive/2014/Sneak-preview-of-the-new-Openaidse/>. See also Karl Peterson (Sida) posted in PWYF, "The making of Openaid.se," September 23, 2014, <http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/updates/by-country/sweden/making-openaid-se/>.

¹³ 98 reports were published in August 2015; 54 in February 2015; and 56 in 2014 (dated not cited). <http://www.openaid.se/sv/corruption-reports/>.

¹⁴ http://www.sida.se/globalassets/global/sa-arbetar-vi/anti-corruption/sida_arsrapport_2014_korruption_se_webb.pdf.

¹⁵ PWYF, *2015 EU Aid Transparency Review*.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ See the survey of the user needs of Aid Information Management Systems (AIMS) in recipient countries: "Country Survey - IATI Data and Aid Information Management Systems" (2013), <http://www.aidtransparency.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Paper-4a-Country-Survey-of-AIMS.pdf>.

¹⁸ PWYF, *2015 EU Aid Transparency Review*.

¹⁹ Karl Peterson (Sida) posted in PWYF, "The making of Openaid.se."

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ According to Openaid.se, in 2014, SEK 7.5 billion (19% of the total) went to refugee costs and SEK 5.5 billion (14% of the total) to unspecified aid. Total aid costs were SEK 38.2 billion in 2015.

²² Elias Andersson, "Sida kräver tillbaka miljonbelopp," *Expressen*, 6 January 2015, <http://www.expressen.se/nyheter/sida-kraver-tillbaka-miljonbelopp/>.

²³ Elias Rådelius, "White paper, Part 4: Keys to success and the road ahead," 28 May 2015, <http://www.openaid.se/blog/part-4-keys-to-success-and-the-road-ahead/>.

²⁴ See footnote 22.

4: Improved opportunities for dialogue and transparency in aid management and implementation

Commitment text:

The commitment on improved opportunities for dialogue and transparency in aid management and implementation aims to increase mutual knowledge and participation. Greater knowledge and involvement of more actors create better possibilities for accountability and promote innovative thinking. Increased transparency also facilitates active involvement and public participation and may limit the scope for corruption and misuse of resources. The commitment will mainly be achieved through strengthening channels for dialogue and feedback on aid management and implementation with different parts of society.

Main activities:

- Develop and implement an updated government strategy for aid information and communication activities.
- Negotiate and implement a compact between the Government and Swedish civil society organisations that enhances dialogue and outlines these organisations' role in Swedish aid.
- Support initiatives related to ICT that create opportunities for increased participation from a broader spectrum of the population.
- Further develop procedures for management of reports by the public, organisations and employees of misuse, suspected corruption and other complaints with an impact on Swedish aid funds.

Milestones:

- 4.1. A government-established strategy for aid information and communication activities, including regular follow-up on results.
- 4.2. A government communication on Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGU), which also highlights potential conflicts of interest within one of the policy's global challenges.
- 4.3. A negotiated CSO compact, including regular follow-up on implementation.
- 4.4. Arrangement of an aid dialogue event.
- 4.5. Creation of opportunities for increased participation as a result of supported initiatives.
- 4.6. Established procedures for suspected corruption and complaints handling for Swedish aid-funded activities, including active dialogue with multilateral development organisations.

Editorial note: For ease of reading, the author combined milestones 4.3 and 4.4 for analysis below (now 4.3. and 4.4 Negotiated CSO compact & aid dialogue).

Responsible institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)

Supporting institution(s): Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Start date: 2014

End date: 2017

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
OVERALL			✓		✓	✓	✓			✓				✓		
4.1 Strategy for aid information and communication			✓		✓					✓				✓		
4.2 Communication on PGU			✓		✓					✓				✓		
4.3 & 4.4 CSO compact & aid dialogue event				✓		✓					✓				✓	
4.5. Increase participation by ICT initiatives	✓				Unclear				✓				✓			
4.6 Establish procedures for corruption and complaints handling	✓				Unclear						✓		✓			

What happened?

This commitment focuses on communication and dialogue in the field of development aid and includes six milestones.

Milestone 4.1 on development of the aid communication strategy has a limited completion rate. In May 2015, the government assigned the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) to develop the basis for a new strategy for information and communication activities in international development cooperation, hereafter referred to as the “strategy,” by 1 October 2015.¹ The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) held a consultation meeting concerning the development of the strategy in December 2014 with around 40 civil society organizations (CSOs), most of which are already involved in the implementation of the ongoing communication strategy.²

The main aim of the strategy is to strengthen citizen engagement in support of a fair and sustainable global development, as well as to raise awareness about the importance of development cooperation. Sida is requested by the government to make suggestions on what can be achieved with the strategy in the following areas:³

- Raised awareness about activities and results of Swedish development cooperation;

- Dissemination of knowledge and advocacy, in order to contribute to poverty reduction and equitable and sustainable global development;
- Independent assessment of the contribution of development cooperation and other policy areas to equitable and sustainable global development.

The forthcoming strategy is a follow-up to the present communication strategy (expiring in December 2015). The financial support channelled through this strategy consists of nearly SEK 100 million (approximately USD 12 million) per year. Only a minor part of strategy activities will be carried out by Sida for communication purposes while the rest will be up for calls for tenders and applications from other organizations based on criteria developed by Sida.

Milestone 4.2 is focused on a government communication about the Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGU).⁴ The completion rate is limited. The PGU stipulates that all government policies should contribute to an equal and sustainable global development. Public oversight occurs through an official, public communication to Parliament every two years, and the next report is due in spring 2016. The 2016 communication will focus on how the PGU can contribute to the new Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the United Nations in September 2015. Moreover, all government ministries have been commissioned to draw up plans on how the PGU will be implemented in their ministry.⁵

Milestone 4.3 concerns a compact between the government and CSOs, including regular follow-up on implementation and the arrangement of an aid dialogue event. The compact aims to enhance dialogue between the government and the CSOs and defines the role of CSOs in Swedish development aid. The government decided to launch the compact to improve relations with CSOs and to emphasise the important role they play in the development field. The compact was considered particularly important since, in recent years, the Swedish CSOs have emphasized that they are not sufficiently involved in the development of aid policy. In particular, several CSOs⁶ have emphasized that only limited consultations have taken place during the development of the Swedish aid policy platform,⁷ the key document governing Swedish aid policy.⁸

A series of “compact dialogues” were organized by the MFA in 2014. Judging from the level of participation, civil society organizations’ interest in the compact was quite strong. The large majority of the invited CSOs (53 out of 60) took part in the first meeting in March 2014. Participation declined over time but was still rather high (31 CSOs took part in the September 2014 meeting).⁹ Moreover, 65 CSOs were invited to give written input about the compact, and 21 did.¹⁰ The government adopted the final version of the compact in July 2015.¹¹ The compact establishes core principles of civil society-government cooperation. These include civil society autonomy and independence, increased dialogue, enhanced quality and sustainability in development cooperation, transparency and the importance of diversity. The aid dialogue event (Milestone 4.4), scheduled to take place in autumn 2015, will be a meeting targeting a broader circle of CSOs, where the implementation of the compact will be discussed.

Milestone 4.5—the “creation of opportunities for increased participation as a result of supported initiatives”—is formulated unclearly, making it hard to track progress. The IRM researcher did not manage to get any further information about this milestone from the government contact.¹² The government self-assessment contains no information on progress on this milestone.

After several conversations with the MFA, the IRM researcher is still unclear what Milestone 4.6 aims to achieve. The MFA contact indicated that there were no newly established procedures for suspected corruption and complaints handling for Swedish aid-funded activities during the evaluation period. The MFA and Sida carry out

continuous monitoring of Swedish aid funds through organizational assessments of the multilateral development organizations funded by Sweden or through similar means. If the MFA/Sida discover that there are gaps in the procedures of a multilateral development organization with regard to corruption and complaints handling, Sweden initiates a dialogue with the relevant organization to address the problem.¹³ The government self-assessment mentions that it has developed courses on anti-corruption, but it is unclear if these are public or internal.

Did it matter?

Overall, this commitment has a minor potential impact on improving dialogue in the field of development aid management and implementation. A number of the milestones were unclear, while Milestones 4.3 and 4.4 showed more promise. Sweden is a respected voice in the international arena and an important donor to multilateral organizations. Innovative initiatives in aid transparency and accountability could have significant potential impact globally if Sweden led them. As written, however, this commitment could be more ground-breaking.

The strategy for aid information and communication (Milestone 4.1) and the communication about the PGU (Milestone 4.2) have not yet been published. Given the limited knowledge about their content, the potential impact of these milestones is assessed as minor as they are standard government communications and would not increase the openness of government in a notable fashion.

Moreover, since it was unclear what Milestones 4.5 and 4.6 aimed to achieve, it was not possible to assess their relevance and impact. The Minister for International Development Cooperation and the Minister for Foreign Affairs have recently underlined the need to improve the documentation on dialogues taking place between the MFA and the UN, especially concerning Sweden's demands for results and follow-up as well as about decisions made.¹⁴ Hence, Milestone 4.6 could potentially have a notable impact, especially were it to be applied to multilateral as well as bilateral organisations. A large share of Swedish development assistance is non-earmarked money that Sweden does not control directly. However, advocacy on the part of the government to enhance procedures for corruption and complaints handling would be a very important milestone were it implemented. As written, the scope of the milestone remains unclear.

In contrast, Milestone 4.3 on the compact is an important step forward and could have a significant impact on the cooperation between government and civil society. The importance of the compact lies in the process through which CSOs and government regained mutual trust and managed to produce an output that was satisfactory to both parties. In recent years, the Swedish civil society has emphasized that CSOs are not sufficiently involved in the development of aid policy.¹⁵ The compact, and especially the dialogues preceding it, were generally very well received by civil society. The dialogue process was open and interactive, and the MFA showed serious commitment through the presence of high-level officials in some of the meetings. Moreover, the MFA has made an effort to meet about 30 to 40 CSOs in the field (outside Sweden) to get their views on the compact.

Apart from larger meetings, a smaller working group consisting of the MFA, Sida and approximately 10 CSO representatives (generally secretary generals) was created to work intensively on the text of the compact. The working group, meeting as often as every two weeks for half days, was very resource-intensive for the CSOs, but also very important for encouraging mutual trust and cooperation. The MFA acted in a transparent way by placing most of the relevant documents (i.e., mind maps, presentations, and notes) online and by producing a summary of all the written comments received from CSOs.¹⁶

It is still unclear what kind of importance and status the compact will be given with respect to other strategic and policy documents in the field of development cooperation. This will be shown by actual practice—for example, by how the MFA and the embassies abroad adapt their working procedures in accordance with the compact. The next big dialogue event about the compact (Milestone 4.4) is scheduled to take place in autumn 2015.

Moving forward

Civil society evaluation of development aid

The forthcoming strategy for information and communication activities (Milestone 4.1) offers an opportunity for CSOs to request resources to evaluate development aid. Considering the limited number of independent evaluations of Swedish aid, the IRM researcher recommends CSOs seize this opportunity. In particular, evaluations should focus on private sector use of tax money for development aid and on the application of the PGU to other government areas.

PGU implementation

The IRM researcher recommends that the MFA clarifies the process for monitoring PGU implementation. In the framework of the communication (Milestone 4.2), all government ministries have to draw up plans on how their work will relate to the PGU. To strengthen the forthcoming communication, the consulted CSOs recommended that the MFA clarify:

- How the development of these plans will be monitored;
- Whether this process also includes civil society representatives; and
- If the MFA will have the mandate to follow-up on these plans.¹⁷

The IRM researcher concurs.

Looking beyond the communication itself, the Swedish Agency for Public Management underlines a number of weaknesses with the PGU implementation:

- No entity has the responsibility for managing or monitoring the PGU;
- There are no specific funds allocated for its implementation;
- The PGU has been deprioritized over time and the commitment of government ministries to the policy is weak.

At the same time, the PGU is more important than ever before considering global challenges such as financial stability and climate change.¹⁸ The government should therefore assign human and financial resources to the implementation of the policy and raise the level of priority of its implementation (e.g., by assigning the responsibility for the policy to senior government officials). Moreover, given the abstract quality of the policy, the government should develop operational goals that state what the government ministries and agencies are expected to achieve.¹⁹

CSO compact

The government should assign a clear status to the CSO compact, allocate the appropriate resources for its implementation, and integrate it into its working procedures and processes. It is also very important that adequate resources are provided for an evaluation on the progress of the compact.

Complaints mechanism

Finally, given that Sweden is an important player in the field of international development aid, Milestone 4.6 on procedures for corruption and complaints handling for aid-funded activities is a valuable initiative. However, this milestone would benefit

from a clearer formulation to make its progress measurable. The IRM researcher recommends that this be done.

¹ The Government Offices, "Assignment to develop a basis for information and communication activities in international development cooperation" ("Uppdrag att ta fram underlag för informations- och kommunikationsverksamheten inom internationellt utvecklingssamarbete"), (May 2015), <http://www.regeringen.se/land--och-regionsstrategier/2015/05/uf201532103udustyr>.

² Anna Centerstig (MFA), email to Alina Östling, 11 September 2015.

³ The Government Offices, "Assignment to develop a basis for information."

⁴ Ministry for Foreign Affairs, "Shared Responsibility: Sweden's Policy for Global Development," 2002/03:122, <http://www.government.se/legal-documents/2003/05/200203122/>.

⁵ This was a verbal statement expressed by the MFA representative Anna Centerstig during the consultation with civil society members held by the IRM researcher in Stockholm in August 2015.

⁶ These CSOs include Adult Learning and Empowerment Fund, Swedish National Commission for UNESCO, UNICEF Sweden, Svalorna, and The Interest Organization for Popular Movement Folk High Schools.

⁷ The aid political platform is a key document for the Swedish aid policy, and is the basis for the government's management of Swedish development assistance. The document is available at: <http://www.regeringen.se/rattsdokument/skrivelse/2014/03/skr.-201314131/>.

⁸ UNICEF Sweden, "Lack of dialogue about the new aid policy platform," 26 June 2013, <http://blog.unicef.se/2013/06/26/brist-pa-dialog-om-ny-bistandspolitisk-plattform/>.

⁹ Participation rate at meetings as reported by the MFA—8 March 2014: 53 organizations, 13 May 2014: 36 organizations, 11 September 2014: 31 organizations. Hedvig Söderlund (MFA), email to Alina Östling, 24 August 2015.

¹⁰ MFA, "Synpunkter på överenskommelsen mellan regeringen och svenska civilsamhällesorganisationer inom Sveriges bistånd," 23 October 2014, <http://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/0afc48c7aa964ea3816fcc4c46ce9f79/sammanstallning-synpunkter.pdf>.

¹¹ The adopted compact is available at:

<http://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/756e79c7e6d14aca966ab95c85d8bc50/150701-gemensamma-ataganden.pdf>.

¹² Anna Centerstig (MFA), interview by Alina Östling, 6 August 2015.

¹³ Per Trulsson (MFA), interview by Alina Östling, 25 September 2015.

¹⁴ Opinion piece by Isabella Lovin, the Minister for International Development Cooperation, and Margot Wallstrom, the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Isabella Lovin and Margot Wallstrom, "Mer öppenhet i stödet till FN," *SvD* (27 November 2014), <http://www.svd.se/mer-oppnhet-i-stodet-till-fn>.

¹⁵ UNICEF Sweden, "Lack of dialogue." See also, Civil Rights Defenders, "Opinion on the government's foreign aid policy platform," letter 2013/14 (11 February 2014).

¹⁶ <http://www.regeringen.se/artiklar/2015/07/cso2014/>.

¹⁷ These views were expressed during the consultation with civil society members held by the IRM researcher in Stockholm in August 2015. See Section VIII: Methodology and Sources for more details.

¹⁸ The Swedish Agency for Public Management's summary of the publication "Sweden's Policy for Global Development: the Government's joint responsibility?" (2014:1), <http://www.statskontoret.se/In-English/publications/2014---summaries-of-publications/swedens-policy-for-global-development.-the-governments-joint-responsibility-20141/>.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

5: Increased aid transparency at the global level

Commitment text:

The commitment on increased aid transparency at global level aims to accelerate international efforts on publishing aid information in accordance with the Busan commitment on a Common Standard. Increased publication of timely, forward-looking and comprehensive aid data in a standardised way creates better conditions for accountability and governance in partner countries, leading to sustainable and locally owned development results. It also facilitates division of labour and the use of all the available financial resources for poverty eradication. The commitment will mainly be achieved through activities, including those listed here, in order to promote other development actors' efforts to meet international transparency commitments.

Main activities:

- Promote IATI reporting among other development actors and the use of IATI data at country level, through dialogue and development of methodology and capacity.
- Promote transparency and anti-corruption work in the EU and multilateral development organisations, including IATI reporting.
- Support initiatives related to ICT that facilitate aid transparency.
- Promote transparency including budget transparency in partner countries as a part of Swedish development cooperation.

Milestones:

- 5.1. Increased number of countries and organisations that publish aid data to IATI.
- 5.2. Contributions to IATI related work on methodology and capacity development.
- 5.3. Actions taken at EU level to increase aid transparency, and increased number of multilateral development organisations with Swedish development assistance funds that publish aid data to IATI.
- 5.4. Examples of improvements in aid transparency, as a result of supported initiatives.
- 5.5. Examples of transparency improvements in partner countries.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)

Supporting institution(s): Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)

Start date: 2010

End date: 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
OVERALL		✓			✓		✓	✓		✓				✓		
5.1. Promote IATI reporting			✓		✓		✓	✓			✓				✓	

5.2 Promote transparency and anti-corruption work in the EU & multilateral organizations		✓			✓		✓	✓			✓		✓			
5.3 Support ICT in aid transparency		✓									✓		✓			
5.4 & 5.5 Promote transparency in partner countries		✓					✓				✓		✓			

What happened?

This commitment aims to promote transparency in development aid by promoting International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) reporting standards among development actors. The commitment lists a number of vaguely formulated target areas, but, due to their lack of specificity, it was difficult to measure impact. According to multiple interviews conducted by the IRM researcher with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), the IRM researcher was able to determine completion of some of the milestones, although details remain lacking.¹

Milestone 5.1 has a limited completion rate. Its aim was to promote IATI reporting among other development actors and the use of IATI data at the country level through dialogue and development of methodology and capacity. Sweden has shared its experience and contributed to IATI,² which is a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative that seeks to improve aid transparency. As part of this effort, Openaid.se was made available as an open source platform for other IATI publishers to use in whole or in part, and Sida has provided support to several organizations in trying out the software during the evaluation period. At the IATI Steering Committee meeting in June 2015, Sweden offered to work with partner countries that are interested in providing information on all their IATI donors at the country level (similar to www.d-portal.org, but adapted to local needs).³ Sweden has also contributed to the refinement of IATI's Transparency Indicator methodology by supporting the Creditor Reporting System (CRS)⁴/IATI pilot jointly with the UK and the Netherlands.⁵

Moreover, Sweden is contributing to the IATI Secretariat with in-kind personnel support of five persons (part-time).⁶ Sida also shared the experiences of working with the IATI standard from a donor perspective by publishing a white paper in spring 2015. The white paper covered the following topics:

1. Why do we care about aid transparency and IATI?;
2. How to get started publishing using the IATI standard as a bilateral donor agency;
3. Challenges;
4. Keys to success and the road ahead.

Milestone 5.2 to promote IATI in the EU and multilateral organizations is not started. Sweden has an ongoing dialogue with multilateral development organizations with Swedish development assistance funds about the importance of publishing aid data to

IATI. However, the MFA could not report on any particular action taken in the framework during the evaluation period.⁷

Milestone 5.3 on ICT promotional activities regarding ICT in aid transparency and Milestones 5.4 and 5.5 on promoting transparency in aid recipient countries are formulated vaguely without any measurable outputs, making it difficult to ascertain the level of completion. When interviewed for this report, the contact from the MFA—the ministry responsible for these milestones—stated that the specific aims of these milestones were forthcoming. At the time of writing (September 2015), no such specifications had been provided.

Did it matter?

Sweden is a demonstrated leader in aid transparency and in thinking about aid effectiveness. As an innovator, it plays an important role in promoting good practices among other countries and multilateral donors. However, the milestones contained in this commitment could be more clearly spelled out to improve the contribution of Sweden in promoting the accountability of aid in both donor and recipient countries.

While the intention of the commitment is to promote aid transparency, the milestones do not provide sufficient detail on how many countries and organizations receiving Swedish aid would start publishing data according to IATI standards. Even with such data at hand, it would be difficult to verify the correlation between the increase in publications and Swedish efforts in this regard considering the variety of factors influencing the decision to publish data (e.g., political will, technical capacity, or financial resources).

Moving forward

The MFA should set out clear milestones for achieving the stated objective of the commitment. Milestones should be formulated in a measurable way.

The first steps toward aid transparency commitments achieving transformative potential impact include:

- Clarifying the relationship between Swedish government activities and intended changes in recipient behavior (including in multilateral organizations);
- Enhancing support of the monitoring and evaluation of impacts and aid (as envisioned in Commitment 4);
- Taking into consideration the accountability and consequences for the misuse of aid (also as envisioned in Commitment 4).

Civil society stakeholders interviewed consider promoting aid transparency in the EU and in multilateral development organizations to be important and recommend that the MFA involves CSOs when deciding about priorities on transparency and anti-corruption work in multilateral development organizations.⁸

¹ Multiple interviews were conducted around these milestones. See Section VIII for a list of interviews with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

² <http://www.aidtransparency.net>.

³ IATI Steering Committee documents: <http://www.aidtransparency.net/governance/steering-committee/steering-committee-documents>.

⁴ Creditor Reporting System (CRS).

⁵ IATI, “Annual Workplan: September 2014–August 2015,” <http://www.aidtransparency.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Paper-3B-IATI-Workplan-Y2-FY14-15.pdf>.

⁶ Sweden is contributing to the IATI Secretariat in-kind with Senior Management Oversight, a Senior Policy Advisor, a Communications Specialist, a Policy Advisor and a Programme Officer.

⁷ Per Trulsson (MFA), interview by Alina Östling, 25 September 2015.

⁸ These views were expressed during the consultation with civil society members held by the IRM researcher in Stockholm in August 2015. See Section VIII: Methodology and Sources for more details.

V. Process: Self-Assessment

The government had not published any progress report at the time of the writing.

Table 2: Self-assessment checklist

Was the annual progress report published?	No
---	----

Follow-up on Previous IRM Recommendations (2015 +)

The table below outlines the key recommendations from the first IRM report in 2014¹ and briefly explains how/if they were addressed.

Key recommendations: 2014	Addressed?	What happened
Broaden future OGP commitments to include not only aid transparency but also other areas relevant to open government.	Partly	This was partly addressed by expanding the number of commitments related to other areas of government from one to two.
Sweden should take steps towards fulfilling the Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGU) principle ² in the framework of an OGP commitment.	Partly	The current plan does not include any commitment on PGU, but it does include a milestone (4.2). It is yet to be seen how significant this milestone is.
The Swedish budget and spending should be released as open data, both at the level of government and the public sector, nationally and locally.	No	
Sweden should envision more ambitious commitments in the field of public participation, especially with regard to individual citizen engagement and participation facilitated by new technology.	No	There are no commitments that focus specifically on public participation, and none of the milestones include any initiatives targeted towards including citizens in decision making.
A political decision to make open data a priority is imperative.	No	
The government should improve the legal aspects of open data.	Yes	The current plan includes a commitment (2) on the re-use of public sector data.
The government should develop channels for civil society consultation in the context of the next OGP action plan.	No	Only one consultation meeting with four participants was organized during the first year of the action plan.

The government should widen the circle of civil society organizations—not only those working in the field of aid transparency, but also (potential) open government stakeholders—and undertake awareness-raising activities around the OGP.	Partly	The outreach regarding the OGP action plan was limited. In addition to the aid development community, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) contacted the International Council of Swedish Industry (NIR) and a couple of academic institutions.
The OGP coordination should be placed in the hands of another entity.	No	

¹ *Sweden IRM Progress Report 2012-2013*, [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Sweden%20OGP%20IRM%20Public%20Comments%20\(Eng\).pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Sweden%20OGP%20IRM%20Public%20Comments%20(Eng).pdf).

² Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGU). According to the PGU, the government should take into account development cooperation objectives in all its policy areas, not only in development policy.

VI. Country Context

Sweden is at the forefront of transparency, accountability, technology and innovation. International indices generally place Sweden in the top quintile in terms of civil liberties and political rights,¹ eGovernment, ICT, and open data. According to the latest edition of the Networked Readiness Index, Sweden has one of the best political and regulatory environments² in the world, excellent ICT infrastructure, affordable ICT access, and a highly skilled population, most of which (95%) use the Internet.³ However, it is worth noting that Sweden has regressed slightly on some of the indices since its first IRM report: the Networked Readiness Index (from 1st to 3rd place), the Web Index (from 1st to 5th), the eGovernment Development Index (from 7th to 14th) and the eParticipation Index⁴ (from 15th to 45th).⁵

In terms of the OGP value “technology for transparency,” the Open Data Barometer ranks Sweden as one of the world leaders (3rd place out of 86 countries).⁶ Swedish authorities have high quality data, making the potential for its re-use strong.⁷ However, in practice, the re-use of data is limited and the benefits for businesses, citizens and the public sector are far from being realized. The consulted stakeholders emphasize that one of the key challenges ahead for open data in Sweden is its re-use. Sweden is also one of the most generous and committed donors in the world.⁸ Since 2006, Sweden allocates one percent of its gross national income (GNI) to aid, which amounted to approximately SEK 38 billion (USD 4.38 billion) in 2014.⁹ Sweden’s development cooperation covers 33 countries across Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America.¹⁰ As might be expected, Sweden has also made significant progress on transparency in the field of development cooperation. It is one of the top performers on the 2014 Aid Transparency Index¹¹ and is, together with the UK, among the leading countries to implement the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard.¹² However, civil society stakeholders underline that there is a lack of transparency around tax-funded aid projects run by the private sector, which are on the rise.¹³

Sweden also performs quite well on public participation. Public consultation is a routine part of developing draft laws, and committees of inquiry are set up for the development of major policies and legislation.¹⁴ However, the collectivistic and party-centred tradition of political engagement in Sweden does not favor citizens’ direct participation in political processes.¹⁵ Consequently, the principal channel for participation—the consultation system (“remissförfarande”)—is mainly tailored to established civil society organizations and does not encourage participation from ordinary citizens.¹⁶ At the same time, the experimentation with alternative and innovative forms of public engagement has, to date, taken place in scattered and experimental ways, mostly in small-scale settings.

While being one of the world's foremost democracies and aid donors, Sweden is also the world's 12th largest arms exporter. In 2014, arms worth SEK 8 billion (USD 914 million) were sold to 54 countries¹⁷ including Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Pakistan.¹⁸ Arms exportation is a policy area where accountability and transparency is very limited, and a large part of exports of Swedish military equipment in recent years have gone to countries where corruption is widespread.¹⁹ This issue has been widely debated in Sweden, especially after the report of a cross-party parliamentary inquiry on the arms trade was released in June 2015.²⁰ The report recommended that Sweden use a “democracy criterion,” meaning that potential purchasing countries would be judged on the degree to which democratic institutions are in place and how they work.²¹ However, legislation in the field is not expected until next year (2016), and it is yet to be seen whether the recommendations will have any impact on actual export practice.

During 2015, Sweden—a country of 9.8 million people—has received over 160,000 asylum seekers, which means that it is now one of the EU states with the highest proportion of refugees per capita.²² Public authorities and municipalities are finding it difficult to cope with the pressure, above all, in terms of safety in the reception of refugees and provision of housing.²³ This has led to a radical reversal in refugee policy announced by the government in November 2015. Sweden’s generous asylum regime will revert to the “EU minimum,” meaning that most refugees will receive only temporary residence permits and the right of refugees to bring families to Sweden will be severely restricted.²⁴

Considering the above-mentioned issues faced by Sweden, it is worthwhile to look beyond the field of development aid and eGovernment in the next national action plan and consider broadening transparency and accountability to other areas of governance, such as arms exports, private sector aid, refugee management and public participation.

Stakeholder priorities

Stakeholders consulted for this report have suggested a range of priorities that could be addressed either in the framework of this action plan or through commitments in the next one. These include a higher level of ambition on transparency; increased transparency in the area of arms exports and private, tax-funded, aid development initiatives; enhanced public participation; and improved re-use of public sector information. Moreover, as a crosscutting recommendation, civil society stakeholders suggested that government institutions should be more transparent and explicit about the rationale behind their policy proposals and decisions.

Raise the level of ambition on transparency

Stakeholders from civil society, the government and even a political party²⁵ agree that Sweden could raise its level of ambition on transparency. The Swedish transparency guarantee should be broadened beyond aid-specific data to government transactions in general. In particular, the Green Party stresses that the transparency guarantee can be used to evaluate the implementation of the Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGU).²⁶ PGU states that all government policies—not only development cooperation—should contribute to the goal of achieving equitable and sustainable global development. A human rights approach based on the perspective of poor people toward development has to inform all development policies.²⁷

The full implementation of the Swedish transparency guarantee (Milestone 3.1) should shed light on how other policy areas are conflicting with Swedish development cooperation objectives. To do this in practice, the same standards used for the traceability of aid flows (IATI) could be applied to all policy areas, not just to the development cooperation field. This would make it possible to combine and analyze data across policy areas and enable an assessment of the overall results of all the Swedish government’s actions in a particular country. An example would be the overall impact of trade, arms exports and development aid to India. By doing this, the PGU effectiveness would also become clearer.²⁸ In order to apply IATI to more policy areas would require a political decision about the release of standardized data. Moreover, as suggested by a government interviewee, several global open data initiatives on related topics could be connected according to the same logic and standard, such as Open Spending²⁹ and the Open Budget Survey.³⁰ This would allow for the synchronization of data across countries and a more comprehensive visualization of global government transactions.

In practice, Sweden could commit to applying the IATI standard to more areas of government, not only to aid data. This would be a very ambitious commitment that is

probably not achievable in the framework of a two-year national action plan. However, as a first step in this direction, Sweden could apply IATI to data in at least one government area closely related to development cooperation, such as trade.

Enhance transparency in private sector aid

In the field of development cooperation, civil society calls for more transparency on aid initiatives by the private sector funded with tax money. A recent civil society organization (CSO) report points out that allocations from the aid budget to the private sector have increased in past years, while it is unclear if this type of private sector intervention contributes to sustainable development results for people living in poverty—the ultimate goal of Swedish development policy. Hence, the government should carry out more independent evaluations of this type of aid use.³¹

Improve participation of partners in recipient countries

Civil society notes that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) could focus OGP commitments related to development aid on the right-holders³² in partner countries. Presently, the recipient perspective on aid planning and implementation is often missing. Sweden should commit to creating mechanisms for involving CSOs in partner countries at the earliest stages of decision making about aid strategies and budgets. In addition, more complaints mechanisms for partners in recipient countries should be made available.

Give re-use of data political priority

The consulted stakeholders emphasized that one of the key challenges ahead for open data in Sweden is its re-use. The government should promote the re-use of data and give it political priority.³³ To achieve transparency and innovation—the overarching goals of open data in Sweden—the government should develop a systematic approach to open data across government authorities and a model for funding of joint solutions. This would give priority to open data initiatives, improve cost efficiency and improve the quality of open data sources.³⁴ In practical terms, a funding model for solutions and a roadmap setting out what data should be opened up and by when could be developed in the framework of the current action plan.

Scope of action plan in relation to national context

The scope of the Swedish OGP action plan is rather limited, focusing only on aid transparency, eGovernment and the re-use of public sector information. Overall, the potential impact of the OGP action plan has been strongly diminished because of its narrow scope. The action plan did not include commitments on some of the important issues discussed in Section VI: “Country Context” and Section VII: “General Recommendations,” which would benefit from more openness and transparency.

¹ Sweden has the highest freedom rating (civil liberties and political rights) of 2015. The Freedom House, *Freedom in the World Index (2015)*, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/sweden>.

² In the Networked Readiness Index, the political and regulatory environment pillar (nine variables) assesses the extent to which the national legal framework facilitates ICT penetration and a safe development of business activities, taking into account general features of the regulatory environment (including the protection afforded to property rights, the independence of the judiciary and the efficiency of the law-making process) as well as more ICT-specific dimensions (the passing of laws relating to ICT or software piracy rates).

³ The World Economic Forum, *Global Information Technology Report 2015*, <http://reports.weforum.org/global-information-technology-report-2015/economies/#indexId=NRI&economy=SWE>.

-
- ⁴ <http://unpan3.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Data/Country-Information/id/165-Sweden>.
- ⁵ On the World Economic Forum's "The Networked Readiness Index," Sweden held first place in 2012, and third in 2015; on the WWW Foundation's "Web Index," it went from first place in 2012 to fifth place 2014; on the UN's "e-Government Development Index," it went from 7th place in 2012 to 14th place in 2014 and on the UN's "e-Participation Index," it went from 14th place in 2012 to 45th place in 2014.
- ⁶ *Open Data Barometer* (2015), <http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/report/analysis/rankings.html>.
- ⁷ <http://www.edelegationen.se/Pa-gang-inom-e-forvaltning/Regeringen-overlamnar-proposition-om-vidareutnyttjande-av-offentlig-information/>.
- ⁸ Sweden is the largest Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donor in terms of development assistance as a percentage of GNI, and the sixth largest by volume. Sweden is one of only five DAC members to have met the UN target of 0.7% and it is committed to continue delivering 1% of its GNI to ODA. Source: OECD, "DAC member profile: Sweden," *Statistics from the Development Co-operation Report* (2015), <http://www.oecd.org/dac/sweden.htm>.
- ⁹ "Swedish development cooperation and its results in figures" (2014), <http://sidapublications.citat.se/interface/stream/mabstream.asp?filetype=1&orderlistmainid=4000&printfileid=4000&filex=5990125804000>.
- ¹⁰ Sida, "Our mission" (2014), <http://www.sida.se/English/About-us/Our-mission/>.
- ¹¹ *2014 Aid Transparency Index*, <http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/>.
- ¹² For more information on the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard: www.aidtransparency.net.
- ¹³ Diakonia and the Swedish church, "Business and development assistance: mapping of transparency, evaluations and tied aid," 4 June 2014, <http://www.diakonia.se/naringslivbistand14>.
- ¹⁴ OECD ranks Sweden as number two of 36 countries on the indicator "civic engagement." Source: OECD, "Better life index 2015: Sweden," <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/countries/sweden/>.
- ¹⁵ Joachim Åström, et al., "Crisis, Innovation and e-Participation: Towards a Framework for Comparative Research," *Electronic Participation Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 8075(2013), p. 26–36, http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-40346-0_3.
- ¹⁶ See also "Independent Reporting Mechanism Sweden: Progress Report 2012–13," *Open Government Partnership (OGP)*, (2014), p. 38, <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/sweden/progress-report/report>.
- ¹⁷ Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI), "Landguiden" (2015), https://www.landguiden.se/Lander/Europa/Sverige/~/link.aspx?_id=F169217E24DF48EA9B902FC5486FEC98&_z=z.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹ Opinion piece by Anna Ek, Bo Forsberg, Anna Lindenfors, Malin Nilsson, and Karin Wiborn, Karin, "Skarpare förslag om vapenexport behövs," *SvD*, 26 June 2015, <http://www.svd.se/skarpare-forslag-om-vapenexport-behovs>.
- ²⁰ The parliamentary inquiry was set up by the government with the aim of developing proposals for a new arms legislation, primarily to investigate how Sweden can tighten export controls to non-democratic regimes. <http://www.svenskafreds.se/kex-krigsmaterielexportoversynskommitten>.
- ²¹ "Swedish arms sales should depend on buyer's democratic credentials – report," *The Guardian*, 26 June 2015, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jun/26/swedish-arms-sales-buyers-democratic-credentials-report>.
- ²² "Swedes now want fewer refugees, poll says," *The Local*, 25 December 2015, <http://www.thelocal.se/20151225/swedes-now-want-fewer-refugees-poll-says>.
- ²³ Government Offices, "Government proposes measures to create respite for Swedish refugee reception," 24 November 2015, <http://www.government.se/articles/2015/11/government-proposes-measures-to-create-respite-for-swedish-refugee-reception/>.
- ²⁴ "Sweden slams shut its open-door policy towards refugees," *The Guardian*, 24 November 2015, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/24/sweden-asylum-seekers-refugees-policy-reversal>.
- ²⁵ Stakeholder views originate from either interviews conducted by the IRM researcher, from opinions expressed during the consultation meeting held by the IRM researcher in Stockholm in August 2015, or from the literature and media articles consulted during the research conducted by the IRM researcher. The latter are clearly referenced in the following text.
- ²⁶ Green Party, "Area of expenditure 7: International Aid," Motion 2013/14: U279, http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Forslag/Motioner/Utgiftsomrade-7-Internationell_H102U279/?text=true.
- ²⁷ Sweden's Policy for Global Development 2002/03:122, <http://www.government.se/legal-documents/2003/05/200203122/>.
- ²⁸ This is based on the recommendations of the Swedish Agency for Public Management on how to better evaluate PGU. Source: The Swedish Agency for Public Management's summary of the publication "Sweden's Policy for Global Development: the Government's joint responsibility?" (2014:1),

<http://www.statskontoret.se/In-English/publications/2014---summaries-of-publications/swedens-policy-for-global-development.-the-governments-joint-responsibility-20141/>.

²⁹ <https://openspending.org/>.

³⁰ <http://www.internationalbudget.org/opening-budgets/open-budget-initiative/open-budget-survey/>.

³¹ Diakonia and the Swedish church, "Business and development assistance."

³² Assumed in the rights-based approach, every human being is inherently a right-holder who should enjoy universal human rights that must be guaranteed. By ratifying the different United Nations human rights treaties, states automatically assume the principal roles of guaranteeing these rights. Source: UNICEF Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States' (CEE/CIS) Advocate for Children toolkit, http://www.advocate-for-children.org/advocacy/rights_based_approach/rights_holders_duty_bearers.

³³ "Data-driven innovation through public service information" ("Datadriven innovation genom offentlig information"), 26 June 2015, <http://www.vinnova.se/sv/Aktuellt--publicerat/Kalendarium/2015/150630-Datadriven-innovation-genom-offentlig-information/>.

³⁴ VINNOVA, "Slutrapport av regeringsuppdrag om den tekniska plattformen öppnadata.se - en portal för innovation," Öppnadata.se, 25 June 2015.

VII. General recommendations

This section recommends general next steps for Sweden’s OGP process in general, rather than for specific commitments. These recommendations come from the commitment evaluations above, stakeholder consultations, and the IRM researcher’s analysis of the process of developing and implementing the section action plan.

The recommendations are organized in two key sections. Section 1 presents recommendations on future OGP commitments, while Section 2 proposes recommendations related to the OGP process.

1. Recommendations on future commitments

Broaden the transparency guarantee beyond aid-specific data

Sweden should broaden the transparency guarantee beyond aid-specific data to government transactions in general. As a first step in this direction, Sweden could apply International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards to data in at least one government area closely related to development cooperation, such as trade.

Apply the principles of the Swedish Policy for Global Development (PGU) to government decisions about arms exports

To bring more transparency into the area of arms exports where accountability and transparency is very limited, the IRM researcher concurs with civil society stakeholders¹ that Sweden should commit to applying the principles of the Policy for Global Development (PGU) to government decisions about arms exports. In particular, Sweden should commit to the following: (i) make available information about how the members of the Export Control Council²—an entity created to ensure parliamentary transparency on arms exports—vote; (ii) give the public access to information about how the Inspectorate of Strategic Products (ISP) makes assessments in individual arms deals; and (iii) enact clear rules that impose requirements on the relevant authorities to conduct risk analysis when export permits are issued to avoid corruption in the procurement process.³

Enhance accountability in private sector aid

Civil society calls for improved transparency around tax-funded private sector aid and for more independent evaluations of this type of aid use.⁴ Given that the strategy for aid information and communication (Milestone 4.1) aims to improve independent assessment of development cooperation, the government could add a specific focus on, and assign funding to, an evaluation of private sector interventions.

Improve transparency on refugee costs

Sweden should consider a commitment to improve accountability regarding refugee costs, especially in light of the extraordinary influx of refugees during the past year. Presently, refugee costs⁵ are administered as part of the aid budget and are traceable only on a generic level. Sweden should enable the public to follow this particular aid stream through the whole chain of information (i.e., decision, implementation, and monitoring) on Openaid.se. Another commitment suggested by civil society stakeholders is to administer refugee costs separately from the aid budget, given that these costs tend to detract funds from actual development assistance.⁶ In October 2015, the Ministry of Finance was considering the diversion of 60% of the aid budget (amounting to SEK 25 billion or USD 3 billion) to cover the escalating refugee costs.⁷

Expand public participation

Sweden should envision more ambitious commitments in the field of public participation, especially with regard to individual citizen engagement and innovative approaches to participation. This could be done by developing ambitious commitments that aim at the higher levels of the IAP2 Spectrum such as “collaborate” and “empower.”⁸ In particular, targeting individual citizen engagement and taking advantage of new technologies would allow much broader involvement in public consultations and facilitate the aggregation of opinions.

A specific future commitment to this end could be for the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation to expand Commitment 1 on the citizen-centred approach to eGovernment; the ministry would develop a plan for increasing the capacity of civil servants to engage with different stakeholders and for better involving the civil society and academia into the co-production of services and decisions.

Another commitment would be for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) to improve aid planning and implementation by developing OGP commitments to involve civil society organizations (CSOs) in partner countries at the earliest stages of decision making about aid strategies and budgets. In addition, more complaints mechanisms for partners in recipient countries should be made available.

Give re-use of data political priority

To promote transparency and innovation, the government should develop a systematic approach to open data across government agencies and a model for funding of joint solutions. The funding model could be developed by outlining solutions and creating a roadmap to set out what data should be opened up and by when.

2. Recommendations on the OGP process

Develop a formal and regular consultation mechanism

To allow meaningful dialogue on the OGP commitments, the process would greatly benefit from the creation of a formal multi-stakeholder consultation mechanism. A recent report on government-civil society interactions within OGP, co-authored by the IRM researcher,⁹ showed the value of having such structures in other countries. Development of such a mechanism should be based on standards around the selection of members, their mandate and tenure, as well as the recording and publication of meeting proceedings. The government could use the model of the CSO compact (Milestone 4.3) in particular to create smaller working groups around OGP values and to hold regular meetings to co-design OGP commitments and to monitor their implementation.

Broaden the circle of consulted stakeholders

To improve the quality of the consultation process, the range of stakeholders should be broadened beyond the current narrow circle of development aid CSOs. Including a wide range of stakeholders in the development of the action plan will help to elaborate commitments that better respond to open government issues in the country. Also, a wider spectrum of government agencies should be consulted regarding future OGP commitments.

Improve transparency around consultations

The government should improve the transparency of their consultation processes by publishing the information on the list of organizations consulted, the list of participants and criteria for their selection, a summary of the comments received during consultation, and details about if and how each of these comments will be taken into account.

Raise awareness on OGP

To raise the level of awareness about OGP, the government should have a clear communication strategy on OGP. The MFA could create a national OGP website with a calendar for the different steps of the OGP process, information about upcoming and concluded consultations, a list of contacts for different commitments, and an archive with OGP-related documents to improve institutional memory. (For an example see Romania's OGP website: <http://ogp.gov.ro/>.)

Assign the coordination of the action plan to an entity with an overarching remit

The current institutional setting wherein the MFA is responsible for Sweden's OGP commitments limits the scope of the action plan largely to the development aid-related issues. The coordination of the OGP action plan would be better placed in the hands of a government entity with an overarching remit. The Prime Minister's Office or the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation could be better suited to coordinate the OGP action plan.

TOP FIVE 'SMART' RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Broaden the transparency guarantee beyond aid-specific data to government transactions in general. As a first step in this direction, Sweden could apply IATI standards to data in at least one government area closely related to development cooperation, such as trade.
2. Apply the principles of the Policy for Global Development (PGU) to government decisions about arms exports by adopting concrete steps proposed in Section 1: "Recommendations on future commitments" above.
3. Enhance public participation by allowing early and deeper involvement of citizens and civil society in decision-making processes, by implementing a citizen-centred approach to eGovernment and by including CSOs in recipient countries into decision making on aid strategies and budgets.
4. Adopt a systematic approach to open data by developing a roadmap setting out what data should be open and when, and by designing a funding model for joint solutions across government entities.
5. Improve the OGP consultation process by developing a formal mechanism for dialogue, by involving a broader range of stakeholders and by improving the transparency of the consultation process.

¹ Points presented at the meeting with the parliamentary committee set up to review the export of military equipment (Krigsmaterielexportöversynskommittén [KEX]) on 30 January 2015 by Svenska Freds- och Skiljedomsföreningen, Internationella Kvinnoförbundet för Fred och Frihet (IKFF), Amnesty International Sweden, Kristna Fredsrörelsen, Diakonia, and Transparency International Sweden. <https://fredfrihetfeminism.files.wordpress.com/2015/02/punkter-till-mc3b6te-med-kex-30-jan.pdf>.

² In Swedish, Exportkontrollrådet.

³ See footnote 1.

⁴ Diakonia and the Swedish church, "Business and development assistance: mapping of transparency, evaluations and tied aid," 4 June 2014, <http://www.diakonia.se/naringslivbistand14>.

⁵ According to the government, the refugee costs portion of the aid budget includes expenditures for refugees from poor countries during the first year of their stay in Sweden. The government underlines that costs have risen, partly because the proportion of unaccompanied minors has doubled since 2006 and their accommodation is significantly more expensive than for other asylum seekers. <http://www.regeringen.se/debattartiklar/2014/10/vi-foljer-riktlinjer-for-flyktingkostnader/>.

⁶ "Urholkat bistånd svek mot utsatta," *SvD*, 14 October 2014, http://www.svd.se/urholkat-bistand-svek-mot-utsatta_4010323.

⁷ "KI: Ingen fara att låna till flyktingkostnader," *SvD*, 22 October 2015, <http://www.svd.se/flyktingkostnader-pressar-regeringen>.

⁸ "IAP2 Spectrum of Political Participation," *International Association for Public Participation*, <http://bit.ly/1kMmlYC>.

⁹ Mary Francoli, Alina Östling, and Fabro Steibel, "From Informing to Empowering: Improving Government-Civil Society Interactions within OGP," Open Government Partnership (OGP)/Hivos (2015), www.opengovpartnership.org/blog/mary-francoli-alina-ostling-and-fabro-steibel/2015/09/01/improving-government-civil-society#sthash.fAOAozsR.dpuf.

VIII. Methodology and Sources

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

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

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

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

Interviews and focus groups

Each national researcher will carry out at least one public information-gathering event. Care should be taken in inviting stakeholders outside of the “usual suspects” list of invitees already participating in existing processes. Supplementary means may be needed to gather the inputs of stakeholders in a more meaningful way (e.g., online surveys, written responses, follow-up interviews). Additionally, researchers perform specific interviews with responsible agencies when the commitments require more information than provided in the self-assessment or accessible online.

Consultation meeting

Date: 21 August 2015

Place: CONCORD Sweden office, Stockholm

The IRM researcher invited 30 people to the meeting, 13 of these attended (five men and eight women). The participants were a mix between government (four) and civil society representatives (nine). The IRM researcher invited all the government contacts for the commitments related to aid transparency while civil society organization (CSO) representatives were selected among people involved in Sweden's first national action plan and from CONCORD Sweden's Steering Group for Aid Effectiveness. The aim was to spur a dialogue between government and civil society around commitments in a field relevant to both parties.

The IRM researcher would like to acknowledge the support provided by CONCORD Sweden, and Peter Sörbom in particular, to the organization of the meeting and for the generous use of CONCORD's conference facilities.²

List of attendees:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organization</i>
Peter Sörbom	CONCORD Sweden
Magnus Walan	Diakonia
Peter Brune	IM Swedish Development Partner
Anna Centerstig	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Hedvig Söderlund	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Frank Svensson	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Birgitta Rosén	Mission Council
Mia Haglund Heelas	Plan International
Annika Malmberg	Swedish Association for Sexuality Education
Sara Lindblom	Save the Children
Carl Elmstam	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
Maud Johansson	Swedish Committee for Afghanistan
Nina Larrea	Union to Union
Alina Ostling	IRM researcher (chair)

Synopsis:

The consultation meeting focused on the commitments in the field of aid transparency, the main focus being the national action plan. The IRM researcher introduced OGP and the assessment process of Sweden's OGP action plan. Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) representatives presented the commitments on aid transparency in the action plan, including the results achieved so far, challenges, and plans for the future. The participants asked questions and commented on the current commitments and proposed future commitments in the field of aid transparency. Almost all of the proposals were incorporated into the IRM report by the IRM researcher. The participants were active and engaged, and the government and CSO representatives were prone to listen to each other.

Interviews

The IRM researcher interviewed 10 people (five women and five men). The list of interviewees is presented below. The interviews took place face-to-face and by telephone.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Date</i>
Hedvig Söderlund	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	5-Aug-15
Anna Centerstig	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	6-Aug-15
Per Trulsson	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	25-Sep-15
Magnus Enzell	Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation	29-Aug-15
Annica Sohlström	Forum Syd	30-Aug-15
Carl Elmstam	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	30-Aug-15
Peter Sörbom	CONCORD Sweden	7-Sep-15
Maria Lagus	My Right	9-Sep-15
Karina Aldén	Ministry of Finance	16-Sep-15
Erik Borälv	VINNOVA	24-Sep-15

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

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

The current membership of the International Experts' Panel is:

- Yamini Aiyar
- Debbie Budlender
- Hazel Feigenblatt
- Jonathan Fox
- Hille Hinsberg
- Anuradha Joshi
- Liliane Klaus
- Rosemary McGee
- Gerardo Munck
- Ernesto Velasco

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

¹ Full research guidance can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual, available at:
<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/about-irm>.

² CONCORD Sweden is a branch of the European NGO confederation for relief and development (CONCORD) with 48 Swedish CSO members. CONCORD Sweden's mission is to conduct information and advocacy on EU development cooperation and policy, with a focus on poverty reduction.

IX. Eligibility Requirements Annex

In September 2012, OGP decided to begin strongly encouraging participating governments to adopt ambitious commitments in relation to their performance in the OGP eligibility criteria.

The OGP Support Unit collates eligibility criteria on an annual basis. These scores are presented below.¹ When appropriate, the IRM reports will discuss the context surrounding progress or regress on specific criteria in the Country Context section.

Criteria	2011	Current	Change	Explanation
Budget transparency ²	4	4	No change	4 = Executive's Budget Proposal and Audit Report published 2 = One of two published 0 = Neither published
Access to information ³	4	4	No change	4 = Access to information (ATI) Law 3 = Constitutional ATI provision 1 = Draft ATI law 0 = No ATI law
Asset Declaration ⁴	4	4	No change	4 = Asset disclosure law, data public 2 = Asset disclosure law, no public data 0 = No law
Citizen Engagement (Raw score)	4 (10.00)) ⁵	4 (10.00)) ⁶	No change	<i>EIU Citizen Engagement Index</i> raw score: 1 > 0 2 > 2.5 3 > 5 4 > 7.5
Total / Possible (Percent)	16/16 (100%))	16/16 (100%)	No change	75% of possible points to be eligible

¹ For more information, see <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/eligibility-criteria>.

² For more information, see Table 1 in <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>. For up-to-date assessments, see <http://www.obstracker.org/>.

³ The two databases used are Constitutional Provisions at <http://www.right2info.org/constitutional-protections> and Laws and draft laws at <http://www.right2info.org/access-to-information-laws>.

⁴ Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, "Disclosure by Politicians," (Tuck School of Business Working Paper 2009-60, 2009), <http://bit.ly/19nDEfK>; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level Of Transparency," in *Government at a Glance 2009*, (OECD, 2009), <http://bit.ly/13vGtqS>; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries" (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009), <http://bit.ly/1cIokyf>. For more recent information, see <http://publicofficialsfinancialdisclosure.worldbank.org>. In 2014, the OGP Steering Committee approved a change in the asset disclosure measurement. The existence of a law and *de facto* public access to the disclosed information replaced the old measures of disclosure by politicians and disclosure of high-level

officials. For additional information, see the guidance note on 2014 OGP Eligibility Requirements at <http://bit.ly/1EjLJ4Y>.

⁵"Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat," *The Economist Intelligence Unit* (London: Economist, 2010), <http://bit.ly/eLC1rE>.

⁶"Democracy Index 2014: Democracy and its Discontents," *The Economist Intelligence Unit* (London: Economist, 2014), <http://bit.ly/18kEzCt>.