

**Denmark: 2014-2016 End of term Report**

To raise the impact of OGP in Denmark, the government can broaden the inclusivity of the OGP process and deepen in-person engagement with a more diverse group of stakeholders. Future action plans may include commitments regarding political party financing, lobbying regulations and access to information 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 1 October 2013 to 30 June 2016.

Since Denmark joined in 2011, its OGP process has been coordinated by the Ministry of Finance's Agency for Digitisation (AFD) through one lead official, who is also responsible for other tasks not related to OGP. Consultation for Denmark's second action plan was carried out using an online platform. The hearing received 27 responses from various public offices, NGOs and citizens, but no in-person consultations were held before or during commitment implementation.

Denmark is a highly decentralized society based on extensive local self-governance. Thus, a large part of civil participation and open government activity is carried out at local and regional levels, without necessarily involving central government. For further context on the Danish Open Government implementation procedure, please refer to the IRM mid-term report available on the OGP website.

At the time of writing (September 2016) Denmark had neither begun development of a third national action plan nor provided a self-assessment for the end of term evaluation.

<b>Table 1: At a Glance</b>		
	<b>Mid-term</b>	<b>End-of-term</b>
Number of commitments	16	
<b>Level of completion</b>		
Completed	9	10
Substantial	5	4
Limited	1	2
Not started	1	0
<b>Number of commitments with:</b>		
Clear relevance to OGP values	10	
Transformative potential impact	0	
Substantial or complete implementation	14	14
<b>All three (⊕)</b>	0	0
<b>Did it open government?</b>	Major	1
	Outstanding	0
<b>Moving forward</b>		
Number of commitments carried over to next action plan:	Unknown	

**Consultation with civil society during implementation**

Countries participating in the OGP follow a process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan and during implementation. The table below summarizes how the Danish government followed OGP guidelines for consultations during implementation.

Table 2: Action Plan Consultation Process

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the government meet this requirement
During Implementation	Regular forum for consultation during implementation?	No. Not during second year of implementation.
	Consultations: Open or Invitation-only?	N/A
	Consultations on IAP2 spectrum <sup>1</sup>	N/A

For development of the action plan, the Agency for Digitisation (AFD) issued a formal advance notice 33 days prior to consultation clearly indicating the format and timeline for public consultations and providing relevant government contact information.

Of the 27 hearing answers received during the online open consultation held on the public portal, 19 could be characterized as coming from public offices or public actors, 6 from NGOs and 2 from private citizens. The participating NGOs have divergent focus areas ranging from transparency advocates (Åbenhedstinget), to environment/sustainability (Green Cross). The breadth of NGO responses was mirrored by those from public offices including universities, municipalities, ministries and government councils.

While the Danish government then consulted many stakeholders in developing the action plan, it employed no mechanism to ensure that input received would influence its final decisions on commitments. No in-person consultations were held during action plan development. Though the Danish government’s midterm self-assessment does indicate that it held informal meetings with citizens and interested parties, these were not documented. Moreover, those meetings did not relate to the entire action plan, but rather to individual commitments or specific parts of commitments. For example, various NGOs were invited to a set of meetings pertaining to Commitment #5 on including the elderly in the transition to digital communication – but those meetings were not documented and thus lack evidence of participants, agenda and outcome. The IRM researcher suggests documenting such informal meetings in the future. As the second Danish action plan was not meant to cover more than one year, but ended up being extended into a second year, no civil society consultation was held during the second year of implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> IAP2 Spectrum information available here [http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/Foundations\\_Course/IAP2\\_P2\\_Spectrum.pdf](http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/Foundations_Course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum.pdf)

## Progress on commitment implementation

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

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

Based on these criteria, at the midterm report, Denmark’s action plan contained 0 starred commitments. At the end of term, based on the changes in the level of completion, Denmark’s action plan contained 0 starred commitments.

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

Finally, the graphs in this section present an excerpt of the wealth of data the IRM collects during its progress reporting process. For the full dataset for Denmark, see the OGP Explorer at [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 with significant progress may appear relevant and ambitious, but fail to open government. In an attempt to capture these subtleties and, more importantly, actual changes in government practice, the IRM introduced a new variable ‘did it open government?’ in End-of-Term Reports. This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice has changed as a result of the commitment’s implementation. This can be contrasted to the IRM’s “Starred commitments” which describe *potential* impact.

IRM Researchers assess the “Did it open government?” regarding each of the OGP values that this commitment is relevant to. It asks, did it stretch the government practice beyond business as usual? The scale for assessment is as follows:

- Worsened: worsens government openness because 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
- Outstanding: a reform that has transformed ‘business as usual’ in the relevant policy area by opening government.

To assess this variable, researchers establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan. They then assess outcomes *as implemented* for changes in government openness. Readers should keep in mind limitations. IRM End-of-Term Reports are prepared only a few months after the implementation cycle is completed. The variable focus on outcomes that can be observed on government openness practices at the end of the two-year implementation period. The report and the variable do not intend to assess impact because of the complex methodological implications and the time-frame of the report.

**Table 3. Overview: assessment of progress by commitment**

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm EOT		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency &	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worse	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Service check of local government consultations			x			x				x						X		x			
2. Promote advance voting				x		x				x						X		x			
3. Promote participation of first time voters				x		x				x						X		x			
4. Meet accessibility requirements for self-service solutions		x			x		x			x					x		x				
5. Develop plan for digital inclusion	x				x		x			x						X		x			
6. Launch digital communication campaign			x		Unclear					x						X		x			
7. Support modernisation of public sector		x			Unclear					x					x		x				
8. Advance the "Free Municipality" project	x				Unclear					x					x		X		x		
9. Recommendations from Growth teams		x			Unclear						x					X		x			
10. Strategy for digital welfare		x			Unclear						x		Unclear				x				
11. Implementation of new Volunteer Charter		x				x				x						X				x	
12. Improve Open Data Innovation Strategy		x			x					x						X			x		
13. Develop the data distributor		x			x		x			x					x			x			
14. Open government camp 2013				x		x				x						X		x			

VERSION FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLY: DO NOT CITE

15. Open government assistance to Myanmar			x	Unclear					x					x							
16. Opening key public datasets	x			x			x			x			x					x			

### **General overview of commitments**

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. End of term reports assess an additional metric, 'did it open government?' The tables that follow below summarize the completion level at the end of term and progress on this metric. Note for commitments that were already complete at the midterm, the report will provide a summary of the progress report findings but focus on analysis of the 'did it open government?' variable. For additional information on completed commitments, please see the Denmark IRM mid-term progress report.

The second Danish action plan is structured around five themes:

- local democracy and participation;
- full digital communication – and inclusion;
- new forms of collaboration and involvement;
- open data - innovation, transparency and enhanced efficiency;
- promoting open government;

The original Danish second action plan was intended to cover one year - through the end of 2014. Since this made Denmark out of sync with the other OGP member countries belonging to cohort 2, the Danish government opted to extend the second action plan by one year and to add two further commitments to the action plan (Commitments #15 and #16). Unlike other commitments, these final two do not belong in any thematic category, as is reflected in the following sections. The division of commitments by thematic category also does not reflect the division in the IRM midterm report. The IRM researcher instead opted to follow the same thematic division used during the IRM mid-term evaluation – however all commitments are clearly numbered and can thus be cross-referenced among all these documents.

**Commitment I. Service check of local government consultations**

**Commitment Text:**

The Government will set up a committee that is meant to implement a service check of statutory local government consultations and which is to look into the possibility of adjusting the rules governing local government consultations so as to plan for more expedient involvement of citizens and the business community in local government decisions without compromising on citizens’ civil rights

Responsible institution: None specified

Supporting institution(s): None specified

Start date: Not specified                      End date: Not specified

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

**Commitment Aim:**

This commitment entailed establishing a committee to perform a service check on local government consultations. The committee was established by the Ministry of Economics and the Interior and headed by its previous undersecretary (undersecretary from 2001-2007), Ib Valsborg. Committee members included individuals from several ministries and local administrations, but none from the private sector or NGOs.

**Status**

**This commitment was complete at mid-term**

The committee ended its work in 2014 and released a report in March 2015 that gave specific recommendations on how to conduct municipal and local government hearings. For further information, please see the IRM mid-term progress report.<sup>1</sup>

**Did it open government?**

**Civic participation: Did not change**

Investigating the functioning and status quo of local government consultations, via a committee tasked with recommending possible improvements to the consultation process, does not inherently generate policy changes per se.

The report released by the committee<sup>2</sup> gave specific recommendations, such as showing restraint when adapting new local hearing procedures (recommendation 1, p. 11) and leaving the decision on whether to hold public hearings up to municipalities (recommendation 4, p. 11). The report indicates that local government hearings are already being performed to an acceptable standard - it posits that

no change in municipal procedures is needed. Thus there is no evidence of any policy changes at the national level.

### **Carried forward?**

Given that Denmark has not yet developed a third national action plan, it is uncertain whether this commitment will be carried forward. If it is carried forward, the following recommendations apply:

- When establishing review committees in the future, the government should include formal and direct participation of civil society and other local stakeholders.
- The government can provide guidelines and standards for local level consultation regulations;
- The government can enforce and implement the committees' recommendations.
- Inclusion of municipal and local actors in the consultation process for future action plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Service check of local hearings, March 2015, Ministry of Economics and the Interior, <https://bibliotek.dk/da/work/870970-basis:51656725>



## Commitment 2 and 3: Advance voting and First-time voters

### 2. Call on all municipalities to facilitate advance voting

With a view to encouraging many young first-time voters to use their right to vote, a letter has been circulated to mayors throughout the country urging them to make it possible to vote in advance at e.g. educational establishments and in other places that are frequented by young people and other citizens on a daily basis.

The intention has been to make the option of advance voting more visible and accessible for citizens in the hope that it will have a positive impact on turnout.

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: Not specified .....

End Date: Not specified

### 3. Letter of invitation to first-time voters urging them to vote

Prior to the forthcoming local and regional elections in November 2013, a letter of invitation will be sent to some of the first-time voters in these elections. The letter will provide information about the elections and urge the new voters to cast their vote.

Subsequently, the effect of this effort will be analysed as part of an election turnout project at Copenhagen University with a view to assessing how the message has affected the first-time voters.

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: Copenhagen University

Start Date: Not specified .....

End Date: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?						
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	End of term	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding	
2: Promote Advance Voting				x	x					x						x		x					
3: Promote first time voters				x	x					x						x		x					

### Commitment Aim:

Currently, individual municipalities are responsible for promoting civic engagement - some local governments give it a higher priority than others. In a bid to address declining voter turn-out for regional government elections (Commitment #2), the Danish government circulated a letter among mayors, urging them to allow for early voting due to the volatility of the first-time voter demographic.<sup>1</sup>

To fulfill the same goals, Commitment 3 entailed sending a letter to 100 000 randomly selected first-time voters encouraging them to participate in the 2013 regional government elections.

### **Status**

#### **This commitment was complete at mid-term**

According to the mid-term self-assessment, many municipalities accepted the call and organized advanced voting by postal vote at institutions for education, local libraries, and other public institutions.

The government published two reports in June 2014, with detail regarding the execution of this commitment and samples of the letters distributed. For further information, please see the IRM mid-term progress report<sup>2</sup>.

### **Did it open government?**

#### **Commitment 2**

##### **Civic participation: Marginal**

Following the commitment implementation, two research reports<sup>3</sup> from Copenhagen University showed a 10 percent increase in young voter turnout - however, the reports also found that there was a substantial drop in voter turnout among citizens who are not ethnically Danish. Participation of the latter demographic was already lower than average. The reports thus indicate that the commitment had a positive effect in terms of increasing voter turnout among young people, but only for one subset of the target demographic. As they are based on registration data from Statistics Denmark, the reports do not address the question of why some voters stayed at home.

#### **Commitment 3**

##### **Civic participation: Did not change**

Commitment 3 aims to increase voter turnout in local elections by sending a letter to 100 000 first-time voters, urging them to vote. A Copenhagen University analysis of the effect of this measure on voter turnout concluded that the letter increased participation of first time voters.<sup>4</sup>

In both commitments, the IRM researcher did not find evidence to suggest that systematic approaches were taken to promote participation in electoral process outside these two very specific one-off activities. Also, no local election has been held since the midterm report, resulting in the commitments being evaluated as “did not change.”

### **Carried forward?**

Given that Denmark has not yet developed a third national action plan, it is uncertain whether this commitment will be carried forward in the form of similar letters before future regional elections. As evidenced by the survey performed by the IRM researcher in Denmark’s midterm report,<sup>5</sup> stakeholders call for these commitments to be included in future action plans. If they are, the IRM researcher recommends taking steps to reach non-ethnic Danish voters. Moreover, the subsequent analyses of the effectiveness of the letters in terms of increasing voter turnout should attempt to go beyond mere statistical results to investigate the *motivation* behind voter turnout behavior via e.g. surveys and qualitative interviews.

---

<sup>1</sup> Electoral turnout for young people peaks immediately after their enfranchisement, then falls sharply, [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/57658/1/democraticaudit.com-Electoral\\_turnout\\_for\\_young\\_people\\_peaks\\_immediately\\_after\\_their\\_enfranchisement\\_then\\_falls\\_sharply.pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/57658/1/democraticaudit.com-Electoral_turnout_for_young_people_peaks_immediately_after_their_enfranchisement_then_falls_sharply.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15, <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/denmark/irm>

<sup>3</sup> Centre for Voting and Parties, *Hvem Stemte Og Hvem Blev Hjemme?* [Who Voted and Who Stayed Home?] by Yosef Bhatti, Jens Olav Dahigaard, Jonas Hedegaard Hansen, and Kasper Møller Hansen (Report, Copenhagen, 2014), 52, [Danish] <http://bit.ly/20gQxCL>

<sup>4</sup> Center for Voting and Parties, *Kan Man Øge Valgdeltagelsen? [Is it possible to increase voter participation?]* by Yosef Bhatti, Jens Olav Dahlgard, Jonas Hedegaard Hansen, and Kasper Møller Hansen (Report, Copenhagen, 2014), <http://bit.ly/1RBspsR>

<sup>5</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

## **Commitments 4, 5, and 6: Digital communication and inclusion**

### **Commitment text**

#### **4: User friendliness requirements regarding digital self-service solutions**

*Up to 2015, there will be more and more areas where citizens are to encounter public authorities by going digital. [...] The Government will facilitate the encounter with public authorities to maximum extent. Therefore, work is in progress to make self-service solutions as user friendly as possible - among other things by creating conditions for better data quality and by establishing coherence in the systems. [...]*

*For this purpose, the Government has drawn up a development guide for self-service solutions with 24 minimum requirements regarding user friendliness and accessibility in public self-service solutions when suppliers are to develop or revise a solution. [...] All self-service solutions that become mandatory [...] must meet all the requirements listed in the development guide regarding user friendliness and accessibility.*

#### **5: Plan for inclusion during the transition to digital communication**

*Public authorities' plan for inclusion covers a broad spectrum: from ensuring that help is integrated in the public self-service solutions to preparing and training the employees who encounter citizens on a day-to-day basis. The citizens who need help will find that it is provided at citizen service centres, at libraries, and in readily accessible data rooms nationwide that provide computer assistance to senior citizens.*

*Focus is at the same time also placed on stimulating citizens to explore the digital tools by showing examples of how digital technologies can open up an altogether new world of opportunities. The effort is planned and implemented in collaboration with e.g. the organisations representing older persons and the libraries that contribute to extending the reach of the work.*

#### **6: Common public sector digital communication campaign**

*A comprehensive common public sector digital communication campaign will be launched in November 2013 with a view to supporting the effort to bring everybody on board the "digital express". The idea of the campaign is to place focus on the fact that help is available.*

*The website "Learn more about ICT" ([laermereomit.dk](http://laermereomit.dk)) provides contact information about the many organisations, e.g. libraries, organisations representing older persons and adult education associations that offer ICT courses for special target groups. Instruction videos and other help and support are also available to citizens.*

*Danes will experience the campaign in the press and mass media, and all public authorities will have material at their disposal to be able to communicate the messages directly during encounters with citizens.*

*Responsible Institution: None specified for any commitment*

*Supporting Institutions: Commitment 4: None specified*

*Commitment 5: Senior Citizens Associations;*

*Commitment 6: Senior Citizens Associations and organizations having ICT courses for special target groups*

*Start date: Commitment 6 - November 2013*

*End date: Not specified*

*Editorial Note: The full text of the commitment can be found in the action plan*

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
4: User-friendliness requirements		X			x			x		x					x		x				
5: Plan for inclusion to digital communication	x				x			x		x						x	x				
6: Digital communication campaign			x		Unclear					x						x	x				

**Commitment Aim:**

Commitments 4, 5 and 6 are part of the national IT strategy.<sup>1</sup>

These commitments aim to improve the quality and user experience of self-service solutions in public IT. This is particularly important as more and more services can only be done online.

**Status**

**Commitment 4:**

**Mid-term: Substantial**

The government published the user friendliness requirements and the guide on the open government website. However, the Agency for Digitisation (AFD) recognized that more work needed to be done for all mandatory self-service solutions to meet the minimum requirements stipulated in the guide and in the commitment language. For further information, please see the IRM mid-term progress report.<sup>2</sup>

**End of term: Substantial**

No additional progress on this commitment has been made since the midterm progress report, but Denmark’s initial IT strategy named eGovernment 2011-2015 has been replaced with a new strategy named Digital Strategy 2016-2020. The new strategy also sets out a goal to develop a “user friendly and simple digital public sector.”<sup>3</sup> According to the government, this new strategy is the next logical step of user- friendliness and designing the services to fit the needs of citizens and companies. One of the commitments in the new strategy is to develop more cohesive user journeys, which will provide

more user-friendly and coordinated online-services to citizens and companies. Another commitment seeks to promote better and more cohesive welfare services, which will provide citizens with more cohesive service when responsibility is split between authorities.

**Commitments 5 and 6 were completed at the time of the mid-term evaluation.**

As described in Denmark's self-assessment regarding Commitment #5, the AFD established a National Network for Digital Inclusion in 2015 that outlines citizens' challenges with digital communication. The government organized events for target groups - including senior citizens, the disabled, youth, and immigrants – to inform the inclusion plan. As part of the inclusion plan, citizens now have access to online training to get better acquainted with the portal (borger.dk) and self-service solutions.<sup>4</sup> More details about this commitment's implementation can be found in the IRM Progress Report 2014-15.<sup>1</sup>

Fulfillment of Commitment #6 was a large-scale digital communication campaign between August 2014 and January 2015, as reported in the IRM progress report 2014-15.<sup>5</sup> The government worked in close cooperation with local authorities on this comprehensive media-based campaign (online, press and outdoor advertising) as well as conducting Generation Rallies to encourage digital communication with public authorities.

### **Did it open government?**

#### **Commitment 4**

**Access to information: Did not change**

Several stakeholders emphasized that this commitment, along with several other commitments in the Danish action plan, conflates eGovernment with open government. This commitment aims to improve user services, but not to make them more open or transparent. A better or user-friendlier service does not ensure better access to more information. The commitment's relationship to open government is thus not clear and as a result there is no change with respect to opening government.

#### **Commitment 5**

**Access to information: Did not change**

Echoing the previous commitment, this commitment is part of Denmark's national IT strategy spanning 2011-2015. The inclusion plan, aimed at bringing stakeholders into the digitization process to improve individuals' access to technology, was meant to ensure that the elderly are not left behind - that would worsen the intergenerational "digital divide." The information and services in question were available offline before the introduction of e-government, but are now only available online - there is no *additional* information and the level of access is the same, thus there is no change in access to information.

As stated in the IRM progress report,<sup>6</sup> various groups opposed to e-government (including the DaneAge Association, the senior citizens group Ældresagen, and leading Danish newspapers) had argued that making government services available only online would exclude some citizens from accessing important government information.

#### **Commitment 6**

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic Participation: Did not change**

**Public Accountability: Did not change**

The digital communication campaign to increase awareness of the importance of ICT and ICT training represents a laudable effort to reach out to stakeholders, but is not relevant to OGP values and did not change government openness.

---

<sup>1</sup> Denmark IRM Progress Report 2014-15 <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/denmark/irm>

### **Carried forward?**

User friendliness of public IT infrastructure is part of Denmark's next national IT strategy, including the following focus areas:<sup>7</sup>

- Focus area 9.2, "digitization for everyone," outlines strategies for educating children in the use of ITC as well as increasing knowledge of ITC to citizens and companies. The focus area is part of a 'security and trust' track within the IT strategy.
- Track 2 of the national IT strategy<sup>8</sup> characterizes public ITC as a motor for growth, and aims to improve the ITC-environment for the business community, increase efficiency within the supply sector, and use public data as a motor for growth.

---

<sup>1</sup> The national IT strategy for 2011-2015, AFD, <http://www.digst.dk/Strategier/Digitaliseringsstrategi-2011-15>

<sup>2</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Focus Area 1, A user friendly and foreseeable public sector, AFD, <http://www.digst.dk/Strategier/Initiativer/Let-hurtigt-og-god-kvalitet/Fokusomraade-1>

<sup>4</sup> Online training in borger.dk: <https://www.ekurser.nu/kursus/185>

<sup>5</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Focus Area 9, Digitization for everyone, AFD, <http://www.digst.dk/Strategier/Initiativer/Tryghed-og-tillid/Fokusomraade-9>

<sup>8</sup> Track 2 of the national IT strategy, AFD, <http://www.digst.dk/Strategier/Initiativer/Gode-vilkaar-for-vaekst>

**Commitments 7 and 8: Modernization of the public sector & free municipalities**

**Commitment 7. Modernization of the public sector & establishment of a center for public innovation**

*Together with employers and employees from the public labour market, the Government has adopted seven principles for collaboration on the modernisation of the public sector. The principles are to promote a performance of public tasks and a culture with a focus on trust, collaboration, results, efficiency, innovation, quality and professionalism. At the same time, these principles serve the purpose of supporting the many good initiatives across sectors and authorities that rethink and improve the public sector.*

*The adoption of the principles will be followed up on in 2014-2016 by initiatives that are to contribute to spreading the principles and supporting modernisation and innovation in the public sector. The initiatives comprise the development of new forms of governance with a focus on trust and collaboration as well as the establishment of a centre for public innovation that is to support the spread and embeddedness of innovation across the public sector. The centre is also expected to strengthen employee and user driven innovation in the public sector.*

**8: “Free Municipality” pilot projects**

*Known as “Free Municipality” pilot projects, these projects are part of the Government’s work on the modernisation and innovation of the public sector. Lessons learned from free municipality pilot projects are to contribute to the Government’s general reform of the public sector with a focus on trust, professionalism, leadership and deregulation, which are significant parameters for a user-orientated sector.*

*Nine municipalities are free municipalities. They have been granted exemption from government rules and documentation requirements for the purpose of testing new ways of doing things. The objective is to find smarter, more resource-efficient and less bureaucratic solutions.*

Responsible Institution: None specified for any commitment

Supporting Institutions: Commitment 7: none specified;

Commitment 8: The nine “free municipalities”

Start date: Not specified.....

End date: Not specified



Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?					
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding	
7. Modernisation of public sector		x			Unclear					x					x			x				
8. Free Municipalities	x				Unclear					x					x			x				

**Commitment Aim:**

Commitment 7 set out seven principles for modernization of the private sector,<sup>1</sup> such as factoring citizens’ resources into public services. A series of follow up initiatives as well as the creation of a new Centre for Public Innovation followed.

Commitment 8 predates the action plan,<sup>2</sup> and entails a series of pilot projects held in “free municipalities.”<sup>3</sup> These municipalities have been granted exemption from government rules and documentation requirements for testing new ways of doing things in order to find smarter, more resource-efficient and less bureaucratic solutions. There were nine “free municipalities” in the period 2012-2015, and results from their experience will be included in future reforms of the public sector.

**Status**

**Commitment 7:**

**Mid-term: Substantial**

As remarked in the IRM progress report, this commitment is vaguely worded, resulting in significant scope for interpretation to what exactly the commitment is attempting to achieve. Nevertheless, the IRM researcher finds this commitment to be substantially completed.

The evaluation of the adopted principles and implementation of initiatives to spread the principles was still on going during the first-year assessment. As noted in the IRM Progress Report<sup>4</sup> the government had conducted governance workshops to develop new governance models focused on trust, collaboration, and civil engagement. It also established a Center for Public Sector Innovation that produced the world’s first Public Sector Innovation Statistic.

**End of term: Substantial**

This commitment has not seen further implementation since midterm evaluation. Since the IRM progress report, the Centre for Public Innovation has hosted many activities, meetings, and workshops (for a complete list, see the news on the COI-website<sup>5</sup>), however it is unclear how many

of these pertain to this commitment. Together, the work of the Centre for Public Innovation and the adoption of the seven principles are an on-going process, scheduled for conclusion in 2019.<sup>6</sup>

### **Commitment 8:**

#### **Mid-term: Substantial**

According to the Danish government's mid-term self-assessment report, municipalities piloted 250 experimental approaches to almost all municipal tasks. Examples include beginning foreign language instruction in earlier grades of schools, or indeed in kindergarten, and new ways of welcoming citizens into job service functions. For further information, please see the IRM mid-term report.<sup>7</sup> A midterm evaluation of the experimental pilot projects performed by Rambøll and released in January 2014 confirmed that implementation was advancing according to the specified timeline.<sup>8</sup>

#### **End of term: Complete**

The period for the free municipalities ended in 2015, the commitment is now considered complete. The Ministry of Social Affairs and the Interior announced that the participating municipalities would publish self-evaluations of their experiments by 30 April 2016.<sup>9</sup> Only Fredensborg Kommune<sup>10</sup> had published such a report at the time of writing, and there is no aggregated assessment like the evaluation performed by Rambøll.

#### **Did it open government?**

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic Participation: Did not change**

**Public Accountability: Did not change**

Neither of the commitments are eligible for the "did it open government" question, a neither of them had any OGP value relevance.

Commitment 7 aims to establish the Centre for Public Innovation, have a series of activities and adopt seven principles for innovation in public offices. However, as implemented it remained unclear how the commitment is relevant to OGP values. As noted in the end of term completion, it is also unclear what relation the activities held at the COI, have to the commitment. Since the adoption of the seven principles is still on-going, any effects or indication of changes in government practice is hard to determine. Especially, given the unclear relevance to any of OGP values.

Commitment 8 aims to perform a series of experiments in the "Free Municipalities", but it does not specify how these experiments were to be adopted into policy on the national or local level. During the period the pilot project lasts, "free municipalities" are allowed to be exempt from complying with policy or legislation in order to find smarter, more resource-efficient and less bureaucratic solutions. As noted in the IRM progress report the relevance of this commitment, as written, to OGP values is unclear.<sup>11</sup> From desk research and interviews with government officials responsible for commitment implementation, the IRM researcher has not found concrete evidence of policy changes. There is no evidence that the experiments conducted by free municipalities in Commitment #8 changed how government discloses information, opens spaces for participation, or is held accountable. Since the commitment is at the local level, it is beyond the scope of this research to examine each action.

#### **Carried forward?**

According information found on the COI website,<sup>12</sup> activities of the Centre for Public Innovation will continue until 2019.

A new free municipality project was announced spanning 2016-2019,<sup>13</sup> and 43 municipalities have applied to conduct this next round of municipal experiments.<sup>14</sup> In late August 2016, the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Interior postponed the appointment of new free municipalities.<sup>15</sup>

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Seven principles for public innovation, COI, <http://coi.dk/om-os/7-principper/>
- <sup>2</sup> <http://www.kl.dk/Fagomrader/Okonomi-og-dokumentation/styring/Frikommuneforsog/De-9-frikommuner/>
- <sup>3</sup> Denmark's Self-Assessment Report to OGP, September 2015, <http://goo.gl/GUIr6a>
- <sup>4</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15, [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)
- <sup>5</sup> News from COI, <http://coi.dk/nyheder/>
- <sup>6</sup> COI to continue their work, COI, <http://coi.dk/nyheder/2016/coi-fortsætter-arbejdet/>
- <sup>7</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15, [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)
- <sup>8</sup> Midterm evaluation of the free municipalities, January 2014, Rambøll, [http://www.kl.dk/ImageVaultFiles/id\\_75799/cf\\_202/Tv-rg-ende\\_rapport\\_-\\_Midtvejsevaluering\\_af\\_frikomm.PDF](http://www.kl.dk/ImageVaultFiles/id_75799/cf_202/Tv-rg-ende_rapport_-_Midtvejsevaluering_af_frikomm.PDF)
- <sup>9</sup> Free Municipalities 2012-2015, Ministry of Social and the Interior, [http://sim.dk/frikommuneforsog-ii/frikommuneforsog-i-\(2012-2015\).aspx](http://sim.dk/frikommuneforsog-ii/frikommuneforsog-i-(2012-2015).aspx)
- <sup>10</sup> Evaluation of free municipality trial, Fredensborg Kommune, [https://www.fredensborg.dk/Admin/Public/Download.aspx?file=Files%2FFiles%2FKommunen%2FFrikommune%2FFrikommune\\_Evalueringsrapport\\_endeligt+udkast.pdf](https://www.fredensborg.dk/Admin/Public/Download.aspx?file=Files%2FFiles%2FKommunen%2FFrikommune%2FFrikommune_Evalueringsrapport_endeligt+udkast.pdf)
- <sup>11</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15, [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)
- <sup>12</sup> COI to continue their work, COI, <http://coi.dk/nyheder/2016/coi-fortsætter-arbejdet/>
- <sup>13</sup> Free Municipalities 2016-2019, Local Government Denmark, <http://www.kl.dk/Okonomi-og-administration/Okonomi-og-dokumentation/styring/Frikommuneforsog/>
- <sup>14</sup> Free Municipalities 2016-2019, Local Government Denmark, <http://www.kl.dk/Okonomi-og-administration/Okonomi-og-dokumentation/styring/Frikommuneforsog/Frikommuneforsog-II/>
- <sup>15</sup> Free Municipality appointment delayed, Ministry of Social and the Interior: <http://sim.dk/nyheder/nyhedsarkiv/2016/aug/udpegning-af-frikommunenetvaerk-udskydes.aspx>

**Commitment 9. Recommendations from growth teams**

**Commitment Text:**

The Government has set up eight growth teams which, in close dialogue with the business community, are to carry out an examination of growth conditions in business areas where Danish companies have international competitive power. The objective is to identify specific measures that can improve the companies’ productivity and development opportunities for the purpose of contributing to growth and employment in Denmark.

Against the background of recommendations from the various growth teams, the Government will present specific initiatives for how the recommendations can be implemented. The business community and stakeholders will be involved in the process on an ongoing basis and will also be permanent sparring partners when the Government’s growth plans are to be carried out. In addition, the business community has actively assumed responsibility for implementing specific growth plan initiatives.

Responsible institution: None specified

Supporting institution(s): The business community

Start date: Not specified                      End date: Not specified

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

**Commitment Aim:**

Commitment 9 feeds into Denmark’s overall Growth Plan aimed at strengthening the country’s business environment and attracting international investments to decrease unemployment and improve living standards. The growth teams predate the second action plan and have been a part of Denmark’s innovation strategy since 2012.

The growth teams are composed of different stakeholders from public administration, the private sector, various associations and academia. The growth team on ICT and digital growth, for instance is composed of board members and CEOs of major companies as well as of renowned think tank figures.<sup>1</sup>

**Status**

**Mid-term: Complete**

This commitment was fully implemented by the mid-term progress report.

The last of the eight growth teams concluded its work in 2014. Recommendations from these teams were incorporated into individual growth plans.<sup>2</sup> In 2014, the government released an “Agreement on Growth Package 2014,” which constitutes the follow-up on the growth teams’ recommendations as well as those of a productivity commission - it aims to reduce the cost of doing business and boost

productivity in Denmark.<sup>3</sup> This was the second Danish growth plan<sup>4</sup> - the third had been released by the time of writing.<sup>5</sup> For further information, please see the IRM mid-term progress report.<sup>6</sup>

### **Did it open government?**

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic Participation: Did not change**

**Public Accountability: Did not change**

As this commitment does not pertain to any OGP values, no relevance coding has been performed for the “did it open government” question. However, several recommendations from the growth teams were incorporated into new growth plans, which did result in policy changes.

To gain OGP value relevance, the commitment would have to be redrafted to include focus areas such as combating corruption – it would also need to have a specific public-facing mechanism.

### **Carried forward?**

As noted in the IRM progress report, the IRM researcher believes the government could use the growth teams concept as a new model for public engagement in policy making. New growth teams could:

- be organized around policy areas beyond business development, such as open data, freedom of information, transparency in local government, welfare, political party financing, etc.
- involve different stakeholders including, but not limited to, government officials, civil society organizations, and academics depending on the policy area
- produce reports with recommendations discussed formally by government officials and incorporated into government strategy
- develop clear guidelines explaining what mechanism or intervention would translate the growth teams’ information into consequences or change

---

<sup>1</sup>Growth teams for ICT and digital growth, Danish Business Authority, <https://erhvervsstyrelsen.dk/vaekstteam-ikt-og-digital-vaekst>

<sup>2</sup> Growth plan Denmark – strong businesses more jobs, Ministry of Finance, <http://www.fm.dk/publikationer/2013/vaekstplan-dk-staerke-virksomheder-flere-job/>

<sup>3</sup> Page 11, Report on Growth and Competitiveness 2014, The Danish Government, <https://www.evm.dk/english/~media/files/2014/14-10-10-report-on-growth.ashx>

<sup>4</sup> Danish Government presents new growth plan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.investindk.com/News-and-events/News/2014/Danish-Government-Presents-New-Growth-Plan>

<sup>5</sup> Growth and Development in Denmark, Danish Business Authority, <http://evm.dk/publikationer/2015/15-11-23-vaekst-og-udvikling-i-hele-danmark>

<sup>6</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15, [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

**Commitment 10. Strategy for Digital Welfare**

**Commitment Text:**

The Government, Local Government Denmark and Danish Regions have jointly drawn up a strategy for digital welfare. The strategy sets the course for the public sector’s work on digitisation and welfare technology in the social, health and educational areas.

The goal is that digital welfare services can be supplied more efficiently to make everyday life less cumbersome and improve the quality of life for citizens. The strategy includes 24 initiatives and runs until 2020. Up to the year 2020, new targets will be set and new initiatives launched on an ongoing basis.

Responsible institution: None specified

Supporting institution(s): Local Government Denmark and Danish Regions

Start date: September 2013                      End date: Year 2020

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

**Commitment Aim:**

Denmark’s Strategy for Digital Welfare was released in September 2013. It consists of 24 initiatives to be pursued through 2020, that each pertain to seven main topics: the spread of tele-medicine, effective collaboration among medical professionals, welfare technology for medical care, new digital possibilities for casework, digital learning and teaching, digital collaboration in teaching, and prerequisites for digital welfare. The strategy is to be augmented with new initiatives during the course of implementation.

**Status**

**Mid-term: Unclear**

The time span of the commitment is much longer than that of the action plan, so its status was labeled “unclear.” The public can view the implementation status of each of the 24 initiatives on the government website for the strategy,<sup>1</sup> but it remains uncertain what actions are still required for this commitment to be coded as complete. For further information, please see the IRM mid-term progress report.<sup>2</sup>

**End of term: Limited**

Based on the same interpretation of the commitment as midterm, the IRM-researcher has re-evaluated the completion status as limited. According to the government, the strategy for digital welfare was discontinued, and the remaining commitments absorbed in the Digital Strategy 2016-2020<sup>3</sup>. The government website on the strategy for digital welfare at the time of writing had not

been updated since April 2016. Nevertheless, in the months after the period of evaluation of this report, the government updated the content of the website, including the reports, and the analysis and initiative page.

The IRM researcher tried to contact the AFD<sup>4</sup> for an update on the digital welfare strategy and its' pertinence to open government, but the responsible official no longer works there. The team responsible for the digital welfare strategy also had not responded to the IRM researcher's request for information at the time of writing.

A follow-up interview with the lead official responsible for OGP (Cathrine Lippert) conducted in August 5<sup>th</sup> 2016, did not reveal any OGP relevant information on the digital welfare strategy.

### **Did it open government?**

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic Participation: Did not change**

**Public Accountability: Did not change**

Due to the lack of specificity in the commitment's language, the IRM researcher is unable to assess its relevance to OGP values - the commitment was thus not evaluated for the question "did it open government?" However, 75% of stakeholders interviewed by the IRM researcher report this commitment as being "important" or "very important" to welfare in Denmark.

The development of a digital welfare strategy has a moderate potential impact. The scope of the strategy is limited by its focus on digital improvements - had its implementation involved release of government-held information or involved citizens in the creation of a new policy structure, the commitment would have become relevant to OGP values and perhaps contributed to changes in government practice in areas of access to information or civic participation.

### **Carried forward?**

As Denmark has not yet developed its third action plan, it is unknown whether this commitment will be carried over. Given the topical differences of initiatives in the digital welfare strategy, as well as the commitment's promise to add initiatives during implementation, there is ample room for connecting the strategy with OGP values.

---

<sup>1</sup> Status on initiatives in the strategy for Digital Welfare, AFD (updated 23 August 2016), <http://www.digst.dk/Digital-velfaerd/Strategi-for-digital-velfaerd/Status-for-strategiens-initiativer.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.digst.dk/Digital-velfaerd/Strategi-for-digital-velfaerd>

<sup>4</sup> The IRM researcher sent an e-mail to [digitalvelfaerd@digst.dk](mailto:digitalvelfaerd@digst.dk) on 3 October 2016.

## Commitment I I: Volunteer Denmark and public sector integration

### Commitment Text:

Denmark's first charter for volunteering was formulated more than ten years ago. Since then, the voluntary sector and the public sector as well as our welfare society have changed very much. Today, we encounter volunteers on the Internet and at local government institutions. In spring 2013, the Government therefore initiated work on ways to innovate the charter for interaction between Volunteer Denmark/Associations Denmark and the public sector.

Following a phase of brainstorming including public consultation and a development phase including a camp for selected stakeholders, a new charter (?) has been formulated by a broadly composed working committee. The charter was published on July 1, 2013.

An implementation phase will follow in the course of autumn 2013 with regional meetings where the charter will constitute the basis for the launch of local dialogue between the public sector and Volunteer Denmark/Associations Denmark on how the visions of the charter can be transformed into reality and implemented locally.

Responsible institution: None specified

Supporting institution(s): None specified

Start date: Not specified

End date: Not specified

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

### Commitment Aim:

The new charter for interaction between volunteers and the public sector was released in July 2013. The purpose of this commitment was to hold five regional dialogue meetings to determine how the visions of the charter could be translated into actions and implemented at the local government level. The charter and all information that pertains to it are available at a government sponsored website (<http://www.frivilligcharter.dk/>).

### Status

#### Mid-term: Complete

The regional dialogue meetings included representatives of national and local government as well as a thorough representation from volunteering associations and other civil society organizations. In total, 440 people participated in these meetings. The results, released as a catalogue on 8 October 2014, included best practices for cooperating with volunteers in the public sector. According to the self-assessment report, completion of the commitment was marked by a closing status meeting of the



charter's work group held on 5 May 2015. For further information, please see the IRM mid-term progress report.<sup>1</sup>

### **Did it open government?**

#### **Civic participation: Did not change**

The new charter for volunteering in Denmark led to ten initiatives by the government that have subsequently been translated into policy area changes, indicating that revisions to the volunteer policy are serving their intended purpose.<sup>2</sup>

Although there have been no studies to determine whether these specific changes led to an improvement of the volunteering world in Denmark, reports from the Center for Voluntary Social Work funded by the Social Ministry of the Interior indicate that the situation in 2014 had greatly improved compared to 2012. According to those reports, 42% of the Danish population engage in volunteer work, compared to 35% in the year 2012.

The IRM researcher has since consulted organizations that work with volunteers.<sup>3</sup> These posit that the updated charter has not yet been fully implemented in the relevant agencies and public offices, such that its intended effect of making volunteer work easier has not yet been achieved. This is most likely because the addressed policy changes resulting from the initiative have not yet been fully disseminated in the relevant public offices. However, it may simply be too early to assess to what extent government practice has been affected by the new charter.

### **Carried forward?**

This commitment has been fully implemented. As the previous volunteer charter, which this commitment replaced, was more than 10 years old, it is not feasible to update this charter again during the course of the next action plan. If it is somehow updated, the IRM researcher recommends it pertain to OGP values, and the commitment be worded to clearly reflect this.

---

<sup>1</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> It has become easier to be a volunteer, Danish Radio, <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/regionale/syd/det-er-blevet-nemmere-vaere-frivillig>

<sup>3</sup> The organizations are The House of Volunteers and Center for Voluntary social work. Several other organizations (for instance The Volunteer Council and FriSes have been contacted; however they were unable to respond before handing in this report.

## Commitments 12 and 13: Open Data

### Commitment 12. “Open Data Innovation Strategy” (ODIS)

#### Commitment Text:

*In order to support the comprehensive effort to make public sector information accessible, the initiative known as “Open Data Innovation Strategy” is to contribute to drawing attention to the potential of public data and to making public data accessible. This is to be achieved, among other things, by assisting public authorities and institutions with guidance in the effort to make data available and by providing guidance on the legislation governing the area.*

*The initiative is, furthermore, to operate the public data catalogue, facilitate exchange of lessons learned, promote networking and collaboration between the public and private sectors that will re-use data, as well as document good examples of open data and the application of open data.*

### Commitment 13. Data Distributor for the distribution of basic data

#### Commitment Text:

*Up to 2016, the basic data registers will be consolidated in a common system a so called “Data Distributor”, which both public and private users of basic data will have the opportunity to benefit from. All common public sector basic data are to be distributed through the Data Distributor, which in the long term will be able to hold other public data than basic data.*

*Various dialogue and network activities regarding basic data are, furthermore, to contribute to encouraging authorities and companies to make use of the improved and free basic data, and to developing partnerships between public and private actors on the application of basic data.*

Responsible institution: None specified

Supporting institution(s): None specified

Start date: Not specified

End date: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
12. “Open Data Innovation Strategy” (ODIS)		x			x					x						x			x		
																x					
13. Data Distributor		x			x			x		x					x		x				
															x						

### **Commitment Aim:**

Both commitments were a part of the first action plan and of Denmark's national eGovernment Strategy for 2011-2015.<sup>1</sup>

Commitment 12 aims to draw attention to the potential of public data and to make public data accessible.

Commitment 13 aims to consolidate the dissemination of public data basic through an online data portal system called "Data Distributor." The government expected to launch a trial period of the data distributor to test its technical capabilities by the end of 2015, and planned to facilitate dialogue between various public and private users of the public data. All information regarding the schedule and advancement of the project can be found in Danish on the website [www.datafordeler.dk](http://www.datafordeler.dk).

### **Status**

#### **Commitment 12:**

##### **Mid-term: Complete**

The government executed a series of actions to revise the Danish legal framework on open data and to promote it, fulfilling the commitment completely. The mid-term self-assessment report states that the government was able to carry out the transposition of a revised Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive through an amendment to the PSI Act approved by Parliament on 27 May 2014.

Government officials as well as representatives from civil society organizations, associations, academia and media provided input during an online consultation - responses can be found online.<sup>2</sup> The amendment came into force on 1 July 2014 and the government led awareness-raising campaigns on the new legislation.<sup>3</sup> For further information, please see the mid-term IRM progress report.<sup>4</sup>

#### **Commitment 13:**

##### **Mid-term: Substantial**

At mid-term, the data distributor was in a phase preparing for public beta access to the data. The IRM progress report found that all relevant milestones had been met, but also found that full-scale implementation of the data distributor had been postponed until 2017. For further information, please see the mid-term IRM progress report.<sup>5</sup>

##### **End of term: Substantial**

At the time of writing, no notable progress had been made in implementing Commitment #13. The data distributor was still in a public beta phase, but meetings about it were scheduled for September and October 2016.<sup>6</sup> A development timeline for the data distributor, updated in September 2016, showed delays for registries pertaining to taxation and addresses in Denmark, but gave no explanation for the delay or revised timeline.

### **Did it open government?**

#### **Commitment 12:**

##### **Access to information: Marginal**

The Open Data Innovation Strategy (ODIS) is an initiative that predates the second Danish action plan. Responses to the revision of the PSI Act, approved by parliament in May 2014, were predominantly positive – they applauded the government's positive attitude towards open data.

The PSI Act itself lays the foundation for public offices to use or facilitate the use and reuse of public data. This alone, however, does not ensure openness or transparency in public offices. Therefore, the

“did it open government?” question is coded as a marginal improvement, when looking at the PSI Act as part of a larger effort to change Denmark’s bureaucratic culture and to open government.

### **Commitment I3:**

#### **Access to information: Did not change**

The online data distributor portal can increase access to data, but cannot guarantee it. Nor does the data distributor provide access to data that is not already publicly available - it does not have a public-facing citizen interface, and therefore it does not offer access to information in an easy way. Currently, it is probably easier to find information via a freedom of information search or find it elsewhere on government websites than on the portal, which must thus be seen primarily as a technical tool that does not open government.

#### **Carried forward?**

Commitment #12 was fully implemented. Stakeholders stressed in the IRM midterm report that the PSI Act should be implemented in accordance with other laws governing information dispersal including copyright, privacy, data protection, etc. They also pointed out that implementation should involve a fair administrative burden, balancing for instance the release of specific information against the workload increase to the relevant official.

It is unknown whether Commitment #13 will be carried forward into the third action plan, but if it is, the IRM researcher recommends adding public data registers to the data distributor online portal so that further government held information is available to the public.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Hearing material on the PSI Act revision, <https://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/17367>

<sup>3</sup> Better possibilities for reuse of public data, AFD, <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/Nyheder/Nyhedsarkiv/Digitaliseringsstyrelsen/2014/Bedre-mulighed-for-genbrug-af-offentlig-data.aspx>

<sup>4</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> The Data Distributor invites to dialogue meetings, The Data Distributor, <http://datafordeler.dk/nyheder/datafordeleren-inviterer-til-dialogarrangementer/>

## Commitment 14. Open Government Camp 2013

### Commitment Text:

The work on promoting open government in Denmark will prove an ongoing and open process which must necessarily extend beyond the initiatives of the National Action Plan. It is very much a matter of changing and developing the mind set in the public sector. The work on open government is, consequently, not a tightly managed project. It is a matter of initiating and supporting fundamental changes in the way the public sector builds relations and collaborates – at national, regional and local level.

The work on implementing the many open government initiatives and activities presented in this National Action Plan will be launched with an Open Government Camp, which citizens, companies, associations, NGOs and public authorities will be invited to attend. The aim and objective of the Camp is to experiment on how civil society and the public sector can collaborate on performing societal tasks in new ways; on creating innovation and development; and on making use of the digital technologies to make our welfare society even better. At the same time, the Camp is to serve as a source of inspiration to public authorities who wish to organise similar events themselves or in other ways work on co production and citizen participation.

The Camp will consist of a number of workshops serving the purpose of addressing current challenges and issues, and the individual workshops and activities of the Camp will be organised as a joint effort by public authorities, civil society organisations, citizens and companies.

Responsible institution: None specified

Supporting institution(s): None specified

Start date: 12 November 2013

End date: 12 November 2013

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

### Commitment Aim:

The AFD held an Open Government Camp on November 12, 2013, for people from the public and private sectors, as well as civil society organizations - 170 people participated.<sup>1</sup> The aim was to experiment with ways in which civil society and the public sector can collaborate, performing societal tasks in new ways. The camp represented an effort to spur innovation and development, as well as to make use of digital technologies to improve societal outcomes - it was intended to be a source of inspiration to public authorities wishing to organize similar events.

## Status

### Mid-term: Complete

This commitment was considered fully implemented at the time of the mid-term evaluation because the camp was held on 12 November 2013.<sup>2</sup> Many of the workshops that addressed challenges identified in the action plan are referred to on the government forum ([digitaliser.dk](http://digitaliser.dk)), and a video-documentary was produced and published on Youtube.<sup>3</sup> For further information, please see the mid-term IRM progress report.<sup>4</sup>

### Did it open government?

#### Civic participation: Did not change

The open government camp addressed several issues related to the second action plan, but the camp being a one-off event related directly to a standardized OGP process of action plan consultation renders it as having no effect on opening government practice. In addition, the very technical themes and a dearth of the requisite civil society expertise resulted in limiting the scope and usefulness of the forum.

This commitment was considered a positive step regarding improving civic participation and ensuring the implementation of the second action plan's commitments more broadly. Although this is admirable, it did not impact policy.

### Carried forward?

The third Danish action plan has not yet been developed. If the camp is part of the third action plan, the Danish government could improve it in the following ways:

- Define a clear and measurable outcome. Provide detailed guidelines of expected results from the camp, including a report with a recommendations section.
- Enhance the impact of outcomes. Design a mechanism that guarantees the above report's recommendations are incorporated into policymaking processes.
- Organize additional workshops. Stakeholders reported that a one-time arrangement like the Open Government Camp could have a broader impact if held on a regular basis.
- Increase level of expertise. Stakeholders reported a general lack of expertise among participants in certain areas - meetings that are focused on specific topics could attract experts and generate better results. The camp could be run on a smaller scale, targeting stakeholders by region or expertise.

Thus far, the government created this space to share knowledge, and the government could adapt this structure to improve impact on policymaking.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://digitaliser.dk/news/2541335>

<sup>2</sup> Meeting at Open Gov Camp 2013, Digitaliser.dk, <http://digitaliser.dk/news/2541335>

<sup>3</sup> Video from Open Gov Camp 2013, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=evEkBpe\\_DHs&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=evEkBpe_DHs&feature=youtu.be)

<sup>4</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

## Commitment 15. Open Government assistance to Myanmar

### Commitment Text:

Denmark wishes to help develop and support inclusive democratic processes, good governance, and respect for human rights in Myanmar, and to contribute specifically to working towards the objective of a more open government with a view to encouraging Myanmar to aspire to join the OGP.

(Commitment published 7 January 2015 at

[http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy and Strategy/Open Government/Open government assistance to Myanmar.aspx](http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy%20and%20Strategy/Open%20Government/Open%20government%20assistance%20to%20Myanmar.aspx))

Responsible institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Supporting institution(s): None specified

Start date: 1 January 2015

End date: 30 June 2016

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

### Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to assist the government of Myanmar in developing democratic processes, specifically engaging Myanmar to aspire to join OGP. This commitment was added to the Danish action plan in January 2015 and was published on the website of the Danish Agency for Digitisation (AFD).<sup>1</sup>

### Status

#### Mid-term: Substantial

Currently Myanmar does not meet the eligibility criteria in any sections of OGP membership. Denmark intends to help prepare Myanmar's regime for a transition into democracy. The Myanmar government set itself 2030 as the year in which to achieve that transition. Danish support for Myanmar's democracy initiative was thus limited in scope, as it spans only until 2020.

The Danish government developed a strategy for facilitating Myanmar's transition to democracy, outlined in the report "Denmark – Myanmar Country Programme 2016-2020" (DMCP).<sup>2</sup> The report includes activities that address three thematic objectives:

- promotion of peace, democratization, human rights and reforms
- improvement of access to and quality of basic education
- enhancement of inclusive and sustainable economic growth, including livelihoods for ethnic minorities

Milestones toward these objectives, set in a policy paper from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, were found to be on schedule and were coded as substantially completed. For further information, please see the mid-term IRM progress report.<sup>3</sup>

### **End of term: Substantial**

The timeline indicated in the original concept paper<sup>4</sup> was not included in the final version of this commitment, making progress difficult to track. According to the original timeline provided, which indicated that a policy paper was the expected output, this commitment has been substantially implemented.

### **Did it open government?**

**Access to information: Did not change**

**Civic Participation: Did not change**

**Public Accountability: Did not change**

Although Myanmar is among the most corrupt countries according to Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index (ranked 147 from 168 countries), its score has improved from 15 points out of 100 in 2012 to 22 points in 2015.<sup>5</sup> However, Myanmar only meets 6% of OGP's eligibility criteria - 75% is required to become part of the initiative.

If the DMCP is fully implemented, it could prove to be transformative for Myanmar. The strategic considerations outlined in the DMCP document and this commitment articulate Denmark's efforts to promote judicial reform, non-discrimination, transparency, and accountability through government-to-government interaction. Another goal is to build civil society capacity in Myanmar. However, the relevance to OGP values in *Denmark* is unclear.

### **Carried forward?**

If the government decides to carry this commitment over to the third action plan, it could add value by promoting transparency and accountability - especially access to justice and human rights - via Danish companies with business interests in Myanmar.

---

<sup>1</sup> Commitment language for commitment 15, AFD, <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/Open-Government/Open-government-assistance-to-Myanmar.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> Concept note for the Denmark Myanmar Country Programme, Embassy of Denmark (Yangon), <http://um.dk/en/~media/UM/English-site/Documents/Danida/About-Danida/Danida%20transparency/Consultations/2015/Concept%20note%20Myanmar%202016-2020.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Concept note for the Denmark Myanmar Country Programme, Embassy of Denmark (Yangon), <http://bit.ly/23fok1y>

<sup>5</sup> A country or territory's score indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption on a scale of 0 - 100, where 0 means that a country is perceived as highly corrupt and 100 means it is perceived as very clean.

<http://www.transparency.org/country#MMR>



### Commitment 16. Opening key public datasets

**Commitment Text:**

Government data can be used as raw material in the development of innovative digital services in the private sector, and access to public data can create more transparency in government decision making and administration. However, a number of key public datasets are only partially open and accessible to civil society.

**Milestones:**

- Data on public spending ("government spending") completely opened. January 2015 June 2015
- Other key public datasets completely opened. June 2015 June 2016
- Updating the standard license for open government data. January 2015 June 2015
- Guidance and tools to support the opening of data, including information on the revised PSI law for public authorities. January 2015 January 2016
- Guidance on the scope for reusing public data, including information on the revised PSI law, civil society and other private actors. January 2015 January 2016

(Commitment published 7 January 2015 at

[http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy and Strategy/Open Government/Opening key public datasets](http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy%20and%20Strategy/Open%20Government/Opening%20key%20public%20datasets))

Responsible institution: Agency for Digitisation (Ministry of Finance)

Supporting institution(s): None specified

Start date: 1 January 2015                      End date: 30 June 2016

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

**Commitment Aim:**

Government-held data in Denmark is currently not available for public use unless provided on the data distributor (see Commitment #13) or on other platforms like Danish Statistics or the databank mentioned in Commitment #13. The available data varies in quality and format, which makes it hard to know the general characteristics of the data itself. This commitment aims to (1) open data on government spending, (2) update the standard license for open government data and (3) to publish easy to understand guidelines for opening of data.

## Status

### Mid-term: Limited

At the time of writing of the IRM progress report, the AFD had organized a workshop to discuss the topic of open data in public administration, but had not achieved the set milestones - implementation was thus coded as limited. For further information, please see the mid-term IRM progress report.<sup>1</sup>

### End of term: Limited

The IRM researcher's interviews with government representatives did not yield information to suggest that any progress happened during the last year of commitment implementation. Some of the milestones also lack specificity to determine the extent of their progress, stating for instance only "other key public datasets will be completely opened." The IRM researcher was not able to determine what the "other" or "key" datasets were, to assess whether this milestone was completed. Government spending data that was meant to be "completely open" is only available via a freedom of information request and not in open data format.

The IRM researcher found a version of a standard license<sup>2</sup> comparable to the old standard license<sup>3</sup> that was updated in September 2016 - after closing of the implementation period assessed in this report. There is no publicly available record of guidance and tools for supporting open data, or enough clarity in the commitment's language to identify specifically what those tools were meant to be. Given that no further progress was made beyond that already reported in the mid-term assessment, this commitment remains limited in completion.

## Did it open government?

### Access to information: Did not change

On the Global Open Data Index, Denmark has a score of 70% for openness.<sup>2</sup> Work remains on effectively opening datasets, determining the quality and readability of the data released, and articulating criteria to identify key public data. Echoing the first action plan's IRM report and the review of this action plan's Commitments #12 and #13, the opening of more datasets and a cultural change in perception of bureaucrats concerning the importance of transparency is very important in this context.

The effect of this commitment on opening government was coded as "did not change" because it was not possible to verify the implementation levels for this commitment and because a freedom of information request was necessary to obtain government spending data.

## Carried forward?

If this commitment is taken forward into future action plans, the IRM researcher recommends adding new activities to broaden its scope and scale:

- The mid-term self-assessment mentions the aspiration of this commitment to create a "manual" for citizens that describes different ways in which citizens can access and reuse public data.
- The government could develop a mechanism that ensures the systematic publication of data year by year;
- The government could organize capacity building activities to teach citizens how to access and use data, for example via "hackathons." A template or format for this might be the annual workshop on Denmark's public finances of 2016, arranged by the Open Knowledge Foundation and the Danish newspaper *Information*<sup>3</sup>;
- The government could allocate proper funding to implement open data initiatives.

---

<sup>2</sup> Most recent version of the standard license can be found here <http://datafordeler.dk/om-data/vilkaar/>

<sup>3</sup> Standard license can be found here <http://digitaliser.dk/resource/2432531>

---

<sup>1</sup> Denmark IRM mid-term report 2014-15,

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark\\_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15\\_Final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Denmark_IRM%20Progress%20Report%202014-15_Final_eng.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Denmark's page on Global Open Data Index, Open Knowledge Foundation, <http://index.okfn.org/place/denmark/>

<sup>3</sup> Data workshop on public finances 2016, Open Knowledge Foundation on Facebook, <https://www.facebook.com/events/450192911854060/>

## METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Commitments are grouped by themes based on the original second Danish OGP action plan. This report is based on a desk review of governmental programs, information available online, media content, references to the government midterm self-assessment report, as well as IRM progress report. A second re-visit of IRM mid-term stakeholder survey, follow-up interviews with stakeholders and with the government official originally responsible for OGP was also conducted. It can be noted that this government official has since resigned, with the new designated official not able to offer comment on progress.

Further, this report is not based on review of the government end of term self-assessment report, as this was not prepared at the time of writing (September 2016).

Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst is a Journalist, Teaching Associate Professor, and PhD Fellow in the Department of Communication and Arts at Roskilde University (<http://bit.ly/2cl90Xf>).

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.

