

INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM:

NORWAY PROGRESS REPORT 2011–2013



Joachim Nahem, International Law and Policy Institute
Christopher Wilson, The Engine Room
First Progress Report



INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM:

NORWAY

PROGRESS REPORT 2011–13



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
I BACKGROUND.....	5
II PROCESS: DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION PLAN.....	7
III PROCESS: CONSULTATION DURING IMPLEMENTATION.....	13
IV IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS.....	15
V SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST.....	17
VI MOVING FORWARD.....	19
VII ANNEX 1: METHODOLOGY.....	23
VIII ANNEX 2: IMPLEMENTATION OF NORWAY'S COMMITMENTS.....	27



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM (IRM): NORWAY PROGRESS REPORT 2011-2013

The Norwegian action plan focused on areas in which Norway has had much success. But the IRM evaluation proved challenging in the Norwegian context because the Norwegian action plan lacked clarity on specific commitments, a forward orientation, relevance to OGP values, and measurable indicators of progress.

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 IRM carries out a biannual review of each OGP participating country's activities.

One of the eight OGP founding countries, Norway began formal participation in September 2011.

At the outset, the Ministry of Government, Administration and Church Affairs (FAD); the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion (BLD), and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) were equal partners coordinating the action plan. FAD gradually assumed the responsibility of lead coordinator during implementation, although MFA continued to fund Norway's OGP activities.

OGP PROCESS

Countries participating in OGP are required to follow a process for consultation during development and implementation of their OGP action plan. Overall, Norway fell short of OGP's recommendations, making no consultation information available online, providing inadequate forewarning, and incorporating little stakeholder feedback into the plan.

Several stakeholders expressed frustration regarding the processes and follow-up to plan implementation. The local researchers found no evidence of any efforts to engage with civil society, the private sector, or other stakeholders during the implementation of the action plan. Norway's self-assessment process was equally limited in its compliance with OGP guidelines, and the self-assessment document did not address many of the challenges apparent in the action plan.

ASSESSING COMMITMENTS IN NORWAY'S FIRST ACTION PLAN

Typical IRM reports evaluate commitment-by-commitment OGP implementation. This type of evaluation proved challenging in the Norwegian context because the Norwegian action plan lacked clarity, a forward orientation, relevance to OGP values, and measurable indicators of progress. When commitments do not relate to OGP values, or do not represent new activities, a detailed evaluation of their implementation does not fall within the IRM mandate.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY PRIORITIES

In a series of stakeholder meetings, individuals and organisations from civil society identified policy areas not addressed in the first action plan, that would serve well as starting points for future action plans. Several represent planned activities that could be included, updated, or reformed as part of Norway's OGP participation.

- Strengthen the 2006 Freedom of Information Legislation
- Install mechanisms for accountability and whistleblower protection
- Include Openness and Technology Awards in OGP
- Hold an International Convention on Transparency and Openness
- Ensure corporations publish what they pay in taxes

Two commitments were clearly assessable. The commitment to ensure greater women's participation in municipal government and the commitment to standardise user satisfaction survey formats within government agencies have seen considerable progress.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Throughout the independent review, consultation, awareness, and collaboration consistently surfaced as the most significant challenges to the Norwegian OGP process. It is imperative that the next action plan address these issues.

Consultation

Norway will need to ensure that future plans are drafted in a more consultative manner. Civil society did not have a genuine opportunity to provide input to the action plan currently under review. The Government should:

- Set a clear timeline that gives civil society sufficient notice to participate in deliberations. The Government had already finalized the first action plan when it asked a limited number of civil society organisations (CSOs) to comment.
- Make the IRM timeline and the Norwegian action plan more complementary. Norway will have already developed its second action plan when the IRM publishes its report.
- Publicly share the action plan draft, the schedule for the consultation process, and the list of invited organisations.
- Provide funding and other support to improve CSO involvement in consultations.

Raising Awareness

For FAD to be an effective OGP focal point it needs to receive greater support and collaboration from other government entities, in particular the MFA and the Prime Minister's Office. The Government should:

- Take greater ownership of national consultation, which has been ad hoc and fragmented.
- Clarify responsible agencies and respective focal points for specific commitments.

Communication

Poor communication to potential stakeholders challenged the OGP process. Communication was neither precise about the purpose of OGP nor delivered in a timely manner. Therefore, the Government should:

- Establish a dedicated website, in Norwegian, that clearly explains the purpose and process of Norway's OGP involvement. The site should provide key documents and create a dynamic platform for engagement.

Stretching Commitments

Since most commitment activities already existed in areas where Norway performs well, the Government should:

- Identify commitments in the spirit of the OGP, that are not already implemented domestically, and that are challenging in a Norwegian context. They should include information and communication technology (ICT) management, implementation of the right to information act, addressing low voter turnout among youth (especially among women), and pension fund transparency.
- Future commitments should be measurable and provide clear baselines, indicators, and targets.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS: 2011

To participate in OGP, governments must demonstrate commitment to open government by meeting minimum criteria on key dimensions of open government. Third-party indicators are used to determine country progress on each of the dimensions. For more information, visit: www.opengovpartnership.org/eligibility

BUDGET TRANSPARENCY: 4 OUT OF 4

ACCESS TO INFORMATION: LAW ENACTED

ASSET DISCLOSURE: 4 OUT OF 4

CIVIC PARTICIPATION: 10 OUT OF 10



The Engine Room supports innovation in advocacy by matchmaking in existing support networks of technologists, support organisations and advocates.



The International Law and Policy Institute (ILPI) is an independent institute focusing

on good governance, peace and conflict, and international law. ILPI provides research, analysis, process support and training to clients ranging from private companies and institutions to governments and international organisations.



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 in order to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.

I | BACKGROUND

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

Norway, one of the eight founding countries of the OGP, began its formal participation in September 2011, when Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg launched the initiative along with other heads of state and Ministers in New York.

To participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of (minimum) performance criteria on key dimensions of open government that are particularly consequential for increasing government responsiveness, strengthening citizen engagement, and fighting corruption. Indicators produced by organisations other than OGP are used to determine the extent of country progress on each of the dimensions, with points awarded as described below. Norway entered into the partnership exceeding the minimal requirements for eligibility, with a high score in each of the criteria. At the time of joining, the country had the highest possible ranking for the categories of “open budgets” (4 out of a possible 4),¹ an “access to information law,”² the highest possible rankings in “asset disclosure for senior officials (4 out of a possible 4),”³ and a score of 10 out of a possible 10 on the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index Civil Liberties subscore.⁴

Along with the other founding members of OGP, Norway developed its national action plan from June through September 2011. The effective implementation dates for the action plan submitted in September were 1 January through 31 December 2012. Norway published its self-assessment during April of 2013. At the time of writing, officials and civil society members are working on the second national action plan.

Pursuant to OGP requirements, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) has partnered with Norway-based research organisations, the Engine Room and the International Law and Policy Institute, to carry out an evaluation of the process and implementation of Norway’s first action plan. It is the aim of the IRM to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments in each OGP participating country. See Annex I for more detail on methodology.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) in cooperation with the Prime Minister’s Office coordinated Norway’s initial OGP involvement.⁵ The Prime Minister and his Office have not been involved with OGP since the launch meeting in September 2011, and the MFA has gradually handed over follow-up responsibility of OGP to the Ministry of Government, Administration and Church Affairs (FAD). It should be noted, however, that Norway’s participation in OGP continues to be funded by the MFA. Given the broad thematic focus of Norway’s OGP commitments, especially pertaining to gender equality, the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion (BLD) was invited to be a key government partner in OGP implementation and follow up. Other ministries were also invited to participate in developing the action plan, but their involvement was limited, even for ministries directly responsible for providing information on specific commitments, such as the Ministry of Finance on matters pertaining to financial transparency.

MFA was responsible for OGP until 25 January 2013, and appears to have been involved in co-ordinating input to the action plan from other ministries. Thereafter, FAD took over the responsibility as lead coordinator for OGP (except responsibility for the funding). This change was not officially communicated, however, and created some confusion for stakeholders.⁶ All communication to Norwegian stakeholders regarding the OGP and the OGP action plan was conducted by FAD, which is also officially listed as the contact point for Norway on the OGP website.

It is not clear to Norwegian stakeholders (or the IRM researchers) to which ministry Norway's action plan should "belong," given its broad scope and vague commitments. FAD is not obviously the most appropriate ministry, given that it holds a mandate for only one of the three priority areas outlined in the action plan, and by its own admission⁷ has limited experience and capacity for addressing the fundamental issues of democracy and governance on which OGP is founded. Another challenge with regard to institutional ownership relates to the Norwegian Parliament, which was not consulted on the OGP, a missed opportunity. In addition to the value of raising awareness among political parties, the Parliamentary committees responsible for specific OGP commitments, such as gender, public administration, and democracy at the local level, could play an invaluable role in shaping and providing information on the commitments.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

The IRM report expands on existing work by government and civil society in assessing and carrying out OGP activities, attempting to get as wide a range of relevant voices as possible.

As part of its role in gathering the voices of multiple stakeholders, the IRM researchers for Norway carried out interviews with officials and three stakeholder forums—one for each of the three major themes (public administration, gender, and extractive industries/taxes). The forums are referred to throughout this report as "stakeholder forums."

The reader is encouraged to review two key documents prepared by the government to put this report in context: Norway's first action plan⁸ and the self assessment published by the government in April 2013.⁹ Numerous references will be made to each of these documents throughout this report.

Methods and sources are dealt with more completely in a methodological annex in this report.

¹Open Budget Partnership, 2012, "Open Budgets Change Lives" (Open Budget Partnership, Washington, DC). Available at: <http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBS2012-infographic.png>.

²Kingdom of Norway, Freedom of Information Act (University of Oslo Library, 2006). Available at <http://www.ub.uio.no/ujur/ulovdata/lov-20060519-016-eng.pdf>.

³S. Djankov, R. La Porta, F. Lopez-de-Silanes, and A. Shleifer, "Disclosure by Politicians" (Dartmouth University, 2009). Available at: <http://bit.ly/19nDEFK>; OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose and Level of Transparency" in *Government at a Glance 2009* (Paris: OECD, 2009). Available at: <http://bit.ly/13vGtqS>; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries" (World Bank, Washington, DC, 2009). Available at: <http://bit.ly/1clokyf>

⁴Economist Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat" (Economist, London, 2010). Available at: http://graphics.eiu.com/PDF/Democracy_Index_2010_web.pdf

⁵Odd Magne Ruud, Director General (Ekspedisjonsjef) at Prime Minister's Office (Statsministerens kontor), Interview, 19 June 2013.

⁶Stakeholder Forum, 8 May 2013; Interviews with FAD, MFA and two CSOs consulted and one not consulted for the action plan; Tom Arne Nygaard, Senior Executive Adviser, Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, telephone interview, 4 April 2013.

⁷Nygaard, interview, 4 April 2013.

⁸Government of Norway, *Open Government Partnership (OGP) Government of Norway: Transparency and Inclusive* (Oslo: Government of Norway, 2011).

⁹Government of Norway, *Self Assessment Report – April 2013 – Norway* (Oslo: Government of Norway, 2013).

II | PROCESS: DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION PLAN

Countries participating in OGP are required to follow a process for consultation during development of their action plan.

OGP GUIDELINES

Countries must:

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

A fifth, requirement, during consultation, is set out in the OGP Articles of Governance, section C “Consultation during implementation:”

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

SUMMARY

The Government held an orientation meeting in September 2011, to inform Norwegian civil society and the private sector about its membership of the OGP. At this point, the action plan was largely complete. Civil society provided some feedback, but it is unclear whether this resulted in any changes to the action plan.¹ On 9 May 2012 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Ministry of Development invited other ministries to a meeting for discussing how to follow up the commitments in the Action Plan.² No further meetings were held, either public or with select stakeholders. The researchers did

not find any evidence of awareness-raising activities or other efforts to engage citizens in the OGP process. Participants in the stakeholder forums initiated by IRM national researchers expressed frustration that these meetings were held to review rather than develop the action plan.

Until April 2013, information on the OGP action plan was available only as an attachment to an email, which was sent directly to select participants. As of Spring 2013 some information was made available on the government web pages (<http://bit.ly/GzFd16>), and in the Government’s self-evaluation on the OGP official website.

Countries participating in OGP are expected to follow a set process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan. The OGP provides specific recommendations on how to do this. Overall, Norway seems to have fallen short on implementing many of the recommendations set by the OGP. The sections below address specific points and questions used by the OGP to guide countries in developing their national action plans.

PROCESS, TIMELINE, AND COMMUNICATION

According to OGP guidelines, countries are to make the details of their public consultation **process and timeline available (online at minimum) prior to the consultation**. As indicated, Norway held only a single information meeting where the action plan was presented to select stakeholders.

Norway did not provide any online information regarding the action plan’s process or timeline. Moreover, it did not produce a **summary of public (or other) consultations** and all individual written comment submissions available online.

Countries are also advised to consult the population with sufficient forewarning and through a variety of mechanisms—including online and through in-person meetings—to ensure the accessibility of opportunities for citizens to engage. The researchers did not find any evidence of outreach or communication to citizens on the OGP, for example, through media outlets. A quick internet search restricted to the Norwegian language resulted in a single reference to the OGP: a news story from September 2011 on the MFA site.³ It is, therefore, reasonable to say that OGP was not communicated or discussed in the public sphere. In addition to a single press statement in the government’s web archives, a single page for the initiative has now been posted. This page is not well positioned or easy to find without links, however, and does not support or encourage engagement or input.

According to stakeholder feedback, Norway did not generally provide adequate warning for consultations. Participants in stakeholder forums described the challenges they face in accommodating additional processes into overloaded workflows, and that this is especially challenging with short notice. Additional information and outreach would likely have compensated for short notice, but at least two weeks’ notice would have been desirable.

QUALITY AND RANGE OF CONSULTATION

A key criterion for the OGP process and consultation is that “countries are to **consult widely** with the national community, including civil society and the private sector; seek out a diverse range of views.” It is fair to say that, especially with regard to gender, the consultation was broad in quantitative terms, with 32 civil society and private sector entities being invited to a meeting on 12 September. The Government (led by FAD) has on a number of occasions expressed the desire to consult more widely, especially on the themes of the action plan, but by its own admission has not been able to do so in a meaningful way.⁴

The meeting of 12 September was not documented by MFA or other government representatives, making it very difficult to evaluate the quality and range of consultation. There is no record of who participated

but according to the Government self-assessment, 20 organisations participated in the briefing. However, of the 15+ civil society organisations contacted by the national researchers, only two reported having participated; most had not even heard of it and only two organisations provided written comments on the draft action plan. Without minutes or a summary of the meeting, it is difficult to ascertain whether recommendations made by civil society and private sector were taken on board for the final version. However, in subsequent meetings and interviews with stakeholders it seems clear that the draft plan presented remained more or less the same as the plan presented at the meeting.⁵

BOX 1 | Civil Society and Private Sector Actors Invited to OGP Briefing 12 September 2011

Abelia (Business association of Norwegian knowledge and technology based enterprises, http://abelia.no/english/category255.html)
Akademikerne (Federation of Norwegian Professional Associations, http://www.akademikerne.no/no/om_akademikerne/english/)
DIFI (Agency for Public Management and eGovernment, http://www.difi.no/artikkel/2009/11/about-difi)
Forum for Kvinner og Utviklingsspørsmål (FOKUS, Forum for Women and Development, http://www.fokuskvinner.no/en/About-FOKUS)
Frivillighet Norge (The Association of NGOs in Norway, http://www.frivillighetnorge.no/no/English/)
Funksjonshemmedes Fellesorganisasjon (FFO, Norwegian Federation of Organisations of Disabled People, http://www.ffe.no/en-gb)
Hovedorganisasjonen for universitets- og høyskoleutdannede (UNIO, an independent organisation engaged in labour policy for the academic sector, http://www.unio.no/kunder/unio/cms2011.nsf/pages/english)
IKT-Norge (Norwegian Interest Organisation for the ICT Sector, http://ikt-norge.no)
Juridisk rådgivning for kvinner (JURK, an organisation providing legal council for women, http://www.jurk.no)
Kvinnegruppa Ottar (The Feminist Group Ottar, http://kvinnegruppa-ottar.no/en)
Landsrådet for Norges Barne- og ungdomsorganisasjon (LNU, The Norwegian Children and Youth Council, http://en.lnu.no)
Landsrådet for Norges Barne- og ungdomsorganisasjon (LNU, The Norwegian Children and Youth Council, http://en.lnu.no)
Norsk kvinnesaksforening (NKF, The Norwegian Association for Women's Rights, http://kvinnesak.no/english)
Næringslivets Hovedorganisasjon (NHO, Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise, http://www.nho.no/english/)
Næringslivets Hovedorganisasjon (NHO) (Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise, http://www.nho.no/english/)
Norsk Pasientforening (an independent organisation supporting patients in their interaction with the public health sector, http://www.pasient.no/hvem_er_vi)

BOX 1 | Civil Society and Private Sector Actors Invited to OGP Briefing 12 September 2011, continued

Norsk presseforbund (The Norwegian Press Association, http://presse.no/)
Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS, http://ks.no/u/English)
REFORM Ressurssenter for menn (Reform- Resource Centre for Men, a politically independent not-for-profit organisation, http://www.reform.no/in-english)
Røde Kors (The Norwegian Red Cross, http://www.rodekors.no/)
Samarbeidsforumet for funksjonshemmedes organisasjoner (SAFO, an umbrella organisation for groups working for the interests of disabled people, http://www.safo.no)
Samisk KvinneForum (Sarni NissonForum, Sámi Women's Network, http://www.saminissonforum.org/eng)
Samisk kvinneorganisasjon (Sámi Women's Organisation, https://norggasarahkka.wordpress.com)
Senter for kunnskap og likestilling (KUN, Kun Centre for Gender Equality, http://www.kun.nl.no/no/om_kun/in_english/)
Tax Justice Network Norway (http://taxjustice.no/)
Transparency international Norge (http://transparency.no/)
Universitetet i Agder, Senter for likestilling (Centre for Gender and Equality, http://senterforlikestilling.org/)
Publish What You Pay Norway (http://publishwhatyoupay.no)
Wikimedia Norge (https://no.wikimedia.org/wiki/Hovedside)
Yrkesorganisasjonenes Sentralforbund (YS, Confederation of Vocational Unions, http://www.ys.no/kunder/ys/cms.nsf/pages/english)
Note: Although these civil society and private sector actors were invited to participate in a September 2011 OGP briefing, it is not clear how many actually participated because no record was kept of the meeting.

Of the stakeholders contacted by the national IRM researchers for in-depth interviews, only two had participated in the information meeting, and both were positive about the initiative and the information meeting. Both expressed frustration, however, over the lack of follow-up or ongoing dialogue. There was, in any case, clearly little room for input at the information meeting, as the action plan was already complete, and organisations were largely unfamiliar with the initiative. Some participants at the stakeholder meeting expressed the view that the consultation was more perfunctory than meaningful, given the timeline and that the themes had already been identified.

Groups working with gender and women's rights were arguably overrepresented in government consultations, compared to other actors, such as those representing the private sector. Regarding the latter, only IKT Norge (a lobby organisation for Norwegian ICT companies) seems to have participated.⁶ There appears to have been no participation of actors based outside Oslo (the capital), which is encouraged by OGP consultation guidelines.

Although the select organisations invited to the information meeting generally represent a diversity of views within civil society, it is not possible to determine what views were excluded by a closed consultative process. It is also important to note that few of the invited CSOs were actually able to participate or provide feedback to the action plan; hence the net effect of stakeholder feedback was not particularly diverse.⁷

¹ Stakeholder forums; Tom Arne Nygaard, Senior Executive Adviser, Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, telephone interview, 4 April 2013; Survey of Norwegian Civil Society.

² Government of Norway, *Self Assessment Report – April 2013 – Norway* (Oslo: Government of Norway, 2013), 2.

³ Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Norge tar sikte på å delta i Open Government Partnership," 7 September 2011. Available at: http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/aktuelt/nyheter/2011/ogp_initiativ.html?id=654144

⁴ Tom Arne Nygaard, Senior Executive Adviser, Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, telephone interview, 4 April 2013.

⁵ Interviews with FAD confirm that only minimal changes were made based on consultation with civil society (Frivilighetssentralen's suggestion on 'volunteerism' was partially taken on board). Interviews with IKT Norge indicate that several pertinent recommendations, especially relating to ICT, should have been taken into the action plan. Interview with Liv Friehow, Director IKT Norge, 10 June 2013.

⁶ Nygaard, interview, 4 April 2013.

⁷ Stakeholder forums; Ongoing discussions with the Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs.

III | CONSULTATION DURING IMPLEMENTATION

As indicated in the preceding section, the quality of consultation during the development of the Norwegian action plan did not live up to the quality of consultations set forth in guidelines from the OGP. Several stakeholders expressed frustration regarding these processes as well the follow-up to them. The researchers found no indication of any efforts to engage with civil society, the private sector, or other stakeholders during the implementation of the action plan or in relation to the OGP generally.

IV | IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS

All OGP participating governments are to develop OGP action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period.

OGP GUIDELINES

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

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

The five OGP grand challenges are:

1. **Improving Public Services**—measures that address the full spectrum of citizen services including health, education, criminal justice, water, electricity, telecommunications, and any other relevant service areas by fostering public service improvement or private sector innovation.
2. **Increasing Public Integrity**—measures that address corruption and public ethics, access to information, campaign finance reform, and media and civil society freedom.
3. **More Effectively Managing Public Resources**—measures that address budgets, procurement, natural resources, and foreign assistance.
4. **Creating Safer Communities**—measures that address public safety, the security sector, disaster and crisis response, and environmental threats.

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

While the nature of concrete commitments under any grand challenge area should be flexible and allow for each country's unique circumstances, all OGP commitments should reflect four core open government principles:

- **Transparency**—information on government activities and decisions is open, comprehensive, timely, freely available to the public, and meet basic open data standards (e.g. raw data, machine readability).
- **Citizen Participation**—governments seek to mobilise citizens to engage in public debate, provide input, and make contributions that lead to more responsive, innovative and effective governance.
- **Accountability**—there are rules, regulations, and mechanisms in place that call upon government actors to justify their actions, act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and accept responsibility for failure to perform with respect to laws or commitments.
- **Technology and Innovation**—governments embrace the importance of providing citizens with open access to technology, the role of new technologies in driving innovation, and the importance of increasing the capacity of citizens to use technology.

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

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

THE NORWEGIAN COMMITMENTS

IRM reports aim to evaluate OGP implementation on a commitment-by-commitment basis. This has proved challenging in the Norwegian context. As a general rule the emphasis of most IRM reports focus on the level of completion of OGP action plans. This commitment-by-commitment approach does not, however, work for assessing the first Norwegian action plan. As far as it is possible to evaluate (given the aforementioned limitations), none of the commitments identified in the Norwegian action plan were found to be behind schedule. All of the non-specific commitments, for example, “combating gender stereotypes,” were clearly on schedule or addressed in some way by the Norwegian government.

Moreover, commitments in the Norwegian action plan were generally characterised by the following issues:

- Little clarity on what was a commitment
- Unambitious commitments
- Lack of forward-looking commitments
- Lack of relevance of commitments to OGP values
- Commitments for which progress is difficult to measure

These issues have made evaluating the implementation of individual commitments challenging. When specific commitments are not directly related to OGP values, or do not represent new activities undertaken under OGP, it is not clear that a detailed evaluation of their implementation should fall within the mandate of this review. As such, a detailed evaluation of each commitment is annexed to this report (Annex II), and this section will treat general issues of clarity, ambition, relevance, measurability and the degree to which the action plan was forward looking.

The IRM researchers considered that, broadly, the commitments fell into three major sections:

- Transparency in the management of oil and gas revenues, efforts for financial transparency;
- Open public sector and inclusive government; and
- Measures to promote gender equality and women’s full participation in civic life, the private sector, the public administration and political processes.

The sections, “open public sector and inclusive government” and “transparency in the management of oil and gas revenues, efforts for financial transparency,” had the following problems:

- Little clarity on what was a commitment: the action plan did not provide clear, specific actions going forward; and
- Lack of forward-looking commitments: much of the text described actions that had already been taken.

In the section, “measures to promote gender equality and women’s full participation in civic life, the private sector, the public administration and political processes,” many of the commitments had no apparent relevance to OGP.

Most of the issues and commitments were not phrased in a way that made them verifiable.

While the IRM does not assess whether or not commitments are new, stakeholders consistently noted that the action plan only committed to pre-existing activities.

This combination of problems led the IRM researchers to focus on the bigger pictures of action plan process, form, and ownership.

However, to document progress on the issues in the three designated action areas, IRM researchers assembled the table in Annex II. Because the action plan did not have clearly stated commitments, the table relies on the analysis carried out by OGP,¹ which identified 18 “commitments” within the action plan (first column), and compared them with the outcomes reported in the government’s self-assessment (second column). To identify the work carried out by the Norwegian Government, the IRM team in Washington and the IRM researchers in Norway analysed these 18 commitments in terms of (1) whether the commitment was forward looking, (2) whether it was OGP relevant, and (3) whether it was specific enough to be verifiable. Notably only three commitments met all three criteria. Two were only to be implemented outside of the implementation period.

¹ OGP is supported by several institutional branches. A small support unit and a networking mechanism together carry out basic analysis and support on OGP action plans. The nongovernmental organization, Global Integrity, serves as the networking mechanism until the end of 2013. During 2012, Global Integrity analysed OGP action plans, including the Norwegian action plan, identifying the number of commitments and tagging commitments with subject headings.

V | SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

This section reviews the self-assessment process carried out by the Norwegian government. It includes criteria taken directly from OGP guidelines, which are summarised in Box 2.

Norway’s deadline for delivering a self-evaluation to the OGP Support Unit was extended until 30 April 2013, and the report was delivered on 17 April. It was not, however, subjected to an open review. Selected CSOs were requested to provide feedback directly to the coordinating ministry, but it is not clear which organisations provided feedback or how this feedback was incorporated. Only “Frivillighet Norge” (Association of NGOs in Norway) made written comments to the report. It said the plan put too much emphasis on the individual citizen and not enough on organised society.

The report described consultation efforts, but did not review their efficiency, results, or what might have been done differently. The non-specificity of commitments and differences in formatting make it difficult to determine where and how specific commitments are addressed. Some, however, are clearly missing. See Annex II.

As most of the Norwegian commitments were pre-existing and non-specific, it is difficult to ascertain timelines. Several projects with multi-year time spans seem to be on track though it is unclear to what extent these schedules represent OGP commitments. It is also problematic that the self-assessment organises and references commitments differently than the action plan, and in a way that makes it difficult to match commitments in one document to those in the other.

The Norwegian self-assessment report goes to lengths to assert the Norwegian “culture of openness” but does not specifically reference government obligations, responsibilities, or activities to further or facilitate government openness writ large.

Was annual progress report published?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Was it done according to schedule?	Unclear
Is the report available in the local language(s)? According to stakeholders, was this adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the report available in English?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Did the government provide a two-week public comment period on draft self-assessment reports?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Were any public comments received?	Some
Is the report deposited in the OGP portal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Did the self-assessment report include review of consultation efforts?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Did the report cover all of the commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Did it assess completion according to schedule?	Unclear
Does the report reaffirm responsibility for openness?	Unclear
Does the report describe the relationship of the Action Plan with Grand Challenge Areas?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

VI | MOVING FORWARD

RELEVANT NATIONAL CONTEXT FOR THE NEXT OGP ACTION PLAN

Norway is making many forward strides in the areas of transparency, participation, and accountability. The following section highlights areas or ongoing activities that hold promise for the next version of the national action plan.

Access to Information

Norwegian Freedom of Information legislation was enacted in 2006. Although Norway's OGP action plan mentions the legislation, it is not included in any commitment. Several media reports have described difficulties and challenges relating to how the access to information legislation functions in practice.¹ Challenges for citizens as well as government officials mandated to provide information include:

- Requests for information from journalists to ministries have been turned down by various government entities.
- There are multiple instances of concern regarding the right of patients and their access to information from the public health care system.
- There have also been concerns that the right to information law provides too much information to commercial actors. For example, universities are concerned about students' privacy rights when commercial actors elicit information about students from them.
- Civil servants have complained that the act is too onerous on the bureaucracy.

Implementation challenges and proposed solutions of the Norwegian information law could be included in the OGP action plan as it concerns a key OGP principle. More specific challenges and recommendations can be found in a Transparency International study on Norway² and the Parliamentary Ombudsman's annual report.³

The Norwegian Association for Journalism has also addressed many of the issues associated with the right to information act in its Openness Index.⁴

Accountability Mechanisms

No new or revised accountability mechanisms have been initiated since development of the action plan. The government is, however, currently reviewing several relevant areas, including the freedom of information legislation and whistleblower protection.⁵

Technology and Innovation

Two awards given by FAD concern OGP principles and themes, but were not included in the action plan. They include an award to the most "open" government agency (<http://bit.ly/1291ZAJ>) and an award for the most influential woman in the technology field (<http://bit.ly/14AWWLd>). These awards and the awardees could be used as resources for Norway's OGP action plan.

FAD regularly discuss its work on ITC related issues at a blog at <http://blogg.regjeringen.no/fiks/>

International Actions

Two actions are particularly relevant on the international level:

- Norway is pushing for an international convention on transparency-openness.⁶
- A recently passed European Union (EU) law makes it mandatory for companies registered or connected to EU countries to publish what they pay in taxes to all countries. Norway has since proposed a law that would make it mandatory for Norwegian companies or companies operating in Norway to publish what they pay in taxes in all countries.⁷

Given the demonstrated interest of the Government in furthering the international openness agenda, concrete commitments around advocacy and implementation of these reforms would fit well in the next action plan.

STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIES

Stakeholders see the following commitments as the most important in the current action plan:

- Financial transparency relating to extractive industries and the Norwegian Pension Fund, as these represent the largest sources of income and assets

to Norway and several developing countries. Extractive and financial transparency are far more significant than development aid.

- Equal pay for work of equal value; despite generally good gender equality, the pay gap between men and women, especially in the private sector, remains a concern.
- Digitising public services remains important so that government can interact with increasingly ICT-savvy users while not marginalising non-ICT proficient users such as pensioners and immigrant women.

Based on these discussions, the following actions or activities were identified as priorities for the next iteration of the action plan:

- Freedom of Information Act, 2006: practical implementation challenges in responsible institutions;
- Tax reporting and evasion;
- ICT innovation to promote openness; and
- Norway's proposal for an international convention on openness.⁸

In pursuing these areas, it was suggested that the Norwegian Government consult with stakeholders from the private sector, and especially those already engaged in creating apps that enable greater public participation and feedback on public services.

Stakeholder feedback indicated that the current action plan is too broad and imprecise. The gender focus does not appear to be OGP-specific and should probably be replaced with more relevant ICT and democracy initiatives. Academia, research, and university communities, who have been all but absent as stakeholders, have an important role to play in the development of the next action plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Throughout the independent review process, the IRM researchers consistently encountered issues regarding consultation, collaboration, and process as the most important challenges to the Norwegian OGP process. It is imperative that these issues be addressed to the degree possible in the next iteration of the Norwegian action plan, especially when finalizing that plan.

As such, recommendations arising from this review process are structured into the areas of consultation, ownership, communication, and stretching commitments.

Consultation

Norway will need to ensure that future plans are drafted in a more consultative manner, especially with regard to civil society, which did not have a genuine opportunity to provide input to the action plan currently under review. Greater consultation is also likely to yield better results for implementation as relevant stakeholders have an incentive to stay engaged. Several key findings and lessons emerged from the first consultation process:

- **The Government should set a clear timeline that gives civil society actors sufficient notice to prepare and participate in the deliberations.** Several stakeholder forum members noted that input for the second action plan was solicited right before the summer recess, which will all but guarantee low participation and feedback.
- **The timelines of the IRM review process and development of the second Norwegian action plan are not complementary,** as Norway will already have developed its second action plan when the IRM recommendations are made available to the government.
- **Stakeholder Forum participants reported that the first action plan was already developed and adopted when it reached the limited number of CSOs asked to provide comments.** The list of organisations invited was relatively extensive, but the list of CSOs that actually participated or genuinely felt involved was very low. Some CSOs consulted expressed frustration that their input was not included. For example, IKT Norge (ICT Norway) said that the themes identified were not based on consultation.
- **The OGP draft, the consultation process, and the list of invited organisations were not shared publicly (contrary to the recommendations in OGP guidelines).** A key recommendation made at the IRM Stakeholder Forum was that civil society needs funding to meaningfully engage in the OGP process and related work. CSOs are stretched thin and simply do not have the capacity to engage pro-bono in a consultation process that does not have the potential of programmatic support. FAD

should consider funding a civil society steering committee or secretariat to ensure broad and meaningful participation. At a relatively low cost, FAD could invite one or several CSOs to coordinate this outreach activity to ensure broad participation and high-quality input for the action plan. There should also be scope for CSOs to engage on implementation by submitting funding proposals.

- **Stakeholders suggested creation of a Nordic OGP partnership (the assumption being that the other Scandinavian countries have a shared understanding and practice on OGP principles).** This suggestion is pertinent but may best be done through a civil society network rather than through the government.

Ownership

Some challenges relate to who owned and led the OGP engagement from the Norwegian government side. At the outset, Norway was represented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA); the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion (BLD); and the Ministry of Government, Administration and Church Affairs (FAD). These three entities were also dominant in shaping the action plan. BLD and MFA have not been active in following up or ensuring the buy-in of their constituencies. FAD has become the ministerial focal point for OGP without being able to take full ownership of the process. Although FAD has international experience, its remit for dealing with open government issues beyond public administration topics is limited. If FAD is to be an effective focal point for OGP, it will need to receive greater support and collaboration from other government entities, in particular the MFA and the Prime Minister's Office (International Section), which facilitated Norway's entry into OGP. The Government should take greater ownership in driving the national consultation, which to date has been ad hoc and fragmented. It is also imperative that the Government clearly identifies a responsible agency and focal point to civil society and other stakeholders.

Communication

A challenge with the national process has been poor communication to potential stakeholders. Communication has neither been precise on the purpose of OGP nor delivered in a timely manner. A key priority should be to establish a dedicated website and platform, in Norwegian, that clearly explains the purpose and

process of Norway's engagement in OGP. Though a new web page has recently been established for the OGP on FAD's website (<http://bit.ly/GzFd16>), this webpage is neither well positioned, nor easy to engage. Given the highly wired nature of Norwegian stakeholders, Norway's OGP web presence should facilitate engagement, rather than simply providing a link for reference. Ideally, such a site would inform and engage other government agencies, civil society, and the general public. In the spirit of the OGP, the site should not only provide key documents but create a dynamic platform where various actors can engage. The OGP site should also make use of technology and innovation as promoted by IKT Norge or even within FAD, which annually awards prizes to the most "open" government agency website and to the most successful female ICT entrepreneur.

Ambitious commitments

The evaluation of the initial action plan shows few instances of Norway stretching its commitments. In most cases, the commitments were pre-existing, and related to areas where Norway is already a top performer (e.g., gender equality and natural resource management). Norway should identify OGP commitments that stem directly from the spirit and nature of the Open Government Partnership and which are not already implemented or planned domestically. Without striving for such commitments, it is not clear what value the OGP can add to Norway's open democratic practice. Norway should strive to select OGP-related topics that are broadly regarded as challenging in a Norwegian context: for example, ICT management, implementation of the right to information act, addressing low voter turnout among youth (especially among women), and transparency relating to investments of the Pension Fund. It is also imperative that future action plans are measurable and provide clear baselines with associated indicators and targets on what is to be achieved. This strategy may entail reducing the number of commitments, an action that would be beneficial for stakeholders, IRM, and government who all have a remit to evaluate the commitments at the end.

¹E. Jarbekk and T. Hasaas, "For mye offentlighet?" *Aftenposten* (Norwegian daily), 10 January 2012. Describes how some institutions, including universities, are concerned that the information law is being exploited by commercial actors requesting information from universities on students. Available at: <http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/For-mye-offentlighet-6738525.html>; Hanne Mellingsæter, "Oslo får kritikk for brudd på offentlighetsloven" *Aftenposten* (Norwegian daily), 17 April 2012. Describes how the City of Oslo was criticized by the ombudsman for withholding information concerning the building of a new embassy in a residential area.

Available at: <http://www.aftenposten.no/oslo/Oslo-far-kritikk-for-brudd-pa-offentlighetsloven--6803306.html>.

²TI Norway, "TI Norway Launches Report 'The Norwegian Integrity System—Not Entirely Perfect?'" 14 June 2012.

Available at: http://www.transparency.org/news/pressrelease/20120614_ti_norway_launches_report_the_norwegian_integrity_system

³The annual reports are available at <http://www.sivilombudsmannen.no/publikasjoner/>.

⁴Norsk Presseforbunds Offentlighetsutvalg, Åpenhetsindekskåring, 2011. Available at: <http://www.offentlighet.no/content/download/2506/19770/file/%C3%85penhetsindeksen 2011 Rapport.pdf>

⁵Guro Slettemark, head of Transparency International Norway, Interview, 11 June 2013.

⁶Even Tømte, "Slik vil Heikki dele for å skape," *Bistandsaktuelt*, 11 June, 2013. Available at: <http://www.bistandsaktuelt.no/nyheter-og-reportasjer/arkiv-nyheter-og-reportasjer/sperrefrist-klok-ka-tolv-slik-vil-heikki-dele-for-%C3%A5-skape>

⁷Publish What You Pay, "European Union Reaches Deal on Historic Oil and Mining Transparency Law," 10 April 2013. Available at: <http://www.pwyp.no/en/european-union-reaches-deal-historic-oil-and-mining-transparency-law>

⁸Stakeholder Forums; Interviews with Guro Slettemark, TI Norway, 11 June 2013 and Jonas Moberg, EITI Secretariat, 3 May 2013.

VII | ANNEX 1: METHODOLOGY

Early in the planning process for the review of Norway's OGP action plan, it became clear that Norwegian civil society was little aware of the OGP process and not significantly engaged. This lack of awareness was partly because Norwegian civil society is perhaps less domestically focused than civil society in other countries. However, a small but significant number of organisations work on the issues in Norway's action plan, and their lack of familiarity with the OGP process indicates that outreach by the Norwegian Government was also quite limited. To reach a significant sample of relevant civil society organisations, beyond the short list contacted by the Norwegian Ministry of Government, Administration and Church Affairs (FAD), the IRM national researchers decided to partner with prominent civil society organisations in each of the three thematic areas in the Norwegian action plan.

After conversations with several potential partners, the IRM researchers selected the following Norwegian civil society organisations as partners for the consultation process:

- Oslo-based Secretariat of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) for transparency in the management of oil and gas revenues.
- Transparency International Norway for open public sector and inclusive government.
- The Norwegian network organisation, Forum for Women and Development (FOKUS), for measures to promote gender equality and women's full participation.

Each of these organisations hosted a civil society consultation in their thematic area, inviting the organisations contacted by FAD, as well other relevant organisations in their networks. Minutes and descriptions of the three consultations may be found at <https://www.theengineerroom.org/projects/ogp-norway/>.

Fewer organisations participated in these consultations than the national researchers had hoped. Participants suggested that this lack of interest was because the OGP is little known and little understood among Norwegian civil society, and that the value of participating in the process was not clear. Norwegian

civil society is generally stretched thin and not funded well enough to participate in many extra-ordinary activities. As such, an invitation from independent researchers reviewing an unknown process may not have provided a clear incentive to participate. This assertion is supported by a small survey circulated after consultations.

To better understand civil society's interest and engagement in the Norwegian OGP process, national researchers circulated a short survey (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/OGP>). Of the 16 organisations that responded, 10 had been involved in the IRM consultation process. Their results informed the IRM researchers during their investigation, but were not statistically significant enough to include in the final version of this report.

It is also worth noting that the thematic areas in Norway's action plan are well-developed policy areas in Norway, in which a breadth of institutions and organisations are active. Because of the large number of actors, a division of labour has developed. For many issues raised in consultations, participants said they were not able to comment, but were able to identify other responsible organisations or institutions, most which had been invited to consultations but were unable to participate. That institutions directly responsible for OGP commitments chose not to participate in these consultations suggests a significant lack of ownership, and coincides with concerns that the majority of commitments in the action plan existed prior to the creation of the action plan. The institutions responsible for these commitments and the organisations working directly with associated activities may not be aware of the OGP quite simply because these activities have an institutional life independent of the OGP, and the existence of the OGP process has not been communicated. This situation also raises the question of whether the OGP adds value to these processes, or whether existing political processes are sufficient for strengthening openness and accountability mechanisms for civil society. This question did not fall within the remit of the IRM, but merits further investigation.

STAKEHOLDER FORUM: TRANSPARENCY IN THE MANAGEMENT OF OIL AND GAS REVENUES

3 May 2013

Synopsis of meeting

Participants discussed the role that international mechanisms such as EITI and OGP could and should play in Norwegian governance of the oil and gas sectors. Participants then discussed practical, strategic and substantive issues relating to transparency in the Norwegian management of oil and gas contracts. Participants then discussed specific issues and opportunities pertinent to each of the individual commitments in this section of the action plan. Minutes are at: <https://www.theengineerroom.org/projects/ogp-norway/>

Participants

Heidi Johansen (Bellona)

Anders Kråknes (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative [EITI])

Jonas Moberg (EITI)

Terje Dyrstad (Fornynings-administrasjons-og kirke departementet [FAD])

Tom Arne Nygaard (FAD)

Geir Sørensen (Norwegian Foreign Ministry)

Willy Olsen (Norwegian Oil and Gas Partners)

Julie Hass (Norwegian Statistical Office)

Geir Ovensen (Norwegian Statistical Office)

Joachim Nahem (IRM Researcher)

Christopher Wilson (IRM Researcher)

STAKEHOLDER FORUM: OPEN PUBLIC SECTOR AND INCLUSIVE GOVERNMENT

8 May 2013

Synopsis of meeting

Participants' challenges in the consultative process for the action plan were discussed. Participants then discussed principled tensions relevant to the action plan, such as the tension between the principle of transparency and the principle of privacy. They then

discussed the individual commitments, and made specific recommendations. Minutes are at: <https://www.theengineerroom.org/projects/ogp-norway/>

Participants

Terje Dyrstad (Fornynings-administrasjons-og kirke departementet [FAD])

Arne Nygaard (FAD)

Geir Leo Sedler (FAD)

Asbjørn Seim (FAD)

Mari Sund Morken (Lovavdelingen Justisdepartementet)

Kristine Foss (Norsk presseforbund)

Jørgen Juel Andersen (Norwegian Business School)

Geir Øvensen (Norwegian Statistical Office)

Håkon Arald Gulbrandsen (Utenriksdepartementet)

Arne Fliflet (Sivilombudsmannen)

Sigrid Klæboe Jacobsen (Tax Justice Network)

Guro Slettemark (Transparency International)

Gro Skaaren-Fystro (Transparency International)

Joachim Nahem (IRM Researcher)

Christopher Wilson (IRM Researcher)

Mari Dahl Schlanbusch (IRM Researcher)

STAKEHOLDER FORUM: MEASURES TO PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S FULL PARTICIPATION

13 May 2013

Synopsis of meeting

Participants' challenges in the consultative process for the action plan, and expectations for future OGP processes were discussed. Participants then discussed the individual commitments, referencing problematic areas and institutional approaches to gender equality in Norwegian policy and practice. Several specific recommendations were made. Participants then discussed how FAD could facilitate greater civil society engagement in the process in the future. Minutes are at: <https://www.theengineerroom.org/projects/ogp-norway/>

Participants

Terje Dyrstad (Fornynings-administrasjons-og kirkedepartementet [FAD])

Tom Arne Nygaard (FAD)

Helene Langsether (FOKUS)

Anton Popic (FOKUS)

Anita Sæbbø (Forum for Women and Development (FOKUS))

Lone Alice Johansen (Krisesentersekretariatet)

Elisabeth Rusdal (Norges Kvinne-og familieforbund)

Joachim Nahem (IRM Researcher)

Christopher Wilson (IRM Researcher)

ABOUT THE INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM

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

The current membership of the International Experts' Panel is:

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

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

VIII | ANNEX 2: IMPLEMENTATION OF NORWAY'S COMMITMENTS

Given the challenges mentioned above with the Norwegian action plan, this table summarizes which commitments the OGP identified, how those commitments were identified in the government's self-assessment, and whether the commitment was forward looking, was OGP relevant, and had verifiable progress.

Norway's OGP Action Plan Commitments Identified by OGP Partner Global Integrity ¹	Progress on Commitments Identified in Norway's OGP Self-Assessment Report	Forward Looking? ²	OGP Relevant?	Is progress verifiable?
<i>Open Public Sector and Inclusive Government</i>				
The Government aims to provide digital public services to improve services and ensure more effective administration. This will require amending legislation, putting in place common IT systems, and ensuring that the public sector delivers good, effective, and predictable digital services to the general public.	The objectives of the Government are that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public sector is to be accessible online to the extent possible • Web-based services are to be the general rule for the public sector's communication with citizens and businesses • A digital public sector will result in improved services • Digitization of the public sector will free up resources for areas in need of more resources³ 	Yes	Yes	No
The Central Government Communication Policy came into force on 16 October 2009, and applies to all ministries and government agencies. The aim of the policy is to ensure that citizens: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive correct and clear information about their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities • Have access to information about the Government's activities • Are invited to participate in the formulation of policies, arrangements, and services. This policy is based on six principles: Openness, participation, access to relevant information for all citizens, activeness, coherence, and line management.	All state enterprises are required to make public data available so it can be used by others, that is, it is published electronically in a user-friendly format. ⁴	No	Yes	No

Norway's OGP Action Plan Commitments Identified by OGP Partner Global Integrity ¹	Progress on Commitments Identified in Norway's OGP Self-Assessment Report	Forward Looking? ²	OGP Relevant?	Is progress verifiable?
<p>Make use of the public information resources financed through public funds. In addition to the democratic aspect, free access to public data resources can stimulate the development of new business opportunities and innovation. In this connection, all state enterprises are required to make public data available so that it can be used by others, that is, it is published electronically in a user-friendly format.</p>	<p>All state enterprises are required to make public data available so that it can be used by others, that is, it is published electronically in a user-friendly format.</p>	Yes	Yes	No
<p>Develop a better system for the compilation and dissemination of official statistics on state resource use and results, known as StatRes.</p> <p>The main objectives of StatRes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More openness on the level of resources the state uses and the outcomes of this input • A better basis for analyses, management, and decisions, not least across sectors • To motivate state enterprises to improve their performance through greater visibility. <p>Public disclosure is a democratic right. StatRes is a democratic tool because it demonstrates the connection between the level of resources used and what this provides in the way of public services and results. StatRes is publicly accessible on the Internet. We are seeking to make it easier for users to use these data, and new information is published on an ongoing basis.</p>	<p>We are seeking to make it easier for users to use these data, and new information is published on an ongoing basis.</p>	Yes	Yes	No
<p>Users' opinions and experience of public services are important. Therefore we have initiated a major national survey to obtain open, accessible, and comparable information about the population's perception of public services over a period of time.</p> <p>The survey is administered to a sample of the population and includes both general questions and questions about specific public services such as education, culture, and the environment. Even though 94% responded that they are satisfied with Norway as a place to live and work, there are challenges. For example, 58% are of the opinion that the public sector wastes resources. The results of the survey are made public, and the data are freely available for further use.</p>	<p>A second survey was to be carried out for in autumn 2012, to assess trends over time for specific services and agencies/entities. We have required all state enterprises to conduct user surveys at regular intervals. The results of these surveys are to be made public. One of the challenges is to get the agencies to follow up the surveys, not least in dialogue with users.⁵</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes

Norway's OGP Action Plan Commitments Identified by OGP Partner Global Integrity ¹	Progress on Commitments Identified in Norway's OGP Self-Assessment Report	Forward Looking? ²	OGP Relevant?	Is progress verifiable?
<i>Measures to Promote Gender Equality and Women's Full Participation</i>				
Follow up the recommendations of the white paper on equal pay for men and women (debated in the Parliament on 12 April 2011), for example, to ensure that the social partners responsible for value creation follow up. Equal pay for work of equal value is a fundamental principle of an open democracy.	The pay gap persists in a labour market where women and men are almost equally qualified and educated. Today, differences in length of work force participation, education, and age explain a minor part of the pay gap. It is, therefore, an issue of political concern that we still have a pay gap on the average for the entire EU area.	Yes	No	No
Ensure that more women apply for top posts in the private sector (the quota system cannot be used when employing new personnel); we must make use of everyone's talents, and this must be part of corporate social responsibility (CSR).	The self-assessment did not include information about this commitment.	Yes	No	No
Ensure the further development of local democracy where there are still very few women mayors or principal municipal executives. ⁶	The Government has developed a special programme to increase competence on and efforts towards the integration of the equality perspective in municipal policies and services.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Develop a gender equality programme together with all Norwegian municipalities as a measure in the forthcoming national, cross-sectoral gender equality action plan scheduled to be launched in autumn 2011.	Develop a gender equality programme together with all Norwegian municipalities as a measure in the forthcoming national, cross-sectoral gender equality action plan scheduled to be launched in autumn 2011.	Yes	No	Yes
Include immigrant women in the labour market by giving them information about their rights and pre-qualification programmes such as "Ny sjanse" (a new chance). ⁷	In the summer of 2013 a new measure, the Job Chance, was to be initiated. The goal is to increase the employment rate among immigrants, and the main target group is women who stay at home without supplementary benefits, and who are not attending any language or labour market training. The Job Chance initiative will be based on the experiences from the Second Chance project .	Yes	Yes	Yes
Address unfortunate gender stereotypes that have a tendency to spread. Use kindergartens, schools, the voluntary sector, the labour market and, not least, modern media.	The government has entered into dialogue with the advertising industry and the media to reduce the level of advertising that contributes to unattainable body ideals for young men and women, including retouched advertisements. The government has initiated a project to explore the need for compulsory labelling of retouched advertisements and the influence of such advertising compared with other "media."	Yes	No	No

Norway's OGP Action Plan Commitments Identified by OGP Partner Global Integrity ¹	Progress on Commitments Identified in Norway's OGP Self-Assessment Report	Forward Looking? ²	OGP Relevant?	Is progress verifiable?
Ensure that young people of both sexes have a genuine opportunity to influence decisions that affect their lives. This issue is now being examined by a government commission whose report was to be published in autumn 2011.	The national official report (NOU 2011:20) "Youth, Power and Participation," was delivered to the Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion in December 2011. National and local government, research institutions, youth organisations, and other parts of civil society were invited to give statements at a public hearing. BLD will continue follow up of the suggestions from the report, in close collaboration with other ministries and bodies of government.	Yes	No	Yes
Follow up national and international action plans to combat domestic violence, with a focus on the absence of violence as a prerequisite for women's rights and full participation in civic life and the labour market.	The old action plan against domestic violence, Turning Point, expired in 2011. In January 2012, the Government launched a fourth action plan against violence in close relationships. This plan was prepared in collaboration with four ministries. The 23 measures in the plan are based on the need to see the work against violence as an integrated, cross-sector perspective. A white paper on violence against women and domestic violence (the first in Norway) was to be presented to the Parliament in March 2013. The white paper will be followed by a new action plan for 2014–17.	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Transparency in the Management of Oil and Gas Revenues</i>				
The Government will follow up Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) implementation in years to come, in close cooperation with the multi-stakeholder consultative group. We will continue to support the Oslo-based international EITI Secretariat, and use development funds to support developing countries' work in various phases of their EITI implementation. Norway supports developing countries' efforts to increase transparency in the oil and gas sector directly through the EITI and via the World Bank, by supporting international NGOs such as Revenue Watch Institute (RWI), and through various measures under the Norwegian Oil for Development programme (OfD).	Transparency in the extractive sector is important, not least in many natural-resource-rich developing countries, but in principle the same transparency should apply to all sectors. Norway will continue to push – bilaterally and multilaterally – financial transparency and the fight against the secrecy promoted by tax havens and many financial centres, so damaging not only to poor countries with natural resources but to all countries and to good governance globally.	Yes	Yes	No

Norway's OGP Action Plan Commitments Identified by OGP Partner Global Integrity ¹	Progress on Commitments Identified in Norway's OGP Self-Assessment Report	Forward Looking? ²	OGP Relevant?	Is progress verifiable?
The Ministry of Finance participates actively in the IMF-coordinated International Forum on Sovereign Wealth Funds (IFSWF), which promotes transparency and good governance in such funds all over the world.	Transparency in the extractive sector is important, not least in many natural-resource-rich developing countries, but in principle the same transparency should apply to all sectors. Norway will continue to push – bilaterally and multilaterally – financial transparency and the fight against the secrecy promoted by tax havens and many financial centres, so damaging not only to poor countries with natural resources but to all countries and to good governance globally.	No	Yes	No
Norway will hold the Financial Action Task Force presidency from July 2012 to July 2013. Norway also participates actively in OECD efforts to fight tax evasion, with a particular focus on the role played by tax havens. We are also working in many arenas to promote greater transparency with regard to financial transactions as a means of combating illicit financial flows/money laundering.	Transparency in the extractive sector is important, not least in many natural-resource-rich developing countries, but in principle the same transparency should apply to all sectors. Norway will continue to push – bilaterally and multilaterally – financial transparency and the fight against the secrecy promoted by tax havens and many financial centres, so damaging not only to poor countries with natural resources but to all countries and to good governance globally.	No	Yes	No
Transparency is a key dimension of the Norwegian Government's recently adopted Action Plan Against Economic Crime (March 2011). The action plan discusses country-for-country reporting. This is a measure designed to increase transparency and involves requiring that multinational companies and enterprises include tax information when they publish their annual accounts. This measure could supplement other, more specific measures designed to ensure that correct revenues are made subject to taxation in different countries. The Commission of the European Union is currently considering whether such a requirements should be introduced in the European Union. As set out in the action plan, the Government is willing to consider introducing such requirements in Norway, either in connection with new EU legislation in this area, or on an independent basis.	Transparency in the extractive sector is important, not least in many natural-resource-rich developing countries, but in principle the same transparency should apply to all sectors. Norway will continue to push – bilaterally and multilaterally – financial transparency and the fight against the secrecy promoted by tax havens and many financial centres, so damaging not only to poor countries with natural resources but to all countries and to good governance globally.	No	Yes	Yes

¹ OGP is supported by several institutional branches. A small support unit and a networking mechanism together carry out basic analysis and support on OGP action plans. The nongovernmental organization, Global Integrity, serves as the networking mechanism until the end of 2013. Global Integrity analysed the Norwegian OGP action plan identifying 18 commitments and tagging them with subject headings.

² The IRM team in Washington and the IRM researchers in Norway analysed these 18 commitments in terms of (1) whether the commitment was forward looking, (2) whether it was OGP relevant, and (3) whether it was specific enough to be verifiable.

³ The self-assessment marked this commitment as "new" even though the action plan included a similar commitment.

⁴ The self-assessment cited the same commitment to address implementation of both "The Plain Language Project" and "The re-use of public sector information." (pp. 3-4)

⁵ This commitment is well underway. Information on the survey and survey results may be found at <http://www.difi.no/artikkel/2013/06/innbyggerundersokelsen-2013-er-naa-offentlig>

⁶ Of Norway's commitments, this one best fulfilled the OGP guidelines. Still, as the self-assessment shows, action on this commitment is pending.

⁷ The commitment implementation schedule falls outside of the assessment period for this IRM report.



Independent Reporting Mechanism
Open Government Partnership
c/o OpenGovHub
1889 F Street NW
2nd Floor
Washington, DC 20006

Open
Government
Partnership

INDEPENDENT
REPORTING MECHANISM