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|  |
| --- |
| Table 1: At a Glance |
|  | Mid-term | End-of-term |
| Number of commitments | 19 | 19 |
| Number of milestones | 41 | 41 |
| Level of completion  |
| Completed | *1* | *1* |
| Substantial | *3* | *5* |
| Limited | *10* | *9* |
| Not started | *5* | *4* |
| Number of commitments with: |
| Clear relevance to OGP values | *17* | *17* |
| Transformative potential impact | *1* | *1* |
| Substantial or complete implementation | *4* | *6* |
| All three (✪) |  |  |
| Moving forward |
| Number of commitments carried over to next action plan: | *6* |

Following the debt crisis, government instability stalled implementation of the second Greek action plan. The commitments, focused on access to information and parliamentary transparency, lacked sufficient detail to lead to meaningful reforms. This action plan tackled key areas such as taxation and open data; implementation of the third action plan will focus on engaging key stakeholders from the public sector and civil society in a continuous effort to pursue meaningful reforms.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a review of the activities of each OGP participating country. This report summarizes the results of the period July 2014 to June 2016 and includes some relevant developments up to September 2016.

Greece’s participation in OGP is not legally mandated. The Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction is the leading institution for the development and implementation of Greece’s OGP action plan. Within the abovementioned Ministry, individual departments are responsible for implementing open government policies across the public administration, promoting the necessary new regulations, and confronting organizational, legal, technical, and operational issues that might arise in its jurisdiction. In contrast with the development cycle of the first action plan, the Hellenic Parliament contributed more in the development of the second action plan. The Parliament proposed six commitments on parliamentary activities grouped in three thematic clusters; this thematic portion of the action plan is subsumed under the full national action plan. However, the Parliament did not participate with the Ministry of Interior and Administrative reconstruction in the central coordination of the action plan outside of these proposed commitments.

At the time of writing this report, Greece presented on 5 June 2016 a new action plan for its third cycle.[[1]](#endnote-2) Greece developed this plan by opening communication channels and cooperating with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

### Consultation with civil society during implementation

During the implementation period, neither government nor CSOs initiated individual consultation activities. In discussions with government officials as well as OGP-related CSOs, the Openwise IRM research team found that stakeholders widely acknowledge the necessity of a permanent consultation and progress monitoring mechanism. This has also been an issue in some meetings between the OGP support unit, government officials and civil society organizations. Three such meetings were held within the period between June 2015 to June 2016 aiming to provide guidance to government and stakeholders on best practices from other countries hosting successful OGP forums. One of these meetings was the IRM event for midterm report presentation. This meeting was open to stakeholder participation and included three thematic breakout sessions where government members could consult with civil society members regarding the current and future action plans. However, there is currently no permanent consultation forum in place.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 3: Action Plan Consultation Process |
| Phase of Action Plan | OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section) | Did the government meet this requirement |
| During Implementation | Regular forum for consultation during implementation? | No |
| Consultations: Open or Invitation-only? | Open |
| Consultations on IAP2 spectrum? | Consult |

# Progress in commitment implementation

The indicators and methods 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 efficacy in encouraging positive competition between OGP-participating countries: the “starred commitment” (✪). These exemplary OGP commitments meet several criteria:

1. The commitment 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 (Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability).
3. The commitment has a potentially "transformative" impact if implemented completely.
4. Finally, the commitment must see significant execution, receiving a ranking of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, the Greek action plan contained no starred commitments at the midterm report. At the end of term, based on the changes in the level of completion, Greece’s action plan contained no starred commitments.

Commitments assessed as star commitments in the midterm report can lose their starred status if their completion falls short of “substantial” or “full” at the end of the action plan implementation cycle. IRM assesses the commitment progress across the entire term.

Finally, the graphs presented in this section are only an excerpt of the data collected by IRM. Greece’s full dataset is accessible on the OGP Explorer ([www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer)).

### About “Did it Open Government?”

Often, OGP commitments are vaguely worded or not clearly related to opening government, but they actually achieve significant political reforms. Other times, commitments may appear relevant, ambitious, and see significant progress, yet fail the overall goal of opening government. IRM captures these subtleties through a new variable in end-of-term reports: “Did it open government?” This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how government practice has changed as a result of the commitment’s implementation. This can be contrasted to the IRM’s “Starred commitments” which describe *potential* impact.

The Openwise IRM research team assessed “Did it open government?” by examining each of the OGP values relevant to the commitment. We ask, “Did it stretch government practice beyond business as usual?” The scale for assessment is as follows:

* Worsened: worsened government openness as a result of the measures taken by commitment;
* Did not change: did not change status quo of government practice;
* Marginal: some change, but minor in terms of its impact over level of openness;
* Major: a step forward for government openness in the relevant policy area, but remains limited in scope or scale; and
* Outstanding: a reform that transformed ‘business as usual’ in the relevant policy area by opening government.

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

Readers should note limitations. IRM end-of-term reports are prepared only a few months after the implementation cycle is completed. This new variable focuses on outcomes observable at the end of the two-year implementation period. Readers should not use the report and this variable as a comprehensive impact assessment, given the complex methodological implications and the timing of the report.

Table 4. Overview: assessment of progress by commitment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written) | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | None | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major | Outstanding |
| 1. 1 Transparency (Diavgeia) Program Upgrade |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |
| 1.2 Public Participation in Decision Making |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 2.1 Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive on Reuse of Data |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
|  |  |  | ✔ |
| 2.2 Regulatory Amendments on Open Data |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 2.3 Central Open Data Platform |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |
| 2.4 Open Geospatial Data |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 2.5 Open Cultural Data |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 2.6 Open Data for Offshore Companies |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |
| 2.7 Open Public Sector Datasets |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 3.1 Open Public Sector Job Posts |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |
| 3.2 Public Administration Organizational Chart |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |
| 3.3 Open Government Policy |  | ✔ |  |  | UNCLEAR |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |
| 3.4 Strategic Alliance Against Corruption |  |  |  | ✔ | UNCLEAR  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 4.1 Track Changes on Bills |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |
| 4.2 “Parliamentary Transparency” Section ofParliament’s Website |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 4.3 Parliament Website and New Standards |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 4.4 Open Historical Parliamentary Data |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 4.5 Parliament Social Media Policy |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |
| 4.6 Online Provision of Exhibitions |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |

### General overview of commitments

The second action plan put increased emphasis on opening government data to the public. Commitments focused on both legal and administrative issues, as well as on releasing datasets from the Ministries of Finance, Culture, and the Environment. These datasets would publicize geospatial, cultural, offshore company registers, and numerous other examples of government-held data. In addition, a significant part of the second action plan consisted of commitments carried over from the first action plan cycle, which reflect an increased focus on public participation during commitment implementation. These included improvements to the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program, its new website interface called the Diavgeia Platform and the public consultation website, [www.opengov.gr](http://www.opengov.gr). Greece added further commitments in continuation of work begun during the first action plan cycle to open publishing of taxation and geospatial data.

Greece designed new commitments to address public administration integrity and accountability issues. These included initiatives aimed to provide transparency in filling important public sector posts, the publication of official organizational charts for public sector agencies and the reorganization of the inspectorate bodies tasked with fighting corruption.

The third part of this action plan reflected, for the first time, the engagement of the Hellenic Parliament in the commitment-formation process. The Parliament proposed six commitments structured within three thematic clusters. These commitments concerned Parliament’s stated desire to be solely responsible for coordinating implementation of these commitments.

**Clustering**

The second action plan contains nineteen commitments. IRM separately examined and evaluated the majority of these commitments. However, IRM evaluated a small number of commitments in thematically similar clusters for ease of analysis. In particular:

* Commitment 2.1 (PSI Directive on the reuse of data) and Commitment 2.2 (Regulatory amendments on open data) are examined together because both concern the creation of the legal framework required to publicize data and public sector information.
* Commitment 2.6 (Open data for offshore companies) and Commitment 2.7 (Open public sector datasets) are grouped together because the Ministry of Finance has a central role in coordinating their implementation.
* Commitment 4.1 (Track changes on bills) and Commitment 4.2 (“Parliamentary Transparency” section of Parliament’s website) have been clustered for joint analysis as they both relate to expanding Hellenic Parliament IT systems.
* Similarly, Commitment 4.3 (Parliament Website and new standards) with Commitment 4.4 (Open Historical Data) and Commitment 4.5 (Enhancement of Social Media Policy in the Hellenic Parliament) with Commitment 4.6 (Online provision of Exhibitions) form two additional clusters. They represent actions initiated before the formulation of the second action plan and propose improvements to the online digital presence of the Hellenic Parliament.

**Overview of new Action Plan**

The Openwise IRM research team initiated breakout deliberation sessions with public officials and civil society during the Openwise public presentation of the midterm report. Following this, the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction organized and executed several events developing the next action plan: a kickoff discussion with civil society on procedural issues, a day-long meeting focused on seven thematic areas, an online pre-consultation, an activity focused on four additional thematic areas, a Thessaloniki event collaborating with civil society, an online consultation on the draft action plan, and a Parliament discussion about the action plan. These events, according to Ministry of Interior staff, led to the adoption of a new action plan with specific, measurable, time-bound, achievable and realistic commitments that seek to respond to the demands civil society made in the consultation process.

There are several novel aspects to the new action plan’s approach. For the first time, the new action plan seeks to establish open government at the local level by integrating specific commitments at regional levels. Citizens’ relationship with public administration is stronger at this local level. Commitments on education, justice and maritime affairs are included for the first time. The new national action plan also adopted commitments proposed by civil society, and the government plans to collaborate with CSOs for implementation.

The third Greek action plan includes some of the incomplete commitments from the second action plan. The new plan carries over the commitments on public participation and decision-making, as well as those on open cultural data.[[2]](#endnote-3)

The third action plan includes the second plan’s commitment on open government policy. However, the commitment is significantly modified; it attempts to introduce a new legal mandate for open government in Greece.

The new plan also carries over the commitment on open public sector job posts but with a different scope. It now aims to introduce a national registry of public administration managers that would allow for the transparent selection of personnel within the public sector.[[3]](#endnote-4)

The commitment on the public sector organizational charts is now included in the third action plan, modified to provide the regulatory framework required to facilitate implementation.

The commitment on open provision of geodata now includes a new more generic milestone replacing the more detailed ones on the second action plan.[[4]](#endnote-5)

There are 11 incomplete milestones that are not represented the third Greek action plan:

* Commitments by the Hellenic Parliament (4.1 to 4.6) were not included due to insufficient funding for their implementation.
* Commitment 1.1 on the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program update was not included. Following its latest update, the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform feels the program is fully operational.
* Similarly, Commitment 2.3 concerning the Central Open Data Platform is seen by the Ministry of the Interior as nearly complete.[[5]](#endnote-6)
* Commitments 2.6 on open data for offshore companies, 2.7 on open public sector datasets and 3.4 on the strategic alliance against corruption never gained the required ownership and did not move forward. In the case of opening data for offshore companies, a new independent body was proposed but a relevant commitment was not been included in the third action plan.[[6]](#endnote-7)

## Theme 1: Boosting public participation

## Commitment 1.1 Transparency Program upgrade

**Commitment Text:**

Promotion of transparency and accountability, through the improvement of the legal framework and the enhanced application of process transparency in public administration. This is the second phase of the project, and it is called Transparency Program II.The main interventions needed pertain to the institutional and technological enhancement of the current (governmental) Transparency Program project:

Compliance and uniform application of regulations regarding the institutional strengthening of the published document. This will ensure that the unique number given to each document (and not the document itself or its printed version) will be sufficient in referencing, using and handling, throughout the public sector, without the need of additional validation or signing.

Substantial improvement of the website user interface, including additional search functionality, improved usability and enhanced accessibility, and compliance with the WCAG standard (version 2.0, level AA).

Addition of electronic communication channels among citizens, businesses and public administration, in order to submit comments and discuss the published documents (using the user’s account in publishing documents or user accounts on social media e.g. Google, Facebook, etc.).

Provision of personalized content and search results

Improvement of open data provision mechanism, in machine readable formats, aiming to enhance interoperability. Use of open data from governmental audit mechanisms. Implementation of applications for the monitoring of the administrative actions from all interested parties.

Enrichment of the information provided by Transparency Program, with clear categorization based on the government agencies and using additional public sector data sources (human resources, e-procurement, income etc.). This way a wider system for information provision will be created, available to the public. A separate subsystem will be designed, addressing the need of public administration bodies to draw business intelligence reports on public administration functioning, expenses and to support decision making.

Milestones – Timescales

1.1 Issue of instructions and guides on the application of the new pertaining legislative framework and the new pertaining information system (October 2014).

1.2 Complete integration and operation of public bodies in the new Transparency Program (December

2014).

1.3 Conduction of study and gradual promotion of actions enriching the data provided from other data sources of the public sector. Target being the centralized, correct, information provision for a variety of issues; including expenditure, revenue, personnel etc. The study will be initially drafted by MAREG in collaboration with stakeholders - owners of complementary data sets and will be finalized after consultation with NGOs and civil society organizations working in the field (study June 2015, gradual implementation June 2016).

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): Information Society SA

Start date: October 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written) | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 1. 1 Transparency (Diavgeia) Program Upgrade |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |

### Commitment Aim:

In Greece, transparency policies have focused on providing online access to information regarding government actions and decisions. Making information publicly available online serves as a condition to validate government plans and implementation. This commitment builds on the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program launched in October 2010, requiring all government institutions to publish decisions on a transparency portal before they may be considered for implementation. Its aim is to promote transparency and accountability, through the improvement of the legal framework and the enhanced application of Transparency (Diavgeia) Program processes in public administration. The commitment seeks to achieve the following actions:

* Provision of instructions and guidelines for adopting the new interface of the Transparency Program and the implementation of the new legislative framework;
* The complete integration of public bodies into the new interface of the Transparency Program; and
* A study reviewing the promotion of the Transparency Program using data from various public sector sources.

### Status

**Midterm: Substantial**

The government introduced legislative acts and issued guidelines to implement effectively the second phase of the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program. The Openwise IRM research team found that these documents are available online and easily accessible for the public. The new interface of the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program platform is currently operational. However, government bodies have yet to adopt fully all the capabilities of the new interface. According to a member of the OGP government team, there is no data to indicate the degree to which public entities beyond the Ministry of the Interior use the ADA (Number of Internet Uploads) as a document referencing system, although daily observation suggests additional public entities use ADA.[[7]](#endnote-8)

The Openwise IRM research team found that the government substituted participation in the European project, YourDataStories, for conducting a study on government- provided data. The European project is a collaborative effort regarding creative use of open data to tell stories. The government expected that the results from this project would substitute the study planned in the original commitment text.

**End of term: Substantial**

Greece issued guidelines and integrated agencies in the program by midterm review; there were no outstanding actions for this commitment other than the utilization of the YourDataStories project results. However, during a meeting with the OGP interministerial group, the Openwise IRM research team found that Greece aborted this milestone. Government officials stated YourDataStories was an independent, European-funded project that did not specifically serve the promotion goals of Diavgeia: specifically study and promote increasing data provided from public sector sources.[[8]](#endnote-9)

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Marginal**

This commitment attempts to improve the functionality of the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program. The commitment was designed to enhance the institutional framework that legally supports the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program as well as to upgrade the technological platform to improve functionality. The implementation of this commitment within the 2014-2016 period had a marginally positive impact upon the Diavgeia program. Under new institutional framework, new types of organizations, like NGOs, are now legally required to upload annually cumulative information regarding their budgetary operations on the transparency web portals. Also, the government introduced the new Transparency Program with improved search facilities and better tools for public employees when uploading information. These tools provide easier access to the wealth of information displayed on the platform. However, the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program platform’s effect on opening government is limited; some information, such as certain government actions regarding financial decisions, is exempt from the rules of the program. This could set a precedent for future data exemptions, thus reducing overall transparency.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek NAP does not carry forward the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program. The majority of IRM’s midterm suggestions are still relevant not only for earning “complete” status but also for designing a more ambitious and impactful Diavgeia commitment for future action plans. For example:

* Revise the current amendment allowing exemptions for certain governmental bodies to exclude specific decisions from publication on Diavgeia. Future legislation should create strict guidelines regarding the exemption of decisions from publication.
* Investigate specific applications of the “targeted transparency” concept across a select number of policy challenges. For example, data could be extracted from Diavgeia on areas such as health spending and summarized in a visualization that would enable stakeholders and the general public to design and implement policy solutions.
* Create an impact map for the Diavgeia program that defines concrete applications that promote better access to information, meaningful participation, and accountability. Deploy the above applications in an agile manner, e.g. a hackathon or an open innovation contest.

## Commitment 1.2. Public participation in decision making

**Commitment Text:**

Enhancement of the consultation process in all levels (institutional/legal, operational, technical). More specifically the following areas will be improved:

* Institutional: Strengthening of current institutional/legal framework
* Technical: The electronic system www.opengov.gr will be the focal point of information provision and consultation conduction throughout the public sector. Also the functionality offered for consultation of running consultations will be enhanced
* Operational:
	+ Introduction of a unique methodology for deliberation conduction, which will apply to all public administration bodies.
	+ Adoption of a minimum consultation period.
	+ Highlight of best practices. Study of consultations with increased participation.
	+ Identification of consultations and submitted draft legislation. Existence of link between the consultation and final draft (a results table with the comments and suggestions that were accepted will be included). Adoption of same enumeration in both consultations provided and final draft, in order to better correlate
	+ Template for consultation results presentation.
	+ Annual assessment of results.
	+ Training and utilization of executives.
	+ Adoption of mechanisms for reaching and mobilizing citizens. CSOs will be invited to actively participate in this process.
	+ Structured communication with all interested parties.
	+ Gradual integraton of consultations at regional and local level (municipalities) on citizens’ everyday life issues.

Milestones - Timescales

1.2.1 Regulation/legislation in place by end of December 2015.

1.2.2 Operational and technical improvements: gradual implementation, ending June 2016. There will be pertaining Action Plan by the end of 2014 (that will be published), followed be incremental implementation and deployment.

1.2.3 Preparation of a plan for public administration training, awareness raising and citizen mobilization (December 2014), which will include the needed steps for gradual application.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): National Center for Public Administration

Start date: December 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 1.2. Public participation in decision making  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment forms part of Greece’s efforts at strengthening public participation, especially online, in decision making. It aims to improve participation in online consultations by consolidating the legal framework and improving operational and technical aspects required by the web platform. The government committed to establishing a minimum consultation period, introducing a consultation methodology for the public sector, devising a link between the consultation text and the final draft, and reaching out to mobilize meaningful stakeholder participation. Milestones for the above policy goals included:

* New regulation/legislation regarding consultations by end of December 2015;
* Operational and technical improvements by the end of June 2016; and
* A training and awareness plan by the end of December 2015.

### Status

**Midterm: Limited**

Overall, The Openwise IRM research team found evidence of limited completion for this commitment. Greece had not begun implementing regulation or legislation, although commitment does not require completion of legislative action until December 2015.

Greece had partially implemented operational and technical improvements. The Openwise IRM research team found evidence of limited consultations, but there were no adequate mechanisms for the Parliament to adopt findings from these consultations. The training and mobilization plan has limited completion. Although there was no official proposal for training, awareness-raising or citizen mobilization, the National Center for Public Administration provided some guidance and technical support to the teams tasked with implementing consultations in each ministry.

**End of term: Limited**

According to information The Openwise IRM research team gathered during the government’s interministerial OGP meeting, there was no further evidence to support the advancement of this commitment.[[9]](#endnote-10) Government officials confirmed that there had been no action regarding the launch of a new legal framework for online consultation. Members of the interministerial team that work for the National Center of Public Administration, which is responsible for operational updates to opengov.gr, mentioned some new technical improvements.[[10]](#endnote-11) These included automatic update of statistical data, efforts to decentralize the system by allowing public agencies to run their own consultations, security upgrades to withstand malevolent cyber attacks, and training seminars for public employees that use the system. Not all of the above actions were specifically stated in the action plan, and the IRM researcher found that Milestone 1.2.2 has limited completion.

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic Participation: Did not change**

This commitment aimed to establish a new law that would revise existing legislative framework and achieve concrete technical and operational improvements for online consultations. These improvements sought to establish minimum requirements of conduct, but the vague wording of the commitment combined with overlapping actions within milestones limited their potential effect on civic participation. Overall, the implementation of this commitment did not change the status quo regarding the organization, execution and impact of online public participation on the actual decision-making process. For example, the average period for consultations has not changed between 2014 and 2016, remaining at an average 10 days according to opengov.gr websites. Although consultation participants can access information on the parliament.gr website concerning the impact of their input, the only available feedback is a scanned .pdf report of limited value.[[11]](#endnote-12)

### Carried forward?

The improvement of the online open consultation service is included in the Third Greek National Action Plan. The scope of these improvements is similar to those of the previous plan. Improvements include legal and operational actions either rephrased or taken verbatim from the second plan. Specifically, the enhancement of the legal framework gives emphasis to establishing a methodology that would require concise official responses to participants regarding the extent to which their input influenced the consultation life cycle.

## Theme 2: Open government data

## Commitment: 2.1. PSI Directive on the reuse of data

**Commitment Text**

The Greek Government would incorporate on its legislation the revised European Directive on the re-use of public sector information (PSI) until the end of December 2014.

Milestones –Timescales

The incorporations of Directive 2013/37/EU into Greek legislation would be completed by the end of June 2015.

## Commitment: 2.2. Regulatory amendments on open data

Implementation of regulatory amendments that will facilitate further provision of open data managed by public bodies. This commitment entails the following 3 interventions:

1. Publication of instructions (based on current legislation) requiring the inclusion of open data dissemination on designing publicly funded IT projects.

2. Publication of licensing framework for public data.

3. Publication of open data dissemination guide (drawing from existing scientific literature and expertise).

Preparation and circulation to the central and local administration of a guide that will describe the obligations, procedures, methodology and technology for publishing open data. The guide will be written in clear and simple language. It will demonstrate the value of open data, the formats for publication and standard methodologies for optimal operational coordination of the process within each public body.

Milestones –Timescales

2.2.1 Publication of open data provision guide (December 2014)

2.2.2 Guidelines for including open data provision on the design of IT projects (June 2015)

2.2.3 Disclosure of open data licensing framework (June 2015)

**Editorial Note:** Commitments 2.1 and 2.2 were clustered

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: December 2014 End date: June 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 2.1. Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive on Reuse of Data |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |
|  |  |  | ✔ |
| 2.2. Regulatory Amendments on Open Data |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

These commitments aim to introduce a modern legal framework for open data that fulfils European Union Member State requirements. Specifically, they propose to provide concrete guidelines to assist public agencies in their efforts to publish open datasets. These commitments also seek to establish guidelines to ensure that the design of publicly funded projects include provisions for publishing open data. Finally, these commitments aim to provide a licensing framework for open data.

### Status

**Commitment 2.1 Midterm: Complete**

The government fully completed Commitment 2.1 by incorporating Directive 2013/37/EU into Law 4305/14, which also includes regulatory amendments that facilitate provision of open data managed by public bodies.

**Commitment 2.2 Midterm: Limited**

Overall, Commitment 2.2 saw limited completion by midterm. Greece only substantially implemented the first milestone, 2.2.1, concerning guidelines for an open data provision. The government took no action on the other two milestones for providing open data on the design of IT projects (2.2.2) or the disclosure of the licensing framework (2.2.3).

**Commitment 2.2** **End of term: Limited**

This commitment proposed to publish instructions for the inclusion of open data in publicly funded IT projects, publish a licensing framework for public data, and publish an open data dissemination guide. Instead of addressing these commitments separately, the government incorporated a set of data guidelines from the recently passed 4305/14 law. According to information gathered during the interministerial OGP government group, passage of the Public Data Law 4305/14 covers basic open data licensing issues. Article 7 of Law 4305/14 requires public agencies to publish their data, information and documents and allow further use of these materials. However, at the time of writing (November 2016), there is no distinct licensing framework established by the law, and the government has done little towards producing one. The guidelines in the text of the law only state that in the extraordinary event that a licensing framework is necessary, public agencies are strongly encouraged to adopt an appropriate open licensing scheme that provides rights for further use without technical, financial or geographical restrictions. The Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction issued some guidelines through an open data dissemination guide that state public agencies are encouraged to use open, standardized licenses that conform with the national law on intellectual property and the corresponding regulations concerning licensing. The Openwise IRM research team found no further progress related to providing guidelines for designing publicly funded IT projects using open data as of January 2016.

### Did it open government?

**Commitment 2.1 Access to information: Major**

This commitment attempted to modernise the context for providing public data according to relevant European policies and to introduce a standard framework for licensing public datasets. The completion of this commitment through the incorporation of the European Directive into the Greek legal system serves as a precondition to increase the availability of an ever-growing amount of public information and data. This incorporation created a comprehensive legal framework that enforced the ‘open by default’ principle for public data. Moreover, the new law mandates that guidelines and a framework be issued for permitting license schemes regarding the reuse of public data. Thus, it had a major effect on opening government.[[12]](#endnote-13)

**Commitment 2.2** **Access to information: Marginal**

Prior to this commitment, the systematic release of public datasets (regulatory amendments, guidelines and licensing framework) was rare. Therefore, the expected impact of the commitment was moderate. As a result of the new legal framework, the publication of open data in the central government platform has showed a steady increase during the months following the midterm IRM report. At the end of the implementation period (June 2016), there are now about 122 public agencies that have published over 2,200 datasets.[[13]](#endnote-14) However, these 122 agencies represent a rather small fraction of the total number of public agencies; 4,774 public agencies publish decisions on the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program.[[14]](#endnote-15) Further, CSOs raise two issues that point to persisting implementation problems. First, much of the data published at data.gov.gr have low quality in terms of machine readable format.[[15]](#endnote-16) Also, a recent civil society request for specific information from the public administration received a limited government response. [[16]](#endnote-17) This reveals the need to produce additional guidelines for clearer interpretation of the access-to-information legislation. For these reasons, and despite the fact that the commitment might achieve greater agency participation in the future, the impact of this policy remains marginal.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek NAP does not carry forward Commitments 2.1 and 2.2. However, during a panel discussion at the interministerial OGP team meeting, The Openwise IRM research team found that the Ministry of the Interior is planning to introduce measures that will push more public agencies to provide open datasets.[[17]](#endnote-18)

The Openwise IRM research team believes that the open data policy should be a continuing effort. The government might build upon these lessons learned. Therefore, IRM research team’s midterm suggestions continue to hold value and are as follows:

* Design training programs targeted at developing open government skills (technical, cultural, and operational) for public sector employees, in cooperation with the National School of Public Administration;
* Identify good practices within organisations that are relatively advanced in releasing their data. Learn what worked well, enhance efforts where appropriate, and disseminate these good practices to other organizations;
* Involve civil society members in implementing an open data law by organising periodic working meetings; organizations such as GFOSS and Vouliwatch have sent letters of interest during the September 2015 election period;
* Consider a quasi-decentralized organization by empowering local administration to define their own concrete goals, pursue local open data policies and open government action plans;
* Devise an agile open source scheme to modernize government IT systems that will produce data in open formats as soon as possible;
* Consider appropriate regulation that will advance the implementation of law 4305/14 by instituting an incentive/disincentive framework.

## Commitment 2.3. Central open data platform

**Commitment Text:**

Within the context of the implementation and operation of the Greek Government G-Cloud Datacenter, a new central site will be implemented for gathering, storing, disposing and searching open data and linked open data. It will consist of the open data portal data.gov.gr serving citizens and businesses for data retrieval, the website submit.data.gov.gr serving authorized officials in documenting, describing and disposing open data, and a set of specialized tools that through published APIs will deliver all necessary interoperability services for extracting information from systems, devices, applications and third party platforms. Thus the platform will (automatically) collect through standardized processes data generated from the IT systems of public bodies, and will make it available to citizens and businesses.
Milestones –Timescales
The milestones and implementation timescale have as follows:

* 2.3.1 Signing of the implementation contract (July 2014)
* 2.3.2 Implementation Study completion and commencement of pilot phase of the platform (November 2014)
* 2.3.3 Roll-out of the platform with all the available open data sets (June 2015)

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: June 2014 End date: June 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 2.3 Central open data platform  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |

### Commitment Aim:

A common issue in information access policies is creating a web platform to act as a central open data repository. The Greek government had created an initial version of a central platform as of 2013. This commitment aims to take the experimental version of the national open data web platform to a new, fully operational level. The goal of the new data.gov.gr portal is to establish standardized, automatic collection processes for data generated from public IT systems and make this data available to citizens and businesses.

### Status

**Midterm: Limited**

At the midpoint assessment, Greece had completed only one out of three commitment activities. The new version of the data.gov.gr website (Milestone 2.3.3) was up and running during the midterm progress report period. The only missing feature of the platform was a tool that would facilitate the automatic, direct uploading of data from public agencies. However, Greece had not yet begun Milestones 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 regarding the signing of a contract, implementation study and pilot phase. The government altered both Milestones following delays that resulted in transitioning the platform development to in-house resources and expertise. As of the midterm, the contract signing was rescheduled for April 2016.

**End of term: Substantial**

Based on the discussions between The Openwise IRM research teams and government officials during the interministerial OGP government group, the data portal is still pending the automatic uploading feature that would facilitate the immediate publishing of datasets from public agencies. According to the public employee who was responsible for the in-house development of data.gov.gr, the Ministry of Finance has attempted to use the application program interface (API) in order to produce the automatic uploading functionality. Also, the government has published the annual report that evaluates the overall implementation of the open data policies.[[18]](#endnote-19) Beyond stating the importance of open data, this document emphasizes the need to encourage more agencies to publish their data by employing promotional actions and planning cooperation with academic and research centres. Given that data.gov.gr website is essentially operational and a steadily increasing number of agencies are publishing their data and information, The Openwise IRM research team conclude the overall completion level of this commitment is substantial.

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Marginal**

This commitment intended to address the lack of a central online repository in which public agencies could provide their data in appropriate, machine readable formats. Greece expected the revamped data.gov.gr to rectify this deficiency by providing a central platform for public agency data. As a result, a growing number of public agencies provided datasets and information to the website. However, despite the growing number of agencies publishing diverse data (limited only by national security and personal data considerations), there lacked an increase in data quality. The Openwise IRM research team and CSOs concluded problems remain mainly with the quality of datasets in terms of available formats and the actual utility of the released public data.[[19]](#endnote-20) Advanced uses of the data, such as developing applications, is hindered by the fact that many datasets are not machine readable. Potential utility of the released data remains low in many cases where agencies publish hyperlinks that bring users to announcements of textual information on their websites instead of accessible datasets.[[20]](#endnote-21) While quantity remains an issue given the small fraction of participating agencies, CSOs are more concerned with data quality.[[21]](#endnote-22) Thus, The Openwise IRM research team conclude this commitment’s implementation had only a marginal effect on opening government.

### Carried forward?

The third action plan does not carry forward this commitment. This omission might be due to the fact that the central online platform data.gov.gr is operational and experiencing steadily increasing numbers of publicly available open datasets. A future action plan should focus on targeting open data commitments to address civil society concerns about the quality of released data.

## Commitment 2.4. Open geospatial data

**Commitment Text:**

The Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change will be responsible for the coordination of the provision of geospatial data from all public administration bodies. The providers will produce and manage their geospatial data and then provide the data to the Ministry, who in turn will make it available in designated format (e.g., oversized paper maps or data sets). Therefore, it is especially important to tag the geospatial data records with appropriate metadata, so that the records can be easily accessed, retrieved and combined with other data sources. For this purpose, the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change will prepare all the necessary legislative acts and it will define a specific business process for the provision of data. The provided geospatial data will be publicized through the website of the National Geospatial Information Infrastructure following technical standards and procedures to be established. Also the data will be posted on the Central Governmental registry data.gov.gr.

Milestones –Timescales The exact Action Plan depends on the roadmap of Directive 2007/2/EC implementation and it will have to be completed by June 2016. During the consultation processes for the development of the current Action Plan, critical geospatial data sets have been identified. Indicative list: Provide geospatial registry the set of ortho-photos and any other cartographic backgrounds of EKCHA SA (formerly Casadstre SA) Convert and provide OKXE SA archive in digital format Provide data on environmental protection areas (Natura, etc) Editorial Notes:

• The terms "National Geospatial Information Infrastructure (NGII)" and "National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI)" are used interchangeably to refer to the central database of spatial data to be maintained and publicized by the Greek authorities

• OKXE SA refers to the former “Hellenic Mapping and Cadaster Organization SA” or HEMCO SA

• The names "EKCHA SA" and "EKXA SA" refer to the "National Cadaster and Mapping Agency SA", abbreviated as "NCMA SA"

2.4.1. Geospatial registry and EKCHA SA

2.4.2. OKXE SA archive in digital format

2.4.3. Environmental protection areas data

Responsible institution: Ministry of Environment and Energy

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: Not Specified End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 2.4. Open geospatial data  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to open geospatial datasets within the context of the Greek government’s policy to increase access to government-held information. The goal is to streamline public access to a series of geospatial datasets in the appropriate format and with the correct licenses. This will facilitate a series of possible data uses, such as reporting on environmental protection issues.

### Status

**Midterm: Limited**

Until the midterm report, there was no evidence to prove the fulfilment of Milestone 2.4.1 (Geospatial registry and EKCHA SA) and the Ministry had shown only limited progress in implementing Milestones 2.4.2 (OKXE SA archive in digital format) and 2.4.3 (Environmental protection areas data). Furthermore, there was no specific indication of how the government would fully implement these Milestones.

The Organisation of National Infrastructure of Geospatial Information (OKXE) is mandated to provide direct and free access to geospatial information for citizens and public administration. By the midterm review, the Ministry had provided the datasets, by September 2014, in .pdf format, which does not support open data uses and applications. Additionally, as of September 2015, The Openwise IRM research team found that the Ministry had not updated the website since March 2013. At the end of the first year of implementation, the government had not indicated how or when it would release new data.

**End of term: Limited**

Officials from the Ministry of Environment reported during the interministerial OGP group meeting that implementation of this commitment has stalled. The officials attribute the outstanding status of this commitment to the fact that there is no available team of experts within the Ministry to undertake the task of simplifying the complex regulatory framework established with the law 3882/2010 concerning geospatial information.[[22]](#endnote-23) Further, according to information gathered at the aforementioned interministerial OGP group meeting, the new organisational chart of the Ministry does not address the corresponding competency or responsibility for this commitment.

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Did not change**

The goal of providing open geospatial public data is to streamline a regular process to obtain this information with the appropriate licensing framework and format. Since the government has not yet resolved the issues regarding the simplification of the legal framework that supports the provision of the data, there was no progress during this action plan to justify change in the status quo.

### Carried forward?

The next action plan includes a commitment concerning open provision of geodata. Commitment 23 (Open provision of Geo-data) includes a milestone regarding the “Fully-fledged operation of the website of the National Geospatial Information". According to the text, the Ministry of Environment will oversee the adjustment of current legislative framework and undertake all necessary actions to gradually implement this policy and complete the commitment.

## Commitment 2.5. Open cultural data

**Commitment Text:**

The Ministry of Culture and Sports, as well as supervised public bodies, are going to publish cultural data that falls within the definitions of public information of Directive 2013/37/EU. These data sets are to be provided for re-use by citizens, academic institutes and enterprises in order to contribute to the development of the national cultural product.

Milestones –Timescales

* 2.5.1 Amendment of the legal framework and more specifically of Law 3448/2006 with the adoption of new regulatory acts. Also modifications (where necessary) on ministerial decisions regarding the provision of cultural content of Law 3028/2002. This will lead to further amendments for the sectorial – sectoral legislation (completion by the end of 2015)
* 2.5.2 Completion of the National Digital Archaeological Cadastral Registry which will make possible the publication of the cultural data (completion by the end of 2015)
* 2.5.3 Implementation of interoperability services for the re-usability of cultural data from third party bodies, academic institutions and individuals (completion by the end of June 2016)

Responsible institution: The Ministry of Culture and Sports

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: 2015 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 2.5 Open cultural data  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

Opening cultural data to the public is a goal within the broader national policy of increasing access to information. This commitment deals with opening data in the cultural sector according to definitions of public information in Directive 2013/37/EU. Providing open cultural datasets will help stakeholders follow public affairs in relevant policy areas, such as archaeological property, and enable the development of applications and electronic services. To achieve these goals, the commitment offers regulatory amendments, the completion of the National Digital Archaeological Cadastral Registry and interoperability services to allow reusability of data from interested third parties.

### Status

**Midterm: Limited**

Overall, progress in the implementation of this commitment was limited by the midterm review. The government had not yet introduced legal framework amendments, completed the National Digital Archaeological Cadastral Registry, nor implemented interoperability services.

**End of term: Limited**

According to the government self-reporting table included in the third NAP, the implementation of the open cultural data commitment has stalled. The Openwise IRM research team found an announcement on the Ministry of Culture’s Archaeo Cadastre webpage stating that the website will expire due to the pending announcement of a new website.[[23]](#endnote-24)

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Did not change**

Opening up cultural data sets is part of the wider national policy regarding the “open by default” character of public data. Releasing such datasets could have had a positive effect for stakeholders and individual citizens who, for instance, need to be informed if their property lies next to an archaeological site. The two-year implementation period of this commitment did not produce any meaningful change in the availability of cultural data. There is no public announcement when to expect the new website. Finally, a search for Ministry of Culture datasets in the central data.gov.gr platform returns no results.[[24]](#endnote-25)

### Carried forward?

The third Greek NAP includes open provision of cultural data as Commitment 11. The new commitment reflects the pre-existing one and seeks the same goals: the availability of the National Archaeological Cadastre and the implementation of interoperability services that facilitate data reuse. However, although the government mentioned a legal amendment in the initial description of the new commitment text, no such amendment is included as a milestone. As legal amendments have an important role in establishing procedures for the availability of cultural data, The Openwise IRM research team suggest including them as a milestone.

## Commitment 2.6. Open data for offshore companies

**Commitment Text:**

The Ministry of Finance will provide the list of all foreign companies (offshore companies) registered in Greece in a machine readable format. The information that will be published will contain the following: Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), contact details in Greece, information on operations, company name, distinctive title and other relevant information registered for the holding company (TIN of the offshore, country, address, etc.). This information will be accessible and updated in monthly basis (at least). Milestones –Timescales The commitment will be completed by the end of October 2014. This includes software implementation for the population of the data sets. After that, the mechanism for publishing the data will be implemented by the end of March 2015.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Finance

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: July 2014 End date: March 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 2.6. Open Data for Offshore Companies |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to provide crucial information regarding companies that might be involved in tax evasion or corporate fraud. The Ministry of Finance committed to publish a list of all foreign companies (offshore companies) registered in Greece in a machine readable format. This information would contain the following: Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), contact details in Greece, information on operations, company name, distinctive title and other relevant information registered for the holding company.

### Status

**Midterm: Not started**

During the first year of the action plan, neither the central open data portal (data.gov.gr), the Ministry of Finance (www.minfin.gr) nor the General Secretariat of Public Revenues website (http://www.publicrevenue.gr/kpi/) showed offshore company datasets. The Openwise IRM research team learned two main reasons for this absence at a meeting with officials from the Ministry of Finance. First, it is unclear who is responsible for the Commitment within the Ministry of Finance. Second, despite the fact that commitment text refers specifically to all offshore companies without exceptions, some Ministry stakeholders find this definition problematic because technically there is more than one type of offshore company.

**End of term: Not started**

According to the government’s self-assessment text presented as a table within the third NAP, implementation of this commitment has not yet started.[[25]](#endnote-26) This delay is due to pending clarification of which offshore companies should fall under the commitment. The Openwise IRM research team found this problem of defining companies during midterm report interviews and encountered it again while researching for the end-of-term report.

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Did not change**

This commitment addresses access to information regarding offshore company data. This commitment might have had a moderate impact by imposing a level of transparency that might then have enabled structural reform in the fight against tax evasion and financial fraud. However, due to the fact that implementation has not yet begun, there is no evidence that the commitment had any effect on openness.

**Carried forward?**

The Ministry of Finance does not include this policy area in the third Greek action plan. As of January 2017, the General Secretariat of Public Revenue, the agency within the Ministry of Finance responsible for implementing this commitment, will be reorganised as an Independent Agency. This independence will remove the agency from government hierarchical control. The Openwise IRM research team suggest that as soon as the new Independent Agency is operational, it should be informed officially about OGP’s work and the potential impact of a renewed version of this commitment in the next NAP. Since no other independent agency undertakes OGP commitments, the possibility to complete this commitment depends on the new agency’s priorities.

## Commitment 2.7. Open public sector datasets

**Commitment Text:**

The commitment pertains to the provision of open data sets, for free, related to areas of taxation, trade and public procurement. No legislative act is required. The main restrictions involve the technical implementation and readiness of stakeholders. Those data sets will be available to open and machine - readable formats through the governmental portal data.gov.gr.
The data sets are:

* 2.7.1 Taxation datasets:
	+ Local tax offices productivity
	+ Number of tax validations and infringements by geographical breakdown
	+ Analysis of the central governmental budget by Expense Identification Number
	+ Statistics on financial crime
	+ Statistics on individuals and legal entities pertaining to VAT and taxes
* 2.7.2 Public Procurement datasets:
	+ Public procurement data sets from the Central Electronic Public Procurement
	Registry (<http://www.eprocurement.gov.gr>)
	+ Data sets on projects financed by the NSRF, from the monitoring information system of the
	NSRF (<http://destaerga.gr/>)
* 2.7.3 Commerce datasets:
	+ Price data from the Observatory of tuition fees (<http://app.gge.gov.gr/>)
	+ Data from the business registry (<https://www.businessregistry.gr/>):
		- For legal entities: VAT Number, Registry id, Company Name, distinctive title, Local
		business registry Office, Company legal status (active, bankrupt, etc.), headquarters
		address, postal address, capital allocation, management information, legal
		representatives, website, e-commerce website.
		- Information on the corporate changes: Date and type of change
		- Administrative documents: Notices produced by the business registry services
		- Private documents: The balance sheets of companies

Responsible institution: Ministry of Finance

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: June 2014 End date: March 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 2.7. Open public sector datasets |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment seeks to release specifically defined datasets of open data on three Ministry of Finance-related policy areas: taxation, trade, and public procurement. This commitment resulted from an OGP initiative contributed by the Ministry of Finance
and is an extension of the effort to open offshore company data (Commitment 2.6).

### Status

**Midterm: Not started**

Commitment text did not designate responsibility to a Ministry of Finance agency, such as the General Secretariat. This resulted in no implementation progress by the midterm review. Regarding Milestone 2.7.3, the Openwise IRM research team found that a previously published searchable database of tuition fees was available in .xls format on the National Observatory of Athens website.[[26]](#endnote-27) However, there was no information on whether business registry data was publically available. The Openwise IRM research team found Milestone 2.7.3 had limited completion. Since phase one of Milestone 2.7.3 was complete prior to the action plan, and significant work remained to fulfil the goals of the commitment, the Openwise IRM research team believed that the overall implementation of this commitment had not begun.

**End of term: Limited**

According to the government’s self-assessment text presented as a special table within the third NAP, there is partial progress in Milestone 2.7.2 regarding monthly publishing of public procurement dataset in .pdf format.[[27]](#endnote-28) Additionally, a Ministry of Economy, Development and Tourism public dataset became available due to an information system that monitors implementation of the National Strategic Reference Framework (European Funds) concerning progress of funded projects. Regarding Milestone 2.7.1 (publishing taxation datasets), the Openwise IRM research team found no further progress beyond a 2014 table summarizing audits of tax offices.[[28]](#endnote-29)

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Marginal**

Despite past attempts at improvement, processes for publishing datasets on taxation, public procurement, and commercial activities remain unsystematic. Increased availability of these datasets in machine readable format could be of crucial importance, especially in the context of the Greek financial crisis and regarding fiscal policies. The overall impact of this commitment was marginal due to the limited progress in implementation. However, an NGO, Dianeosis*,* recently utilised data regarding the implementation of European funded projects within the National Strategic Reference Framework. This NGO produced infographs that were featured in a special broadcast hosted on the private TV channel, SKAI.[[29]](#endnote-30) This sets a positive precedent on how evidence-based reporting may be produced and published using open public data.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek NAP includes a subset of this commitment’s milestones. Specifically, Commitment 16 acknowledges the fragmented and largely unstructured availability of information regarding publicly funded projects. The commitment seeks to establish a special-purpose website that will offer key performance indicators (KPIs) for the implementation of Public and EU financed projects.

## Commitment 3.1 Open public sector job posts

**Commitment Text:**

Introduction of an open system in the selection of executives serving for a fixed period of time in positions of responsibility in the public sector. This system will replace the current process of appointments to positions of increased responsibility. The system will include interventions in the following areas:

* Institutional level: Establishment of an open selection process for executives. The process will define the minimum required qualifications and all the information regarding the selections will be publicly available.
* Operational level: - Proposal for an integrated process, including the selection of members of the Selection Committee, the publication of the call for interest in www.opengov.gr and the publicity of selection practices. Draft law proposal.
* Technical level: - Collection and publication of data to the executive job market, as well as the internal job market. It will record all vacancies, the expiration date of the filled posts, the requirements of the post and the supervising entity.
	+ Extension of the Census database application

Milestones –Timescales

* 3.1.1 Regulatory interventions: Completion by the end of March 2015
* 3.1.2 Operational and technical changes: gradually until end of September 2015. A plan to implement changes will be drafted by the end of 2014, in order to gradually introduce the new system.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: July 2014 End date: September 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 3.1. Public sector job posts |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to tackle deficiencies in public sector recruitment by establishing reforms to increase transparency and prevent favouritism in public appointments. A transparent and meritocratic system for selecting qualified candidates for high-level public sector jobs is an important accountability policy issue in Greece. As of October 2009, the www.opengov.gr website operates on an ad hoc basis when publishing public appointments of high-ranking positions (e.g. managers, board of directors members, directors of public entities, and some consultant positions). However, this operation is neither mandatory nor institutionally enforced. Therefore, all open recruitment calls on the opengov.gr website and the selection process itself depend on the political will of the relevant minister or authority. To overcome this voluntary operation, the government planned to introduce a legally binding open system for selecting executives, implement operational changes regarding the selection process and technical changes regarding advertising each position.

### Status

**Midterm: Not started**

Greece had not begun implementation by the midterm review and open calls still operated in a limited and unpredictable fashion. The government only published a small subset of high-ranking positions with open calls of interest. Most appointment processes remained opaque.

**End of term: Not started**

According to information gathered at a meeting with the interministerial OGP government team, the government has taken no further action in implementing the commitment.[[30]](#endnote-31)

### Did it open government?

**Public accountability: Did not change**

Ever since its inception in 2009, open calls for recruiting high-ranking public sector positions operated on an ad hoc basis and were solely dependent on the political will of each minister. Introducing a comprehensive regulatory framework, along with appropriate procedures, could have had a transformative impact in selecting high-level personnel by attracting expertise found beyond the public sector. Attracting experts via a transparent meritocratic process will aid in depoliticizing the public sector. The ad hoc process of releasing open calls was evident from 2014-2016, when only fifteen calls were posted online.[[31]](#endnote-32) Since there was no progress in implementing the commitment, the Openwise IRM research team conclude it did not change the status quo or improve open governance.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek action plan includes a modified version of this commitment. Commitment 7, “National Register of Line Managers of the Public Administration,” aims to apply a modern system for selecting line managers at the top of the administrative hierarchy in the public sector.

## Commitment 3.2. Public administration organisational chart

**Commitment Text:**

The Greek Government will publicize the organizational structure of all public administration bodies, down and including the head of department level. At each node, there will be information pertaining to contact details and description of responsibilities. The goal is to have the organizational chart accessible publicly, available to everyone, in open and machine-readable format, and updated in real time. This will also act as a registry of all the public administration organizations in Greece.

Milestones –Timescales

3.2.1. Organizational chart IT system

3.2.2. Organizational charts for Transparency Initiative

3.2.3. Organizational charts for public administration

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: September 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 3.2. Public administration organizational chart |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment is part of the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program as it aims to provide accessibility to the organisational structures of the public sector via machine readable charts. This will increase transparency, allowing CSOs and citizens to understand the internal structure, competencies, and procedures in government agencies and better follow the decision-making process.

To achieve this aim, the government planned the following actions:

* Develop the IT system that will technically handle the publication of organisational charts;
* Create and update organisational charts of public administration bodies participating in the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program; and
* Create and update organisational charts of public administration bodies that are not legally required to participate in the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program.

### Status

**Midterm: Substantial**

The new version of the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program website could automatically present organisational charts of public agencies who were legally obliged to participate in the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program. However, the government acknowledged outstanding issues including presenting detailed information (e.g. the head of departments and the responsibilities for each organizational unit). Furthermore, the text of the commitment refers to all public administration bodies, but the website had yet to include charts for public agencies that do not participate in the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program.

**End of term: Substantial**

Accordingto information gathered at the meeting with the interministerial OGP government group, the IT system is technically able to publish complete information about the organisational structure of public agencies that implement the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program.[[32]](#endnote-33) At the end of the implementation period (June 2016), the organizational charts automatically generate only the organisational units that publish decisions on the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program IT system. Therefore, every public agency that implements the Transparency Program has its own automatically produced organisational chart. However, at the operational level, public agencies have not entered their own organisational charts into the system. According to officials from the OGP government team, the automated charts are inaccurate because agencies have not yet manually updated them. Thus, the Openwise IRM research team suggest that this commitment maintains substantial completion status because the charts are now automatically published as stated in the commitment text. However, problems with accuracy remain to be resolved.

### Did it open government?

**Access to information: Marginal**

Comprehensive information regarding organisational structures of public organisations is often inaccessible and/or inconvenient for either technologically savvy individuals from civil society or ordinary citizens to use in any meaningful way. This commitment was designed to provide basic access to this information in regularly updated machine readable formats. No public agencies have used the IT system to validate and update their organisational charts, which are automatically generated and accessible via the Transparency (Diavgeia) Program platform. Despite the fact that public agencies have not yet used the IT system to ensure the accuracy of their charts in real time, the platform represents a new system for centrally organising and releasing government-held data. Therefore, the Openwise IRM research team conclude this commitment had a marginal effect on opening government.

### Carried forward?

The government included incomplete elements of this commitment in the third action plan with a redesigned scope. Commitment 3, “Publicity of Organisational Charts & Entities of the Public Sector,” acknowledges implementation problems of the previous period and aims to enact a regulatory framework that will require agencies to regularly access and update their organisational charts.

## Commitment 3.3: Open government policy

**Commitment Text:**

Enhancing accountability and the fight against corruption directly depend on the strengthening of audit mechanisms in public administration bodies. The Greek government is currently evaluating and re-engineering the organization of all Ministries. In this context, an organizational unit for Internal Audit will be set up in each Ministry. These units will be responsible for aiding and verifying the compliance to the Open Government policy, fundamental principles, as well as successful implementation of the open government projects undertaken by the Ministry. In the Ministry of Administrative Reform and e-Governance, there will be a unit coordinating and monitoring the implementation of the open government Action Plan and values on a national level.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: September 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 3.3. Open government policy |  | ✔ |  |  | UNCLEAR |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to establish a unit for coordinating and monitoring implementation of the open government Action Plan and values on a national level. In addition, the commitment proposes an internal audit unit within each ministry. These units would oversee and verify that open government policies are implemented correctly. A permanent coordination mechanism for open government policies has been an outstanding issue for Greece ever since the phrase “open government” entered the public debate in 2009, following the release of the initial opengov.gr website.

### Status

**Midterm: Limited**

The overall implementation of this commitment was limited at the midterm review. An initial step toward implementation occurred in August 2014 with the adoption of Presidential Decree 99/2014, art. 11. It mandates the creation of a Transparency, Open Government, and Innovation Department within the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction. However, this solution lacks adequate enforcement powers as a Department stands at the lowest hierarchical level of public administration.

**End of term: Substantial**

The original commitment did not provide a concrete means of addressing Action Plan ownership and commitment implementation. Following the IRM researcher's recommendations to improve OGP coordination and commitment ownership, the Minister of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction formed an interministerial OGP government working group tasked with coordinating necessary NAP implementation actions and follow its progress. The original commitment’s goal is complete to a substantial degree due to this new group. To more fully complete this commitment, the government could have established open government units in all public agencies that would be responsible for engaging in the design and implementation of the action plan.

### Did it open government?

**Marginal**

Implementation of open government policies, and particularly OGP plans, requires an institutional mechanism to coordinate and monitor progress. The government did seek to achieve this commitment’s goal by tacitly adding a new milestone, specifically the formation of a new interministerial team responsible for OGP. However, this team only came into effect at the very end of the implementation period. It has thus far only contributed to the creation of the Third Action Plan and could do very little to assist with the implementation of the Second Action Plan. As a result, the commitment had only a marginal effect on opening governance.

### Carried forward?

The broad policy area of managing open government policies is the opening commitment in the third Greek action plan. Introducing a legal framework on Open & Participatory Governance indicates a significant upgrade from the previous commitment that was narrowly focused to coordination matters regarding open government policies.

## Commitment 3.4: Strategic alliance against corruption

**Commitment Text:**

The commitment consists of two main parts: The first one refers to the development of a strategic alliance with inspectorate and anti-corruption bodies and authorities, and the second one addresses the reorganization of inspectorate bodies.

Under the framework of the e-government strategy, a comprehensive study will be conducted regarding the development of strategic alliance with inspectorate and anti-corruption bodies and authorities. Among other areas of interest, the study will also include identification of: main inspectorate and anti-corruption bodies and authorities; co-operation opportunities with public administration entities; areas, models and ways of cooperation; public administration units that could participate in this strategic alliance, prerequisites and conditions for cooperation; proposals on the ways of implementing strategic alliances in practice; expected results, possible problems and risks/ways to address them; infrastructure and legal framework required.

Within their role, inspectorate bodies detect possible weaknesses in public administration and identify areas where efficiency could be improved. The empowerment of those bodies is highlighted as a priority and could be achieved through mapping the current situation, identifying areas of improvements and undertaking targeted actions to facilitate their ongoing work. The ultimate goal is to ensure optimal coordination of actions and enhance the effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of the public administration.

Milestones

3.4.1. Study on inspectorate bodies

3.4.2. Study on strategic alliance

Responsible institution: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: July 2014 End date: September 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP value relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 3.4. Strategic Alliance against Corruption |  |  |  | ✔ | UNCLEAR |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

The commitment stems from existing anti-corruption governmental measures and consists of two main parts: The first refers to the development of a strategic alliance with inspectorate and anti-corruption bodies and authorities. The second addresses the reorganization of inspectorate bodies. Both milestones for this commitment refer to the production of studies:

* 3.4.1 Study on reorganizing and empowering interspectorate bodies (ending June 2015), and
* 3.4.2 Study on the development of strategic alliance with interspectorate and anti- corruption bodies and authorities (ending December 2015).

### Status

**Midterm: Limited**

The Greek Government had not completed the first milestone on producing a study for reorganizing inspectorates by the midterm review. Progress was also limited on the second milestone for the alliance against corruption. Nevertheless, cooperation between the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction and relevant inspectorate and anticorruption bodies had taken place on an ad hoc basis in the context of the YourDataStories project implementation. In this case, the government was implementing this commitment via a pilot scenario in the YourDataStories project. The ad hoc cooperation on this predominant policy area and its dependence on an international multi-stakeholder project delayed implementation.

**End of term: Limited**

During discussions held between the Openwise IRM research team and members of the interministerial OGP government team, there was no further evidence of progress on this commitment. Based on midterm findings that the government had substituted the 3.4.1 milestone with the European project “YourDataStories”, the Openwise IRM research team found the commitment to publish studies incomplete and the replacement project was irrelevant to achieving the milestones of this commitment. [[33]](#endnote-34)

### Did it open government?

**Did not change**

Corruption is a predominant issue in Greece. However, this commitment focused on producing studies rather than specific, relevant and time-bound actions. Additionally, the implementation of this anticorruption commitment is not located under the proper government agency. According to the commitment, the responsible agency is the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction. A better choice would have been the Ministry of Justice, which has the authority on anticorruption policy. This is the reason why the YourDataStories milestone failed to engage the relevant policy issues and the overall impact of this commitment did not change the status quo.

### Carried forward?

For the first time, the third Greek action plan will include commitments by the Ministry of Justice, although none address fighting corruption. Therefore, the Openwise IRM research team suggested the government prioritize areas in their anticorruption strategy, set up a primary goal for each area, and design specific interventions for the next action plan. Possible intervention areas include hospitals and other public procurement expenses, recently identified by an EU Commission report as the most pressing, in addition to driving license bribes and undeclared labour.

## Commitment 4.1. Track changes on bills

**Commitment Text:**

The original text of bills is amended through various stages of processing, from the parliamentary committee level to voting in the Plenum. Commitment 4.1 is a basic requirement for legislative process documentation, aiming to achieve the adoption of a system that a) monitors the status and history of actions during processing of the bills by the Parliament, b) assists the production of different versions and c) allows for quick distribution, both internally to members of Parliament and the public. At the same time, it serves as a reliable information data base of the Parliament, allowing parliamentarians and the public to retrieve information in an accurate and timely manner, thus promoting the principles of parliamentary transparency.

Milestones –Timescales

The steps and actions to be followed for achieving the commitment were as follows:

* Completion by December 2014:
	+ 4.1.1. Review legislative information flow: Collaboration with Central Government Bodies (General Secretary of the Government Ministries etc.) in order to review information flow from drafting of the bill to voting in Plenum and its subsequent transmission to the National Printing Office for publication
	+ 4.1.2. XML standard for legislative documents: Exploration and joint adoption of an international open standard XML for syntax, structuring, processing and electronic transmission of bills and amendments
* Completion by June 2016:
	+ 4.1.3. Legislative document handling system: Development of a system to handle structured legislative documents, track the document changes and produce different versions of digitally signed documents at each stage of the legislative process

## 4.2. ‘Parliamentary Transparency’ section of Parliament’s website

**Commitment Text:**

Enhancement and improvement of the functionality offered by the “Parliamentary Transparency” section of

the Hellenic Parliament portal. Provision of open structured information.

Milestones –Timescales

* Completion by February 2015:
	+ 4.2.1. “Parliamentary Transparency” website visitor experience: Evaluation of the current state of the section concerning visitor experience (e.g. by creating relevant questionnaire) regarding usability, accessibility and institutional level.
* Implementation (gradually) by June 2016:
	+ 4.2.2. Improvements to “Parliamentary Transparency” section:
	+ Development of the “FAQ” section, for institutional and technological questions originating from visitor feedback.
		- Provision of the visitor information via RSS (Rich Site Summary) either by subject area or by type of decision.
		- Publication of statistical data.
		- Provision of structured information (based on open standards) for execution of the budget by the Parliament.

**Editorial note:** Commitments 4.1 and 4.2 have been clustered for the purpose of analysis in this report. They are discussed jointly in the narrative below.

Responsible institution: Hellenic Parliament

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: December 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP Value Relevance (as written)  | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding4 |
| 4.1. Track changes on bills |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  |  | ✔ |  |
| 4.2. ‘Parliamentary Transparency’ section of Parliament’s website  |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

The main goal of commitment 4.1 is to adopt a system that would allow public monitoring of all parliamentary actions in the legislative process. The system was designed to replace the current numerous, mainly non-digital processes and flows. Drafting and amending legislation texts is still largely a manual job. It does not allow for automatically tracking changes introduced at each processing stage, or for publishing electronic documents in reusable, machine-readable formats. Commitment 4.2 is aimed at improving functionality of the “Parliamentary Transparency” section on the Hellenic Parliament portal by providing more high quality, useable data.

### Status

**Commitment 4.1 Midterm: Substantial**

Greece completed the commitment to track changes on bills (Milestone 4.1.1) on schedule. The government tested the new system by reviewing an existing piece of legislation. However, this test was not public. Regarding Milestone 4.1.2, the adoption of an international open standard XLM, the Hellenic Parliament had started discussions and favoured adopting the technical standard, Akoma Ntoso. The government made no final decisions. Milestone 4.1.3 had limited completion because the government had implemented only the initial design stage of the legislative document handling system.

**Commitment 4.2 Midterm: Limited**

The government has completed improving the transparency section of the website (Milestone 4.2.2), according to parliamentary staff; the Openwise IRM research team verified operation of the relevant section. However, the Openwise IRM research team found no evidence of any work toward creating a survey for website visitors’ experience (Milestone 4.2.1). Parliamentarians are still not required to track and publish decisions or changes made in documents, unless specifically mandated by the President of the Parliament. Therefore, the type, number, and timelines of publishing parliamentary decisions on the system remain unclear. Parliamentary staff have met with other stakeholders, but have not attempted to collaborate closely with relevant nongovernmental organizations, despite expressed interest (e.g. from Vouliwatch). The government was designing an evaluation questionnaire to assess the changes made so far. However, the drafting process was internal, with no outside consultation.

**Commitment 4.1 End of term: Substantial**

Based on the September 2016 inter-parliamentary group meeting attended by the Openwise IRM research team, there was no further progress on the implementation of an online system to track Parliamentary progress on legislation.

**Commitment 4.2** **End of term: Limited**

Based on the September 2016 inter-parliamentary group meeting attended by the Openwise IRM research team, there was no further progress on improving the transparency section of the website, or on creating the evaluation questionnaire. Parliamentary staff stated that the continuing unavailability of required funding led to loss of ownership.

### Did it open government?

**Commitment 4.1**

**Access to information: Marginal**

**Civic participation: Did not change**

The Hellenic Parliament wished to address the lack of transparency and the difficulty in accessing parliamentary session information. The bill-tracking system in use was seen as inadequate and the commitments sought to create a more streamlined version. It was designed to replace the numerous, mainly non-digital processes and operations that did not allow for automatically tracking legislative changes or for accessing machine readable and reusable electronic documents.

Bolstering the parliamentary transparency section of the Parliament’s website would also provide an easier way for the public to track parliamentary staff actions. The partially completed commitments did improve public access to parliamentary texts but fell significantly short of achieving the levels of information availability envisioned by the commitments. As implemented, this commitment only marginally affected the status quo.

The commitment, if fully implemented, would have allowed members of civil society and the public to interact with the Hellenic Parliament in a direct way, increasing civic participation. However, due to Parliament’s limited human resources, officials only implemented the initial stage of a bill-tracking system. Consequently, the ability of the public to participate during the passage of a bill through Parliament has not changed.

**Commitment 4.2**

**Access to information: Marginal**

**Civic participation: Did not change**

By partially completing this commitment to improve the transparency section of the Hellenic Parliament web portal, the government managed to make some updates to the system and increase access to information. However, this improvement is only marginal since no clear obligation exists specifying what information or documents must be published on the website.

If the government had completed improvements to the transparency section of the Hellenic Parliament’s website, specifically regarding accessing budget execution information, civic participation would have substantially increased. It would have been possible for citizens to examine, track and offer comments on a significant portion of decisions concerning Parliament’s internal operation. Civic participation has not changed due to the limited implementation of the commitment.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek Action Plan does not carry forward Commitments 4.1 and 4.2. During the September 2016 meeting of the interministerial OGP government group, the Openwise IRM research team suggested that Parliamentary staff could collaborate with relevant civil society groups in order to achieve some of the aims of these commitments despite the inability to attract the required funding.

## Commitment 4.3. Parliament website and new standards

**Commitment Text:**

Open Parliamentary Data is a major challenge for the Hellenic Parliament, following the example of parliaments worldwide. Moreover, proper structuring of information ensures user broader and more qualitative experience and pooling of all requested data sought for at specific points of the portal.

The specific commitment requires functionality improvement in the Hellenic Parliament portal, in line with new standards that meet the Open Public Data, content enrichment, application development for visual representation of information and development of search tools.

4.3.1. Review study of Parliament website improvements

Milestones –Timescales

Study by June 2015 for:

* Setting up of a project team in order to evaluate parliamentary information flow and technological infrastructure. Determination of the information’s exact nature and the parliamentary data implementation scope, redefinition of standards concerning the kind of information to be disclosed, where, when, and in what format.
* Review of ways, means and time of information presentation.
* Review of the terms of use of the Hellenic Parliament portal, in order to allow for content reuse.

4.3.2. Parliament website improvements

Implementation (gradually) by June 2016:

* Further utilization of the general search tool provided through the web portal in order to enable advanced searches, using logical operators and selection of distinct information groups.
* Content enrichment with data which may concern: dissemination of voting results through open standards, publication of MPs amendments, publication of first draft Minutes of Committee Meetings, additional data on MP’s activity (votes, participation in Committee meetings, in parliamentary missions, abstracts of their interventions in the committees and the plenary etc.), additional data on parliamentary control means (protocol number, search by subject), advanced search criteria of the Plenary composition, publication of Independent Authorities reports, periodic publication of parliamentary control special procedures data, dynamic presentation of the Parliament organization chart etc.
* Better visualization and linking of given information.
* Presentation of existing data, information and documents in a variety of formats: creation of e-books, legislative documents and Minutes of the Plenary in html format further to pdf and word formats.
* Web portal size and key features (menus, images, text) adjustment, depending on user's screen device dimensions (responsive web design).)

## 4.4. Open historical parliamentary data

**Commitment Text:**

The commitment aims to enrich the Parliament web portal content with the publication-in accordance with open standards- of digitized material concerning:

Plenary Session Minutes from the 1st Legislative period to the 8th Legislative period (9-12-1974 to 22-8-1996), Introductory reports of bills tabled from 1975 to 1993.

It also aims at the partial conversion of parliamentary archives into electronic books (e-books), making them available to the public through the web portal.

4.4.1. Digitize public historical Parliament material

Milestones –Timescales

Implementation (gradually) by June 2016:

* Investigation and adoption of specialized optical character reading software (OCR) that will be able to accurately digitize printed historical material relating to Minutes of Plenary Sessions and to Bills introductory reports that was once written on a typewriter.
* Systematic quality control in resulting digitized text files and application of necessary corrections.
* Documentation of the digitized material and its progressive publication on the Hellenic Parliament portal.

Concerning e-books creation, the following actions will be implemented:

4.4.2. Standards and public access to Parliament e-books

Completion by October 2015:

* Exploration and adoption of open standards for the creation and reading of electronic books and open source applications.
* Pilot electronic book creation on different categories of parliamentary documents.
* Finalization of e- books structuring by category of parliamentary documents.

Implementation (gradually) by June 2016:

* Activation of e- books creation and publication process for selected categories of parliamentary material.

**Editorial note:** Commitments 4.3 and 4.4 have been clustered for the purpose of analysis in this report.

Responsible institution: Hellenic Parliament

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: July 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP Value Relevance (as written) | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 4.3 Parliament website and new standards |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |
| 4.4 Open historical parliamentary data |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |
|  | ✔ |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

These two commitments aim to increase the amount of data available to the public and to

improve the functionality of the Parliament’s existing online platforms. The Hellenic Parliament developed these commitments as part of their individual action plan (see Commitment Overview). The commitments primarily focus on streamlining internal parliamentary functions.

### Status

**Commitment 4.3.** **Midterm: Limited**

The government reviewed the study of the Hellenic Parliament website, thereby completing Milestone 4.3.1. According to interviews with parliamentary staff, the government formed a working group to improve the Hellenic Parliament website and to implement the new standards technologies. This group carried out a comparative analysis of the methods and practices used by other nations’ parliaments. The government provided analysis earlier than planned and offered this analysis for public consultation. It was unclear if, and to what extent, the results of the public consultation process were included in this report.

Milestone 4.3.2, improving Parliament’s website, saw limited completion. The Hellenic Parliament’s website contained plenary session minutes from 1996 onward and introductory reports of bills from 1993 onwards published in .pdf, .doc and .txt formats. However, staff formatted these documents mostly on an ad hoc basis as the government had not yet adopted international standards or software requirements (e.g. legislative .xml, Akoma Ntoso, etc.).

**Commitment 4.4 Midterm: Limited**

Staff digitized a small number of files; therefore, Milestone 4.4.1 saw limited completion. Some of the scanned materials were available on the relevant section of Parliament’s website.[[34]](#endnote-35) The Openwise IRM research team found that a low number of the existing digitized historical files were machine-readable, and search capability was limited for available content. Additionally, available information was presented in a way that required the public to have significant parliamentary knowledge to locate and use published data.

Although the Parliament had started scanning these documents and had made the material available on its website for download, it had not adopted optical character reading software (OCR strategies).

The Openwise IRM research team found no evidence that government had begun work on Milestone 4.4.2 by the midterm review. In general, the Hellenic Parliament had not been able to increase visibility of all material because they discovered personal data embedded within the cache of historical documents. This was due to possible issues arising from a Greek Data Protection Agency decision that requires all legal text be made anonymous before publication. This then led implementing agencies to err on the side of caution and not publish material until it had been made anonymous.

**Commitment 4.3** **End of term: Limited**

Based on the September 2016 inter-parliamentary group meeting attended by the Openwise IRM research team, the government made no further progress on implementing unfinished milestones. Parliamentary staff stated that completion was limited due to lack of required funding. This led to a loss of ownership for the commitment as the staff responsible were moved to new tasks and other proposals.

**Commitment 4.4 End of term: Limited**

Based on the September 2016 inter-parliamentary group meeting attended by the Openwise IRM research team, the government made no further progress on the implementing this commitment. Parliamentary staff stated that limited completion was due to lack of required funding, which led to a loss of ownership for the commitment.

### Did it open government?

**Commitment 4.3.**

**Access to information: Marginal**

The Hellenic Parliament made the plenary session minutes from 1996 onward and introductory reports of bills from 1993 onward available through its website. These are published in .pdf, .doc and .txt formats. These documents are formatted mostly on an ad hoc basis and do not follow an international recognized scheme (e.g. legislative .xml, Akoma Ntoso, etc.). This limits the scope of interaction that the public may have with the data.

The partially completed commitments did improve public access to parliamentary texts, but fell significantly short of achieving the levels of information access envisioned by the commitments. These commitments were of modest ambition, aiming to provide additional levels of service on existing, operational web platforms. They intended to bridge the gap between parliament and the general citizenship by boosting participation in the political process and by providing citizens with the power to influence legislation. If completed these website improvements would enhance access to Hellenic Parliament information for all stakeholders and would foster increased transparency.

**Commitment 4.4**

**Access to information: Marginal**

This commitment dealt with the digitization of historic material and only marginally added to the overall amount of information offered to the public. Parliament has started scanning some documents and has made them available on their website for download. The fact that these files are in many cases not machine readable, and have not been processed through an optical character recognition software, limits public ability to search and extract information.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek Action Plan does not carry forward Commitments 4.3 and 4.4. They failed to secure the needed funding and lost ownership as a result.

## Commitment 4.5. Parliament social media policy

**Commitment text**

Parliament Social Media communication policy enhancement and improvement of its already established social media account e- services are the Hellenic Parliament’s major goals. Regular and organized citizens’ approach and access in terms of information, education and participation is a necessity calling for the Parliament’s integrated communication design.

4.5.1. Social media use goals and models

Milestones –Timescales

Completion by March 2015:

* Listing of gaps and needs for the enhancement of each social medium at communicative, administrative and technical level.
* Results’ presentation, decision on the communication policy goal and the information to be posted on social media, the use of social media widgets on specific points of the Hellenic Parliament website, as well as that of the Hellenic Parliament Foundation for Parliamentarism and Democracy, for enabling sharing of specific content.
* Examination of choice between a Creative Commons or YouTube Standard License in compliance with Open Data general practice

4.5.2. Content management teams and content automation

Milestones –Timescales

* Implementation (gradually) by June 2016:
* Establishment and training of content management teams, content uploading and communication with citizens.
* Technical improvements, setting social media widgets, completion of content uploading/posting automation

## Commitment 4.6. Online provision of exhibitions

**Commitment text**

The library and the Hellenic Parliament Foundation for the Parliamentarianism and Democracy organize exhibitions aimed at the study and promotion of the concepts of democracy and parliamentarianism, the search for collective memory and collective identity formation. Digital platform processing of exhibitions, adopting technologies for virtual visits to the natural exhibit sites, enabling open access to exhibitions via the internet and mobile devices promote citizens’ awareness and understanding of parliamentary function. The development of an interactive relationship between the Parliament and the citizens, through educational and cultural activities, encourage their involvement in Parliamentary affairs, while enhancing Parliament openness.

4.6.1. Adopt digital exhibitions platform

Milestones –Timescales

Completion by October 2015:

Platform adoption for exhibition collections’ digital viewing on the internet that will provide easy access to people with disabilities. Implementation should be based on international standards and protocols, open documented and published interface systems with third-party programs, open communication protocols and open environment for data transfer and exchange with other systems (National Documentation Centre, Europeana).

* Development of applications for specialized services for exhibitions’ virtual tour.
* Development of applications for access to digital exhibitions from mobile phones and other popular mobile platforms.
	+ - Digital exhibitions platform

Implementation (gradually) by June 2016:

* Selection of exhibition collections to be transferred to digital platform.
* Examination of the possibility of documentation and presentation of exhibits in multiple languages.
* Digitization of exhibits.
* Identification of copyright for each element to be used in digital exhibition.
* Virtual tour for selected exhibitions. o Gradual publishing of digital exhibitions online

Editorial note: Commitments 4.5 and 4.6 have been clustered for the purpose of analysis in this report. They will be discussed jointly in the narrative below.

Responsible institution: Hellenic Parliament

Supporting institution(s): None

Start date: July 2014 End date: June 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment Overview | Specificity | OGP Value Relevance (as written) | Potential Impact | Completion | Midterm | Did it open government? |
| End of term |
| None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major  | Outstanding |
| 4.5. Parliament social media policy |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |
| 4.6. Online provision of exhibitions |  |  |  | ✔ | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  | ✔ |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |  | ✔ |  |  |  |
| ✔ |  |  |  |

### Commitment Aim:

These commitments seek to improveParliament’s social media services to provide regular and organized communication with citizens and improve public access to information, education and participation. They also endeavour, through Parliament’s *Library and the Hellenic Parliament Foundation for the Parliamentarianism and Democracy*, to create a digital platform where citizens could improve their understanding and awareness of Parliament. These platforms would enable citizens to review processes for historical exhibitions, take virtual visits to exhibit sites, and access exhibits online through mobile devices.[[35]](#endnote-36) The development of an interactive relationship between Parliament and the citizens through educational and cultural activities is intended to encourage public involvement in Parliamentary affairs, while enhancing Parliament’s openness.

### Status

**Commitment 4.5 Midterm: Not started**

The Hellenic Parliament tried to effectively engage with different audiences by enhancing its social media policy and providing access to exhibitions online.

Interaction with the public through social media accounts was minimal by the midterm review. Milestone 4.5.1 attempted to address this issue by creating a unified strategy with overarching goals for social media use. The Hellenic Parliament viewed this commitment as a means of increasing visibility of its actions and as a feedback mechanism for the public. They wished to use their social media accounts to provide daily reports on political issues. Due to Parliament’s limited human resources, officials were not able to enhance properly the current social media policy. Government representatives reported that the Hellenic Parliament staff carried out an internal review of current practices that included possible future social media use scenarios. Nevertheless since this review has not been made available to the public, the Openwise IRM research team concluded this commitment had not started.

Milestone 4.5.2 followed the creation of the strategic goals with the formation of the teams necessary for citizen engagement through social media. At the same time, it aimed to automate some of the content provision. The government had not begun implementation on this commitment by the midterm review.

**Commitment 4.6** **Midterm: Not started**

Milestone 4.6.1 (adoption of digital exhibitions platform) and Milestone 4.6.2 (transfer of collections to digital exhibition platforms) attempted to respond to the Hellenic Parliament’s need to engage further with the public and to create awareness of their mandate. No efforts aiming to secure funding or to provide an online display of Parliament’s exhibitions came to fruition by the midterm review. The government had not begun implementation of the two digital exhibition commitments within the time-frame of the Second Action Plan due unavailable funding.

**Commitment 4.5** **End of term: Not started**

Based on the September 2016 interministerial OGP meeting attended by the Openwise IRM research team, the government made no progress on implementing this commitment.

**Commitment 4.6** **End of term: Not started**

The government had not begun implementation on the two digital exhibition commitments within the time frame of the Second Action Plan due to insufficient funding. Funding never became available and as a result, the commitment ceased to be a priority. Since the midterm report, the Openwise IRM research team could not find evidence of any further attempts by the government to make progress on these two milestones.

### Did it open government?

**Commitment 4.5**

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic participation: Did not change**

This commitment sought to improve the Hellenic Parliament’s social media engagement strategy. If fully implemented, it would have allowed members of civil society and the public to interact directly with the Hellenic Parliament in a more transparent and meaningful way. These improved strategies also could have offered an additional pathway for public participation during legislative consultation periods. However, due to Parliament’s limited human resources, officials have not been able to enhance adequately the current social media policy and public access improvements have been marginal.

**Commitment 4.6**

**Access to information: Did not change**

The online sharing of exhibitions could have allowed the public to engage on less political aspects of Parliament’s work and gain familiarity with its role and operations. Due to Parliament’s inability to fund the specific commitment, the proposed changes did not materialise, and had no effect on opening government.

### Carried forward?

The third Greek Action Plan does not carry forward Milestones 4.5 and 4.6. the Openwise IRM research team suggested cooperating with NGOs with relevant social media and engagement expertise could offer an alternative avenue that would allow for the completion of these commitments.

### METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

This report groups commitments according to the original OGP action plan and midterm report. This report is based on a remote review of governmental programs, draft laws and regulations, governmental decrees, analysis of the commitments and interviews with civil society representatives. The Openwise IRM research team also relied significantly upon information gathered during an interministerial meeting of all agencies connected to the 2nd Greek OGP action plan organised by the Greek National Contact Point on behalf of the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform.



Openwise assists business, government, and civil society organizations in redefining their mission, processes and impact with the transformative power of openness. It was founded in 2014 by a multidisciplinary team with many years of expertise in the fields of Public Policy, Communications, Open Technologies, Social Research, Multimedia Content Strategy, Transparency and Participation.

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