

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

---

Andrea Menapace and Dr. Lorenzo Segato, Independent Researchers

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary: Italy</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>I. National Participation in OGP</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Process: Action Plan Development</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Implementation of Action Plan</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. Analysis of Action Plan Contents</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Theme 1. Participation</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Action 1: Partecipa! .....	19
Action 2: Equip Public Administrations (PA) for Participation .....	22
<b>Theme 2. Transparency, Integrity, and Accountability</b> .....	<b>24</b>
Action 3: TransPArent + 1.....	24
Action 4: Open Data Portal .....	27
Action 5: Follow the Money (SoldiPubblici) (☞).....	31
<b>Theme 3. Technological Innovation</b> .....	<b>34</b>
Action 6: Digital Citizenship.....	34
<b>V. Process: Self-Assessment</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>VI. Country Context</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>VII. General Recommendations</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>VIII. Methodology and Sources</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>IX. Eligibility Requirements Annex</b> .....	<b>45</b>



## Executive Summary: Italy

Italy's second action plan reflects recent efforts to fight corruption. Most of the commitments are still in their preliminary phase and have a low rate of completion after the first year of the action plan. Moving forward, the country's new energy for ambitious reforms in OGP-related policy areas should be captured in action plan design and implementation.

### Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2014-15

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 at the mid and end point of the National Action Plan (NAP) for each OGP participating country.

Italy officially began participating in OGP in September 2011 when the Minister for Public Administration and Innovation, Renato Brunetta, declared the government's intent to join.

According to the OGP calendar, IRM progress reports cover the first year of implementation of action plans. Under the even year country cohort this period is from 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015. Italy adopted its second action plan in December 2014.

The Department of Public Administration (DPA) coordinates the OGP working group in Italy. However, the Prime Minister's Office, the Agency for Digital Italy (AgID), and the National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC) are mainly responsible for Italy's OGP commitments.

### OGP PROCESS

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

In February 2014, a new government planned to set up structural reforms in many sectors of public administration, stressing the relevance of transparency, accountability, and open data.

Development of Italy's second action plan ran from September through December 2014. The government hosted a focus group in Rome with representatives from some civil society organizations (CSOs) and administrative institutions involved in the process. In November 2014, it launched a public consultation through the portal 'Partecipa!' and hosted a second focus group.

At the time of writing this report, the government had not published the self-assessment report, but it allowed researchers to review a draft.

### At a glance

Member since: 2011  
Number of commitments: 6

#### Level of Completion

Completed: 1 of 6  
Substantial: 1 of 6  
Limited: 1 of 6  
Not started: 2 of 6  
Unclear: 1 of 6

#### Timing

On schedule: 3 of 6

#### Commitment Emphasis

Access to information: 2 of 6  
Civic participation: 3 of 6  
Accountability: 0 of 6  
Tech & innovation for transparency & accountability: 3 of 6  
Unclear: 1 of 6

#### Number of Commitments that were:

Clearly relevant to an OGP Value: 5 of 6  
Of transformative potential impact: 1 of 6  
Substantially or completely implemented: 2 of 6

All three (🌟): 1 of 6

## Commitment Implementation

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. Italy's action plan is divided into three main themes that include participation, transparency and accountability, and technological innovation. These main areas contain a total of six commitments (actions). The following tables summarise each action, its level of completion, its potential impact, whether it falls within Italy's planned schedule, and the key next steps for the action in future OGP action plans.

Italy's action plan contained one starred action (Action 5: Follow the Money [*SoldiPubblici*]). These actions are measurable, clearly relevant to OGP values as written, of transformative potential impact, and substantially or completely implemented. Note that the IRM updated the star criteria in early 2015 in order to raise ambition for model OGP commitments. In addition to the criteria listed above, the old criteria included commitments that have moderate potential impact. Under the old criteria, Italy would have received an additional star [Action 4: Open Data Portal].

**Table 1: Assessment of Progress by Commitment**

COMMITMENT SHORT NAME	POTENTIAL IMPACT				LEVEL OF COMPLETION			TIMING
	NONE	MINOR	MODERATE	TRANSFORMATIVE	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	
<p>❖ COMMITMENT IS MEASURABLE, CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS TRANSFORMATIVE POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p>								
<b>Theme 1. Participation</b>								
<b>1. Partecipa!:</b> Revamp the portal for public participation processes.								Behind schedule
<b>2. Equip public administrations for participation:</b> Set up guidelines, monitoring, and coordination for participation processes in the public administration.								Behind schedule
<b>Theme 2. Transparency, Integrity, and Accountability</b>								
<b>3. TransPARENT +1:</b> Re-engineer the citizens' web interface with the National Anti-Corruption Authority								On schedule
<b>4. Open data portal:</b> Publish additional datasets, including the most important data for citizens, and organize hackathons and contests.								On schedule
❖ <b>5. Follow the money (SoldiPubblici):</b> Improve usability of the platform's data, establish communities and training for data reuse, and raise awareness.								On schedule
<b>Theme 3. Technological Innovation</b>								
<b>6. Digital citizenship:</b> Improve and improve digital tools for businesses and citizens to interact with the government.					Unclear			Unclear

**Table 2: Summary of Progress by Commitment**

COMMITMENT	SUMMARY
<p>☛ COMMITMENT IS MEASURABLE, CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS TRANSFORMATIVE POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p>	
<p><b>Theme 1. Participation</b></p>	
<p><b>1. Partecipa!</b> OGP value relevance: Clear Potential impact: Minor Completion: Not started</p>	<p>This commitment aims to restructure and revamp the Partecipa! portal in order to expand its scope and allow monitoring of policy implementation. While this tool was used for consultation during action plan development, IRM researchers did not find evidence of any actions taken to restructure or revamp the portal. Moving forward, aside from pushing the implementation of this commitment, the IRM researchers recommend that the government should work to increase public engagement with and use of the portal.</p>
<p><b>2. Equip public administrations for participation</b> OGP value relevance: Clear Potential impact: Minor Completion: Not started</p>	<p>Action 2 aims to improve management of participatory processes in the different public administration entities at the central and local level. According to the information provided by the government, implementation of this commitment has been delayed, as it is part of a wider reform process that is still ongoing. Stakeholders were skeptical about this action because it focuses on minor, internal procedural deliverables. If carried forward in future action plans, the IRM researchers recommend shifting focus to actions that aim to standardize implementation of guidelines across public administrations and to involve citizens in overseeing this process.</p>
<p><b>Theme 2. Transparency, Integrity, and Accountability</b></p>	
<p><b>3. TransPARENT +1</b> OGP value relevance: Clear Potential impact: Minor Completion: Limited</p>	<p>This commitment aims to strengthen the <i>TransPARENT+1</i> web tool, which is used to facilitate communication between citizens and the National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC). At the time of writing, it is only at an early stage of implementation, and according to ANAC progress will be possible once necessary regulations are approved. Stakeholders perceived the upgrade of the tool as limiting because it restricts the possibility of interaction with ANAC to those who have already filed an information request. Moving forward, the IRM researchers recommend that the tool increases dialogue and interaction possibilities with ANAC and enables visualization of information in interactive formats.</p>
<p><b>4. Open data portal</b> OGP value relevance: Clear Potential impact: Moderate Completion: Substantial</p>	<p>The open data portal action aims to boost transparency of administrative actions and open data. Progress on this commitment has been substantial in terms of the tasks completed. However, work remains to be done to raise the quality of data. In future action plans, the open data portal could, among other things, prioritize the release of data relevant to fight corruption like asset recovery and beneficial ownership. To improve the quality of data, it could also look into an alert mechanism to flag incomplete datasets.</p>
<p>☛ <b>5. Follow the money (SoldiPubblici)</b> OGP value relevance: Clear Potential impact: Transformative Completion: Complete</p>	<p>Follow the money is a starred commitment. It enables a web platform that gives access to public expenditures by all government agencies. The web platform is now fully working. Government is making an effort to integrate the tool within all public agencies. Currently, it enables users to track single payments and link them to electronic invoices and public contracts at no cost and in an open format. If carried over to new action plans, the IRM researchers recommend shifting focus from the tool itself to follow-up actions that increase the usability and scope of datasets.</p>
<p><b>Theme 3. Technological Innovation</b></p>	
<p><b>6. Digital citizenship</b> OGP value relevance: Unclear Potential impact: Minor Completion: Unclear</p>	<p>This action aims to provide citizens and businesses with tools to digitally interact among themselves and with government entities. The commitment as written lacks clarity and does not indicate specific deliverables for proper assessment. Nonetheless, progressive digitalization of public administration services represents an incremental step to increase information and datasets available for public release. The IRM researchers believe that the action could focus on citizens' engagement and recommend including initiatives aimed at reinforcing stakeholders' awareness of the opportunities offered by the technology and digital infrastructures.</p>

## Recommendations

Beginning in 2014, all OGP IRM reports include five key recommendations about the next OGP action planning cycle. Governments participating in OGP will be required to respond to these key recommendations in their annual self-assessments. These recommendations follow the 'SMART' logic: they are Specific, Measurable, Answerable, Relevant, and Time bound. Based on the findings in the progress report, the IRM researchers made the following five SMART recommendations for improving the OGP process in Italy.

<b>TOP FIVE 'SMART' RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
1. Increase participation and engagement of civil society and the business community in the OGP process and in the development of new action plans.
2. Institutionalize a multi-stakeholder forum for regular consultations in order to engage with stakeholders, involve new actors, and set up a feedback process.
3. Adopt accountable metrics to track implementation of transparency, accountability and anti-corruption reforms.
4. Increase disclosure in government activities and contracts, including more open data on beneficial ownership and of conflict of interests.
5. Determine clear roles and resources for the different institutions involved in the OGP process.

## Eligibility Requirements

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

Dr. Lorenzo Segato is the director of the Research Centre on Security and Crime (RiSSC) based in Italy. He is a criminologist whose work has examined the nature and effects of corruption in many different economic sectors in Italy (green economy, healthcare, large procurement contracts, etc.), using qualitative methods of analysis. His main area of research focuses on open data and transparency, evaluation of anti-corruption policies, and procurement in health care.

Andrea Menapace is the executive director of the Italian Coalition for Civil Liberties (CILD). Prior to that, Andrea spent seven years as a consultant working on and researching digital media, governance, and human rights. He carried out missions in the Balkans, India, China, and North Korea. He is the co-founder of Diritto di Sapere (DDS), an organization working on access to information in Italy, and he earned his law degree from the University of Trento, Italy.

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



# I. National Participation in OGP

## History of OGP Participation

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

Italy began its formal participation in September 2011, when the minister for Public Administration and Innovation, Renato Brunetta, declared his country's intention to participate in the initiative.<sup>1</sup>

In order to participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of minimum performance criteria on key dimensions of open government that are particularly consequential for increasing government responsiveness, strengthening citizen engagement, and fighting corruption. Objective, third party indicators are used to determine the extent of country progress on each of the dimensions. See "Section IX: Eligibility Requirements" for more details.

All OGP participating governments develop OGP country action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period. Action plans should set out governments' OGP commitments, which move government practice beyond its current baseline. These commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete on-going reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

Italy developed its first national action plan in 2012 and its second action plan from September through December 2014. In October 2014, the government hosted a focus group<sup>2</sup> in Rome with representatives<sup>3</sup> of several civil society organizations (CSOs) and administrative institutions involved in the process. In November 2014, it launched a public consultation through the portal Partecipa! and hosted a second focus group; in December it published the second action plan.<sup>4</sup> Mid-term progress reports cover the first year of implementation from 1 July 2014 through 30 June 2015,<sup>5</sup> in accordance with the OGP calendar for even-year countries.

## Basic Institutional Context

The adoption of the Anti-Corruption Law<sup>6</sup> in 2012 represented a turning point in the Italian approach to transparency, integrity, and accountability. For the first time, the transparency of the public administration<sup>7</sup> became by law a basic level of benefits,<sup>8</sup> and the right of access to information was strengthened. In the following two years, additional acts<sup>9</sup> have confirmed the relevance of transparency, although some limits still exist.

In February 2014, a new government declared that it would institute structural reforms in many sectors of the public administration, stressing the relevance of transparency, accountability, and open data. In the same year, the government opened the SIOPE<sup>10</sup> (*Sistema Informativo sulle Operazioni degli Enti Pubblici*) database, an information system on the transactions made by all public agencies that is now accessible online for free.

Some reforms adopted in the past year and a half have a direct influence on the topics covered by OGP, but their effects will be seen in the long term. In August 2015, the parliament adopted the Reform of the Public Administration Act, which mandates the establishment of reforms on access to information, anti-corruption, and transparency



law, just to name a few.<sup>11</sup> The prime minister's commitment to these topics seems very high, but the allocation of resources appears rather limited.<sup>12</sup>

The Prime Minister's Office,<sup>13</sup> the Agency for Digital Italy (AgID), and the National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC) are mainly responsible for Italy's OGP commitments. Mr. Stefano Pizzicannella, a senior staff member, coordinates the OGP working group within the Department for Public Administration (DPA). Two agencies are responsible for implementing the OGP commitments included in the action plan: ANAC and AgID. This is also reflected in the self-assessment report, which the DPA finalized with contributions from the two agencies involved in the process.<sup>14</sup> The DPA Office has no legal power to enforce policy changes on other agencies within government. At the current time, its mandate is largely around implementing technological solutions to improve transparency, but it does not have the ability to compel other agencies to enter in commitments.

### Methodological Note

The IRM partners with experienced, independent national researchers to author and disseminate reports for each OGP participating government. In Italy, the IRM partnered with Andrea Menapace, an independent researcher, with support from Dr. Lorenzo Segato from the Research Centre on Security and Crime (RiSSC).<sup>15</sup> They reviewed the government's self-assessment report, gathered the views of civil society, and interviewed appropriate government officials and other stakeholders. OGP staff and a panel of experts reviewed the report.

This report is a mid-term assessment of progress during the first year of implementation of Italy's action plan. Beginning in 2015, the IRM also publishes end-of-term reports to account for the final status of progress at the end of the action plan's two-year period.

National researchers organized a stakeholder forum in Rome, which was conducted using a focus group methodology, and interviewed key experts from both civil society and public administration. The team reviewed several key documents prepared by the government: the first IRM report<sup>16</sup> on Italy's first action plan,<sup>17</sup> the second action plan, and the self-assessment report on the second plan, drafted by the government and sent to the researchers in November 2015.<sup>18</sup> Numerous references are made to these documents throughout this report.

Summaries of these forums and more detailed explanations are given in Section VIII of this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> The letter of intent is available at: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/italy>

<sup>2</sup> For more information see <http://www.funzionepubblica.gov.it/la-struttura/dipartimento-della-funzione-pubblica/attivita/attivita-internazionali/ogp/iniziativa/action-plan-2014.aspx>.

<sup>3</sup> The OGP Italy team sent 53 invitations to 35 civil society organizations. The list of organizations is not public, but it includes all the organizations that have been involved in the OGP initiative in Italy since 2011 (ref. Relazione sul processo di stesura del secondo piano azione OGP available here: <http://www.funzionepubblica.gov.it/media/1207016/relazione%20sul%20processo%20di%20stesura%20del%20secondo%20piano%20azione%20ogp.pdf>).

<sup>4</sup> The second action plan is available here:

<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Second%20OGP%20National%20Action%20Plan.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> OGP country dates and deadlines in OGP can be found here: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/calendars-and-deadlines>.

<sup>6</sup> Law 120/2012.

<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of the present report, the term "public administrations" applies to both central and local governments. Art. 1 of legislative decree 165/2001 defines the public administrations as all the administrations of the state, including schools of any grade, companies and special public bodies, regions, provinces, municipalities and mountain communities, their consortia and associations, universities, the public housing institutes, the Chambers of Commerce, their associations, all public bodies with no economic

---

relevance, at national, regional or local level, and the administrations or other public bodies of the national health care system. The Italian Anti-Corruption Authority's (ANAC) monitoring system and the Anti-Corruption Law applies to both central and local governments, where referred to public administrations. The same for the public payment systems, which apply to central, local, and social security institutions.

<sup>8</sup> According to Art. 117 of the Fundamental Chart (Costituzione Italiana), "legislative powers shall be vested in the State and the Regions in compliance with the Constitution and with the constraints deriving from EU legislation and international obligations. The State has exclusive legislative powers in the following matters: [...] m) determination of the basic level of benefits relating to civil and social entitlements to be guaranteed throughout the national territory."

<sup>9</sup> In particular the legislative decree (lgs.d) 33/2013 on Transparency of the PA.

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.siope.it/Siope2Web/>

<sup>11</sup> Law n. 124/2015.

<sup>12</sup> The structural reform of the public administration system is based on a funding mechanism of cost reduction rather than on increased investments. Therefore, the impact of the reform lies in the capacity to reduce the expenditures of the PA to invest in innovation. Previous reforms have failed on this point as the major cost is related to staff salaries, a cost with little flexibility. See "The Original Sin of the Historical Reform of the PA" (in italian) at <http://www.lavoce.info/archives/36428/peccato-riforma-pa/>.

<sup>13</sup> Namely the Department for Public Administration (DPA) within the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (PCM).

<sup>14</sup> The draft self-assessment report (not yet officially released) was sent by the OGP Italy team to the IRM researchers on the 26/10/2015.

<sup>15</sup> Disclaimer: RiSSC was one of the stakeholders invited to the preparatory phase of the second action plan. Dr. Lorenzo Segato attended the first and (in streaming) the second focus group and was rapporteur together with ANAC for the results of the working table on transparency, integrity, and accountability of the first focus group.

<sup>16</sup> The 2014-2015 IRM Report Documents are available here:

<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/italy/irm>.

<sup>17</sup> The first action plan is available here:

[http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/legacy\\_files/country\\_action\\_plans/Piano%2011%20aprile%20%200pengovPartnership\\_EN.docx](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/legacy_files/country_action_plans/Piano%2011%20aprile%20%200pengovPartnership_EN.docx).

<sup>18</sup> As of 20 November 2015, the self-assessment report had not been published.



## II. Process: Action Plan Development

The consultation process has improved when compared to the first action plan, but the participation of civil society in the different phases of the process was limited and involved almost the same participants as in the first action plan.

The Department of Public Administrations (DPA), in cooperation with the Agency for Digital Italy (AgID) and the National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC), prepared the second action plan and adopted it after a consultation process that included two focus groups and two online publications open for comments. The private sector (e.g., enterprises or business intermediary organizations) was completely absent. The analysis suggests that the OGP working group is partially responsible for the limited participation of civil society in the process because it didn't invite many organizations to participate and those it did invite had short notice. That said, civil society organizations lacked interest in this process, making them partially responsible as well. As evidenced, the process has ample room for improvement.

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 1: Action Plan Consultation Process**

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the government meet this requirement?
During Development	Were timeline and process available prior to consultation?	No.
	Was the timeline available online?	Yes.
	Was the timeline available through other channels?	Yes.
	Was there advance notice of the consultation?	Yes.
	How many days of advance notice were provided?	21 days
	Was this notice adequate?	Yes.
	Did the government carry out awareness-raising activities?	Yes.
	Were consultations held online?	Yes. <sup>1</sup>
	Were in-person consultations held?	Yes.
	Was a summary of comments provided?	Yes.
	Were consultations open or invitation only?	Invitation only.
	Place the consultations on the IAP2 spectrum. <sup>2</sup>	Consult.
During Implementation	Was there a regular forum for consultation during implementation?	No.

**Editorial Note:** Although no longer accessible, the IRM researcher confirmed that the Ministry of Public Administration and Simplification published on their website (1) a detailed timeline prior to consultation, (2) evidence of the awareness-raising activities held and (3) a summary of comments.

#### Advance Notice and Awareness Raising

Some civil society organizations (CSOs) criticized the first action plan for the lack of participation in the development and implementation phase.<sup>3</sup> The new action plan has made some progress to overcome these criticisms. The short duration of the development process possibly limited the capacity to engage civil society. Government presented the process to stakeholders during the first focus group on 7 October 2014, prior to consultation. The timeline was explained during the second focus group on 27 November 2014, and was made available in the website for the duration of the process.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, the timeline was distributed by e-mail to stakeholders.<sup>5</sup>

The DPA asked stakeholders to promote the consultation process, and several websites and blogs distributed the news as part of awareness-raising activities. Notice was given to the participants in the first focus group in Rome. The government, however, did not promote online consultation<sup>6</sup> with the wider public. Instead, they only made information available once the consultation had already begun and the deadline was announced. The second focus group was announced within the existing network.

The number of CSOs that attended the meetings (nine out of 35 invitees) could suggest that the notice was inadequate. According to the DPA, the notice was adequate for the limited universe of stakeholders involved with open government but less so for a wider audience of general citizens.<sup>7</sup> Based on the findings, the IRM researchers conclude that a twenty-one-day advance notice for the first focus group and 16 days for the subsequent meeting qualify as adequate advance notice. The limited number of CSOs that participated, though, may be associated with the lack of proper awareness-raising activities held. Another possible reason for the limited participation is that the invitation was sent by email from the head of the OGP Italy team. A more formal invitation, such as a letter from the prime minister or from the minister, could have led to higher attendance.

The precise timeline of the preparation phase is:

15 September 2014	Government sends out invitation to the 7 October 2015 focus group by email from <a href="mailto:ogp@funzionepubblica.it">ogp@funzionepubblica.it</a> to 53 individual recipients (representing 35 civil society organizations), who had previously worked with the DPA on the OGP initiative or on other initiatives related to open data.
03 October 2014	Government sends out email with information about the focus group.
07 October 2014	Ten representatives attended the first focus group in Rome.
08 October 2014	The government circulated a follow-up working plan to the first focus group via email to nine CSO representatives who attended the meeting and created a shared online working space for around 20 members. <sup>8</sup>
16 October 2014	The draft action plan, updated with the results of the focus group, is circulated among the participants.
04 November 2014	The public consultation on the draft action plan is opened.
11 November 2014	Government sends out an email invitation to the second focus group to 55 individual recipients.
24 November 2014	The public consultation is closed.
27 November 2014	The second focus group in Rome includes remote connections.
28 November 2014	The DPA published a document describing the process of the second action plan on its website.
23 December 2014	The DPA publishes the final version of the action plan on its website.

This timeline appears to be too short to effectively ensure a real engagement of civil society and the private sector. Although government did provide notice via email and telephone calls and encouraged recipients to share the information, it is hard to define this as adequate awareness-raising activity. It did not get the same results as other similar government initiatives in the past. The small number of participants in the focus groups and in the online consultations confirm the limited impact of the strategy.

### Depth and Breadth of Consultation

The consultation involved the OGP Italy team, representatives of civil society (including Transparency International Italy, among others), and the two institutions supporting DPA in the second action plan (ANAC and AgID). During the focus group, each

constituent was able to express his or her view on a list of 6 actions preliminarily identified by the government.

The management of the focus group guaranteed a two-fold objective: giving everyone the chance to express opinions and ending the meeting with some conclusion. The methodology used to design the actions limited the possibility of deviating from the pre-designed structure of the plan. This limited the decision-making power of stakeholders on commitment inclusion or action areas.

Additionally, participants were divided in three parallel groups (originally four), each with two *rapporteurs*—one from the government and one from civil society. This is a good approach that should be maintained in the future.

Interviews with stakeholders during the IRM process—and public declarations following the focus group—were in general critical of the process, and many stakeholders did not consider the consultation very meaningful. However, some acknowledged that it was a step forward from the first action plan consultation, though with limitations possibly because of time constraints, lack of trust in government, and difficulties within civil society.<sup>9</sup> One of the problems with the first focus group was the financial burden for CSOs from across the country to travel to Rome for a two-hour meeting in the late afternoon. This problem was partially mitigated during the second focus group with live streaming for some participants, but DPA had difficulties with its ICT infrastructure.

The consultation is no longer available online, but its results (i.e., the list of comments) are published on the DPA website. Streaming of the second focus group is available online.<sup>10</sup>

Despite the declared intent of “Involve,” public participation was in the form of “Consult,” because the government had already adopted the structure of the action plan before starting the consultation process.

---

<sup>1</sup> Link to online consultation available here: [www.partecipa.gov.it](http://www.partecipa.gov.it).

<sup>2</sup>International Association for Public Participation, “IAP2 Spectrum of Political Participation,” <http://bit.ly/1kMm1YC>.

<sup>3</sup>In May 2013, civil society organizations launched a public consultation. (See <http://www.opengovernmentforum.it/?tag=action-plan>) to see an independent monitoring of the first action plan (other than the IRM mechanism), also with a limited participation. The monitoring brought a report to civil society on the implementation of the first action plan (*report della societa' civile sull'implementazione del primo piano di azione italiano sull'open government*). Two of the criticisms presented in the report were that civil society had not been engaged, consulted, or even informed about the actions undertaken in the implementation of the plan and that civil society had never received feedback from the government about the consultation process on OGP. The report of civil society is available here: [http://www.funzionepubblica.gov.it/media/1082504/ogpitaly\\_pubbl.pdf](http://www.funzionepubblica.gov.it/media/1082504/ogpitaly_pubbl.pdf).

<sup>4</sup>A detailed timeline was presented during the second focus group: <http://www.funzionepubblica.gov.it/media/1207268/la%20consultazione%20per%20il%20secondo%20piano%20ogp.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup>DPA responses to IRM’s requests for clarification on 01/12/2015.

<sup>6</sup>The consultation was open from 4 to 21 November 2014 on the portal Partecipa!

<sup>7</sup>DPA responses to IRM’s requests for clarification on 01/12/2015.

<sup>8</sup>See <https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/ogp-italy>.

<sup>9</sup>See the article of one of the *rapporteurs* from civil society: <http://www.chefuturo.it/2014/10/il-futuro-dellopen-gov-e-perche-la-democrazia-non-e-uno-sport-da-spettatori/>.

<sup>10</sup>See <http://www.governo.it/GovernoInforma/Multimedia/dettaglio.asp?d=77322>.

### III. Implementation of Action Plan

Italy's second action plan did not have a regular multi-stakeholder forum throughout implementation. The lack of such mechanism might have contributed to decrease stakeholder interest in the OGP process.

This section assesses the implementation of the national action plan during its first year. As part of their participation in OGP, governments commit to identify a forum to enable regular multi-stakeholder consultation on OGP implementation. However, no such forum to enable regular multi-stakeholder consultation on Italy's action plan implementation has been identified. The lack of such a mechanism might have contributed to decreased stakeholder interest in the OGP process.

The government has called for consultation on OGP on an ad hoc basis so far, without implementing a regular forum for in-person consultation with stakeholders. For OGP it created an online community forum called *comunità online Open* in 2013 with the aim to make it a tool for regular consultation on the action plan. The online tool is available at <http://www.innovatoripa.it/groups/open-government>.

Stakeholders have claimed that online and in-person consultations have not proved an effective mechanism to improve the OGP process. They were consulted only after the plan was drafted without any opportunity to co-design or co-create the draft. In addition to the missing stakeholder forums, there is no clear policy on open government and expected outcomes when it comes to engagement with civil society. Civil society actors released an independent evaluation of the first action plan, but they have not set up such an initiative for the second action plan.

## IV. Analysis of Action Plan Contents

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

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

### *Access to Information*

Commitments around access to information:

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

### *Civic Participation*

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

Commitments addressing public participation:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Public Accountability**

Commitments improving accountability can include:

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

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

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

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

Examples of strong commitments include:



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

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

### *Technology and Innovation for Openness and Accountability*

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

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

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

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

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

### *Key Values*

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

While most indicators used to evaluate each commitment are self-explanatory, a number deserve further explanation.

1. **Specificity:** The IRM researchers first assesses the level of specificity and measurability with which each commitment or action was framed. The options are:
  - High (Commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal.)

- Medium (Commitment language describes activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain clearly measurable milestones or deliverables.)
  - Low (Commitment language describes activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader.)
  - None (Commitment language contains no verifiable deliverables or milestones.)
2. Relevance: The IRM researchers evaluated each commitment for its relevance to OGP values and OGP grand challenges.
    - OGP values: To identify OGP commitments with unclear relationships to OGP values, the IRM researchers made a judgment from a close reading of the commitment's text. This judgment reveals commitments that can better articulate a clear link to fundamental issues of openness.
  3. Potential impact: The IRM researchers evaluate each commitment for how ambitious commitments were with respect to new or pre-existing activities that stretch government practice beyond an existing baseline.
    - To contribute to a broad definition of ambition, the IRM researchers judged how potentially transformative each commitment might be in the policy area. This is based on the IRM researchers' findings and experience as public policy experts. In order to assess potential impact, the IRM researchers identify the policy problem, establish a baseline performance level at the outset of the action plan, and assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the policy problem.

All of the indicators and methods used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual, available at (<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/about-irm>). Finally, one indicator is of particular interest to readers and useful for encouraging a race to the top between OGP participating countries: the starred commitment. Starred commitments are considered to be exemplary OGP commitments. In order to receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have medium or high specificity.
- 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.
- The commitment would have a transformative potential impact if completely implemented.
- 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, Italy's action plan contained one starred action:

- Action 5—follow the money (SoldiPubblici).

Note that the IRM updated the star criteria in early 2015 in order to raise the ambition for model OGP commitments. Under the old criteria, a commitment received a star if it was measurable, clearly relevant to OGP values as written, had moderate or transformative impact, and was substantially or completely implemented.

Based on these old criteria, Italy's action plan would have received an additional star action:

- Action 4: open data portal.

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 Italy and all OGP participating countries, see the OGP Explorer<sup>1</sup>.

### General Overview of the Commitments

At first glance, the second action plan appears more realistic, though less ambitious, than the previous one. This change of course might derive from the difficulties experienced by the OGP Italy Team with the past plan. Six actions have been designed to be SMART instead of sixteen, thus reducing the scope of the plan. Some of the actions recommit the government to initiatives already in place, while others are too vague to be meaningful, according to interviews with experts. One year after its adoption, most of the six actions are still in their preliminary phase or not started yet. Even though the country shows a new energy for ambitious reforms, the institutional changes of the past two years have contributed to the delay. In general, civil society organizations regard the second action plan as a positive effort made by the DPA and other institutions to open up the process. Criticisms concern the ambition and the potential impact of the plan as well as delays. According to one expert interviewed, the plan should not even be evaluated, since it only involves pre-existing initiatives and contains no innovations.

When compared with the first, here are the potential success factors for the second action plan: the current government's commitment to the modernization and digitalization of the country, the limited number of institutions involved (DPA in cooperation with AgID and ANAC), and a clear chain of responsibility for the different actions. Due to the limited impact of the consultation phase, the plan remains tailor-made for the three institutions.

Risk factors for the achievement of its results include the limited resources available for the OGP Italy team, the uncertain institutional framework, and the number of ongoing reforms that aim at substantially changing the organization and the procedures within the public administration at any level (national, sub-national, and local) in Italy. These factors undermine the OGP process and delay implementation of commitments, therefore threatening achievement of open government goals.

For ease of reading, actions have been grouped in three themes:

Theme 1. Participation

- Action 1: Partecipa!
- Action 2: Equip the PA for participation

Theme 2. Transparency, Integrity, and Accountability

- Action 3: TransPARENT + 1
- Action 4: Open data portal
- Action 5: Follow the money (SoldiPubblici)

Theme 3. Technological Innovation

- Action 6: Digital Citizenship

---

<sup>1</sup> The OGP Explorer provides the OGP community—civil society, academics, governments, and journalists—with easy access to the wealth of data that OGP has collected. It is available at <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer/landing>.

## Theme 1. Participation

### Action 1: Partecipa!

#### Commitment text

*Restructure and revamp the Partecipa! portal as a reference platform for processes of public participation, expanding the current context, limited to consultation, to the stages of monitoring the implementation and the evaluation of services/policies.*

*Create a single signing system for the citizens who participate, so that they can follow the evolution of the initiatives in which they are involved and can also have a public structured space where they can make proposals to the institutions and administrations. Foster the management and dissemination of available applications, optimizing the use of civic media.*

#### Specific Objectives

*Restructure and revamp the Partecipa! portal as open front end where you can:*

*activate a public structured space to receive proposals and requests for administrations;*

*set up a smart repository for all the participation processes, clustering the experiences on the basis of similarity, reuse, performance offered, best practices and collect the tools, the technical documentation, the methods, the guides, etc., to manage the consultation processes;*

*set up a single sign in system for the citizens, with the option to subscribe to a newsletter and the possibility to receive automatic alerts on the progress of the initiative which they have participated in;*

*create a repository of the civic open source applications and of the civic media that can be (re) used to build the consultation processes, with summary profiles and opportunity for comment by users.*

**Responsible institution:** DPA

**Supporting institution(s):** AgID

**Start date:** January 2015

**End date:** June 2016

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

#### What happened?

According to IRM researchers and the government self-assessment, this action has not started yet.

An internet archive search by the IRM team has found that the Italian government launched the initiative “Partecipa!” ([www.partecipa.gov.it](http://www.partecipa.gov.it)) in 2013 to increase citizens' engagement in the process of constitutional reform through all possible and innovative means of communication.<sup>1</sup> In three months (from August to October 2013), the page had around 425,700 visits from around 306,500 unique visitors. The “Partecipa!” initiative was maintained as a tool for civic participation in the government's consultations, and it was used for consultation during the development of both OGP action plans. At the time of writing this report, the IRM researchers did not find further evidence of any actions taken to restructure or revamp this portal.

The second action plan includes three “unique” access points for citizens. This highlights the lack of coordination among initiatives because every authority has its own project for single access points: the portal Partecipa! for action 1 (Participation); the portal “Comunica con ANAC” for action 3 (Transparency, Integrity, and Accountability); and a “single modern and user-oriented portal” for citizens, businesses, and public administration, which falls under action 6 (Technological Innovation).

### Did it matter?

Action 1 aims to create a platform where citizens can sign in, find a repository of open source applications, and send proposals and requests—if the option is activated—for public administrations. This idea does not seem very ambitious, and its execution might be overlapping with a number of similar initiatives set up by the government (e.g., the portal, Data4All, aims at becoming an open data repository).

In principle, the idea of increasing democratic participation by using a website belongs to the concept of a modern state, more accessible and close to its citizens. This process requires a general modernization of the whole country, from reducing the digital divide to digital literacy to the digitalization of the public administration. Some stakeholders report the complexity of encouraging citizen participation in terms of trust, knowledge, opportunity, and expectations. Action 1 follows this idea, but its impact cannot be transformative unless the general framework for dialogue between citizens and public administration bodies evolves further and infrastructural challenges are solved.<sup>2</sup> Italy ranks 22<sup>nd</sup> in the Open Data Barometer, scoring low in terms of impact and government readiness.<sup>3</sup> Action 1 can do little to change these macro issues.

The idea to modernize the webpage is already in line with the government's commitment to enhance communication with citizens: AgID has recently published guidelines for the design of public administration entities' webpages (<http://design.italia.it/>) with little innovative potential. The impact of this action appears to be very limited, and there is no evidence as to the costs of this action.

### Moving forward

IRM researchers recommend that the government focus more on consulting citizens prior to making key decisions. Additionally, it should strengthen its communication strategy to promote participation. Following the successful original experience of Partecipa!, researchers recommend the allocation of sufficient resources to promote the consultations through:

- The use of social networks, such as Twitter and Facebook;
- Visibility in all institutional websites;
- Involvement with schools and the media;
- Engagement of digital champions;
- Support from the CSOs; and
- Activation of a counter and setting of a target.

---

<sup>1</sup>The initiative was launched through the social media. See [https://www.facebook.com/Partecipagov/info/?tab=page\\_info](https://www.facebook.com/Partecipagov/info/?tab=page_info).

<sup>2</sup> Italy's national broadband plan specifies three focus areas for broadband development. The development of next-generation-access networks (NGA) with the help of investments by private Telecom operators is the main emphasis. Italy also adopted a national state aid scheme to support broadband in remote areas through its national broadband plan. See <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/country-information-italy>.

<sup>3</sup>See <http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/report/analysis/rankings.html>.

## Action 2: Equip Public Administrations (PA) for Participation

### Commitment text

#### *Equipe PA for the participation*

*Organize the management of the participation processes (inform, consult, involve, collaborate), taking into account already existing experiences, establish guidelines shared with civil society and identify a centre of expertise at the Prime Minister's Office. Develop skills and culture both for Public Administration<sup>1</sup> (PA) and citizens in order to manage and participate in the processes of participation, including through the use of open data. Ensure external monitoring on participation.*

#### Specific objectives

*Define a policy document/guidelines for the participation processes of the PA to be tested by applying an iterative model and also through the analysis of the previous experiences of participation, so as to achieve a consolidated version of the document as a basis for a next update which restarts the cycle;*

*implement a monitoring process with members outside the Administration to follow the participation processes since the definition of the guidelines;*

*set up a central coordination, which spans over all the administrations and acts both as a network of exchange and sharing and also as a center of expertise for the dissemination and implementation of best practices on participation.*

**Responsible institution:** DPA

**Supporting institution(s):** AgID

**Start date:** January 2015      **End date:** June 2016

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

### What happened?

According to the IRM researchers' findings and the government self-assessment, this action has not started yet. The action aims at setting up guidelines as well as coordinating and monitoring mechanisms for engaging citizens in the decision-making process of the public administration. These appear to be preparatory activities for action 1. The participation working-group in the first focus group stressed the importance of allocating adequate resources in the participatory process, hiring trained and skilled human resource personnel to guide the process, and prioritizing issues that are relevant for citizens.



This action is progressing at a slow pace because it falls within a wider, ongoing reform process. All the measures must be framed in terms of a larger strategy, and there is no clear idea on when and how this action will start.

### Did it matter?

Action 2 relates more to the process (design, management, and evaluation) rather than its impact, with no direct, change-inducing strategy for citizen participation. IRM researchers acknowledge the relevance of the process, but its impact—because it's a more internal, process-oriented action—can be considered minor, with the caveat that it has not yet been initiated. Guidelines for participatory processes are well known and established; some public bodies have already published similar tools.<sup>2</sup> However, establishing overarching guidelines to drive the participation process in public administration, if fully accomplished, could represent a positive incremental step forward.

### Moving forward

Stakeholders were skeptical about the potential impact of this particular commitment within the timeframe of the action plan because of the action's focus on minor, internal procedural deliverables. They recommend a more substantial and less formalistic approach to participation policies.<sup>3</sup>

IRM researchers recognize the limited scope and impact of this action. Therefore, they recommend that in future action plans commitments like this be included as activities or milestones within a broader initiative. Additionally, if carried forward, the IRM researchers would recommend including actions that aim at standardizing implementation of guidelines across public administrations and involving citizens in the oversight of this process

---

<sup>1</sup>The original text in the Action Plan only states "PA". The words "*Public Administration*" have been added for clarity.

<sup>2</sup>See the guidelines of the Emilia-Romagna Region, also published by Formez (<http://partecipazione.formez.it/sites/all/files/Guida%20Partecipazione%20RER.pdf>).

<sup>3</sup>As reported in the second action plan, pg. 6.

## Theme 2. Transparency, Integrity, and Accountability

### Action 3: TransPArent + 1

#### Commitment text

The initiative, called “trasPArenti+1” aims at promoting and fostering the active participation of citizens in the ANAC monitoring activity. This initiative has two main purposes: it aims at spreading the use of the access to information (accesso civico) by public entities and increasing the efforts to enhance transparency, as total accessibility of all information on institutional websites of public administrations (Legislative decree no. 33/2013, articles 1 and 2).

#### Specific objectives

In order to attain the objective, we need **to re-engineer the citizens’ communication web interface “Communicate with ANAC.”** through specific actions aimed at:

- enhancing the functionality, simplifying the front-end interface data acquisition and their quality (participatory supervision);
- strengthening external communication tools online;
- developing the back-end functionality, creating a platform for the internal management and processing of data (database), which enables:
  - to interpret – for corruption prevention purposes - all the information obtained also on the basis of corruption risk indicators that can be possibly identified by the Authority with reference to specific areas of activity of public administrations;
  - to report externally (web publication) the results of supervisory activities operated by the citizen (accountability);
  - encourage the use by citizens of the access to information (accesso civico) through appropriate awareness- raising and civic monitoring initiatives jointly developed with civil society organisations.

**Responsible institution:** ANAC

**Supporting institution(s):** None

**Start date:** January 2015

**End date:** June 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	information	Civic participation	Public accountability	accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
			✓			✓		✓		✓				✓		

## What happened?

According to the government self-assessment, this action has not started yet. However, the National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC) has made some preliminary actions that can be counted toward implementation, and the IRM researchers consider it started and in the early stages of implementation.

This action is a continuation of an existing initiative: in 2013 ANAC developed a web platform, “Comunica con l’Autorità” (<http://campagnatrasparenza.anticorruzione.it/>), to facilitate communication between the authorities and citizens. The platform includes a 2014 pilot program that adheres to legislative decree 33/2013, the “Transparency Law.”

The decree has substantially extended the obligations of transparency for the public administration, putting a special emphasis on the publication of documents on official websites and on alternative ways for citizens to access those documents (*accesso civico*). The campaign, “Comunica con l’Autorità,” gives citizens the possibility to report violations of transparency obligations<sup>1</sup> to ANAC through a guided process.<sup>2</sup> In particular, citizens can file:

- Notice (*segnalazione*) of noncompliance of a public administration (PA) with transparency obligations ex art. 13 lgs. D. 33/2013 (transparency of the organisation of the PA-*organizzazione delle pubbliche amministrazioni*);
- Notice of noncompliance of a PA with obligations ex art. 14 lgs. d. 33/2013 (transparency of appointed to political and elective roles—*dati organi di indirizzo politico*);<sup>3</sup>
- Request for an explanation of the law (*quesito*); and
- Proposal to enhance the transparency policy of the PA (*proposta*).

According to ANAC, the action will start after the approval of the necessary regulations.

## Did it matter?

Action 3 aims to strengthen an existing tool called “TrasPARENTi+1” by organizing its database and setting up a tracking system for requests. The new tool should guarantee better access, precise communication between citizens and ANAC, and greater scope for in-depth analysis of the information collected.

This action is not very ambitious because it aims only to upgrade an existing initiative that, according to ANAC, is already used by citizens. The innovative potential is low, and the agency recognizes that the action is part of a review process for the tool. A member of ANAC, interviewed by IRM researchers, stressed that the initiative aims to bolster the quality of information collected with the tool. The IRM researchers share this view but believe that the upgrade of the tool will reduce its appeal among citizens. In fact, the main reform limits the possibility to dialogue with ANAC, only to those who have already used the *accesso civico* tool to request information. To process a request, the “TrasPARENTi+1” tool requires users to confirm that an information request has been previously sent to the public administration entity that failed to comply with its transparency obligations, by checking a yes or no box on the online form.<sup>4</sup> IRM researchers believe that this will probably increase its impact on single requests but will reduce the overall number of requests and the overall impact of the initiative. The upgrade of the platform appears to be more functional to ANAC’s needs rather than to the needs of citizens. Stakeholders believe that the action will have a limited impact.<sup>5</sup>

## Moving forward

The IRM researchers recommend that the government consider further actions to increase communication between citizens and the National Anti-Corruption Authority. In future action plans this initiative could have greater impact if:

- Data on public administration transparency are presented in visual and interactive forms (e.g., a map of Italy showing the noncompliant administrations with the possibility to link directly to the data repository); and
- Analysis and trends on “transparency in practice” are displayed.

---

<sup>1</sup>As defined in legislative decree 33/2013.

<sup>2</sup>In case of violation of the Transparency Law, citizens must first use the “*accesso civico*,” then file a request to ANAC.

<sup>3</sup>The legislative decree n. 33/2013 re-ordered obligations of disclosure, transparency, and dissemination of information by public administrations. Art. 14 defines the obligations of disclosure of information related to the appointed to political or elective roles at the state, region, and local level. The information has to be published on the website of the public administration and relates to: the appointment documents, with indication of the duration; the curriculum; the earnings of any nature, including travel and missions costs; other appointments, public or private, and related earnings; any other appointment that implies a cost for the public balance; and the annual tax declaration.

<sup>4</sup>The Yes/No box is a mandatory field of the form “La segnalazione è stata già inoltrata all’amministrazione come richiesta di accesso civico ai sensi dell’art. 5 comma 1 del D.Lgs. n. 33/2013?”

<sup>5</sup>IRM stakeholders’ focus group in Rome and single interviews.

## Action 4: Open Data Portal

### Commitment text

*The aim of this action is to boost transparency of administrative actions and foster the open data economy through the following activities:*

- 1. Reinforcing the National Open Data Portal dati.gov.it. Firstly, the number and quality of datasets published on the national portal will be increased, through the release of all data mentioned in the National Agenda 2014 for the enhancement of public information resources; the portal will also host the catalogue of the applications developed through the re-use of PA open data;*
- 2. Publishing the most important data for citizens and businesses. In parallel, a public consultation open to citizens and businesses will be launched in the portal dati.gov.it; it will be open to citizens and business for the identification of further information to be released in addition to those already provided by the National Agenda. The future versions of the National Agenda will include the results of such consultation;*
- 3. Hackathons and contests will be organized to promote the re-use of published data. These will involve specific categories (students, associations, start-ups) or will be thematic (data concerning food, traffic, public expenditure, etc.). A national contest will also be organized to reward the best applications developed using data from the portal.*

*The action is in line with similar international initiatives, for example the G8 Open Data Charter signed by Italy in 2014. AgID shall take all necessary actions to provide standards for the creation of qualitative PA open data.*

Specific objectives

- » *For citizens:*
  - a) greater transparency;*
  - b) possibility to use innovative online services;*
  - c) improved quality of life.*
- » *For companies:*
  - a) availability of open data to develop goods and services;*
  - b) greater transparency;*
  - c) possibility to use innovative online services;*
  - d) simplified relations with the PA.*
- » *For PA:*
  - a) rationalization of expenditure;*
  - b) encouraging the reuse of open data;*
  - c) greater confidence;*
  - d) increase of productivity.*

**Responsible institution:** AgID

**Supporting institution(s):** All

**Start date:** January 2015

**End date:** December 2015

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

**Editorial note:** Under the old criteria of starred commitments, this action would have received a star because it is clearly relevant to OGP values as written, has moderate potential impact, and has been substantially or completely implemented (note that IRM updated the star criteria in early 2015).

### What happened?

Based on the information gathered by the IRM researchers, this commitment has been substantially completed, with ongoing improvements to the number of datasets and the quality of data released.<sup>1</sup>

This action included activities in part already scheduled as part of wider initiatives: the National Agenda for the Promotion of the Public Information Asset and the Plan for Digital Growth 2014–2020, both published by AgID and the Italian government in 2014.<sup>2</sup> In the opinion of the IRM researchers, OGP’s added value is unclear.

The first objective—namely the upgrade of the website, [www.dati.gov.it](http://www.dati.gov.it)—was completed on 05 June 2015, in line with the Plan for Digital Growth.<sup>3</sup> The number of datasets in the portal, [www.dati.gov.it](http://www.dati.gov.it), is constantly growing, and at the date of the analysis 76 institutions had published 10,348 datasets.<sup>4</sup> But the quantity and the quality of the datasets need further improvement. An Internet search shows some limitations of the datasets. For instance, many national institutions have not released datasets in an open format or haven’t updated the datasets, and in some cases even the links are broken.<sup>5</sup>

AgID has made further attempts to give citizens a tool for re-using open data. Three main initiatives on transparency are linked in the Data4All section: OpenEXPO (<http://dati.openexpo2015.it/it>), which is related to expenditure for the Universal Exhibition held in Milan from May to October 2015; SoldiPubblici (<http://soldipubblici.gov.it/>), which pertains to the expenditures of public administrations; and ItaliaSicura (<http://italiasicura.governo.it/>), a program on hydro-geological instability. In the opinion of the researchers, the development of these fairly random datasets reflects the political needs of the government. Indeed, OpenExpo was created after a corruption scandal blew up around the construction of the Universal Exhibition.<sup>6</sup> SoldiPubblici was a response to the claim of more transparency from opposition parties, and ItaliaSicura followed some severe flooding in Italy.

The government fulfilled the second objective of action 4—the creation of a web platform, SoldiPubblici, where citizens can search data on the expenditures of all public administrations— by releasing an update of the platform on 20 January 2015 – on line since December 2014, a month after the publication of the action plan.<sup>7</sup> Publishing new

data was an objective already included in the National Agenda for the Promotion of the Public Information Asset, deadline November 2014.<sup>8</sup>

An Internet search by the IRM researchers has found evidence of a consultation on what types of data to publish. The government opened the consultation on 30 November 2014 (before the publication of the action plan) and closed it on the 31 January 2015.<sup>9</sup> The results of the consultation are available in a report.<sup>10</sup> There is no evidence of consultations launched on February 2015, as reported in the self-assessment report.

AgID was a partner in the hack-a-thon, “The Big Hack—Internet of things,” held in Rome on 10-11 November 2015 (<http://www.dati.gov.it/dataset>). Specifically, AgID launched a challenge on open data, “to solve problems and increase innovative services based on data available on [www.dati.gov.it](http://www.dati.gov.it),” with a prize of €3,000. The winner was an app, “eat(IT),” designed to promote and protect typical Italian food and products.<sup>11</sup> This corresponds to the third objective of the action.

Overall the activities set out in milestones for this commitment have been formally met in quantity. However, work remains to be done to comply with the quality of data promised by this commitment. Also, the quality and standardization of data from public administrations needs to be improved in order to deliver useable datasets to the public.

#### Did it matter?

IRM researchers believe the potential impact of this action is moderate. Datasets on public administration expenditures (searchable by type of expenditure and entity) or on public procurement contracts can increase accountability in public administration and citizen engagement. The commitment had a general objective of making the activities of public administrations and the open data economy more transparent through three different activities. The action shows a strong commitment by the government to increase communication with citizens and to look more modern and friendly than in the past.

The initiatives involving eGovernment and open government must take into account Italy’s limited digital infrastructures.<sup>12</sup> Large investments are needed, and the government has planned to tackle the problem over the next four years. However, more time is needed to verify that the government will solve the existing problems. Notably, although citizens do not seem to be against digitalization, these issues remain only a priority at the government level, receiving little media coverage and little public attention.

That said, this commitment is important because the current number of open datasets is still low and non-standardized. For example, institutions do not regularly update data. Some do not publish data at all, and those that do often use different formats. Italy does not follow the 5-star standard for open data, and without datasets published under clear guidelines users have a difficult time comparing or re-using data. The quality of data is generally low, and public administrations are not committed to opening and updating their data.<sup>13</sup> Hence, the potential impact of this commitment is found to be moderate, a major step forward in the relevant policy area.

#### Moving forward

The IRM researchers recognize that there is room for more ambitious initiatives to move this commitment forward. The potential impact of this commitment, if it was included as part of a future OGP action plan, could be increased by implementing these recommendations, which are also competencies of AgID:



- The opening of key datasets for transparency and the fight against corruption, which remains a high priority in Italy. In particular, data on asset recovery and on beneficial owners of companies;
- The quality of data remains an issue. AgID could set up an alert mechanism that would highlight incomplete records (e.g., contractor names missing); and
- There is an increasing need to coordinate hack-a-thons and other initiatives that include the participation of experts. Furthermore, the initiatives should focus more on citizens' needs and on enhancing their ability to make use of open data.

<sup>1</sup>The metric for this action is the “achievement of the objectives of the National Agenda for the promotion of the Public Information Asset.”

<sup>2</sup>The “Agenda nazionale per la valorizzazione del Patrimonio informativo pubblico” is available here: [http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documenti\\_indirizzo/agendanazionalepatrimoniopubblico2014.pdf](http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documenti_indirizzo/agendanazionalepatrimoniopubblico2014.pdf). The “piano crescita digitale 2014-2020” (strategy for digital growth 2014-2020), is available here: [http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documentazione/strat\\_crescita\\_digit\\_3marzo\\_0.pdf](http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documentazione/strat_crescita_digit_3marzo_0.pdf).

<sup>3</sup>See <http://www.dati.gov.it/content/online-la-nuova-versione-di-datigovit>.

<sup>4</sup>“The quality of published data is usually low, and the possibility of reuse is vanished by the use of data not in open format or licences that don’t allow the reuse of data for commercial purposes.” Second action plan, pg. 9.

<sup>5</sup>For example, it is possible to download the entire catalogue of open data from dati.gov.it from the home page dati.gov.it/Enti/Turismo/dati.gov.it. The page reports that the whole catalogue is updated weekly and can be downloaded in .json (<http://www.dati.gov.it/export/datigovit.json.zip>) or .csv format (<http://www.dati.gov.it/export/datigovit.csv.zip>). These datasets are updated as of 03 June 2015, but the links are broken. Furthermore, this is one of the ten datasets available at the national level in the group “Enti”. Another example: there are 629 open datasets at the municipal level (Comunali), of which there are ninety-three on health care. 60% of these municipal datasets on health care belongs to one small municipality, Albano Laziale (40,000 inhabitants) with 56 datasets, followed by the larger cities of Palermo (13%) and Vicenza and Florence (4% each). With regards to cultural datasets, the Municipality of Albano Laziale holds more open datasets than Milan, Rome, and Florence.

<sup>6</sup> See article by Reuters here <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-italy-corruption-exposed/USBRE44B0FW20140512>

<sup>7</sup>See <http://www.dati.gov.it/content/soldipubblicigovit-naviga-tra-i-dati-della-spesa-della-pubblica-amministrazione>.

<sup>8</sup>See the *Agenda per la valorizzazione del patrimonio informativo pubblico*, available here: [http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documenti\\_indirizzo/agendanazionalepatrimoniopubblico2014.pdf](http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documenti_indirizzo/agendanazionalepatrimoniopubblico2014.pdf), pg. 9.

<sup>9</sup>See <http://www.agid.gov.it/notizie/2014/11/27/consultazioni-valorizzazione-patrimonio-informativo-pubblico> and <http://www.agid.gov.it/notizie/2015/02/13/valorizzazione-patrimonio-informativo-pubblico>.

<sup>10</sup>See [http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/linee\\_guida/segnalazioni\\_dati\\_in\\_open\\_20150212\\_0.pdf](http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/linee_guida/segnalazioni_dati_in_open_20150212_0.pdf).

<sup>11</sup>See <http://www.intelligonews.it/articoli/14-ottobre-2015/31692/the-big-hack-2015-eat-it-la-soluzione-per-la-vostra-alimentazione-smart>.

<sup>12</sup>The European Commission ranks Italy near the bottom of the twenty-eight-member EU in terms of digital economy and online services. A recent report showed that almost a third of the population, 31%, had never used the Internet. Although basic, fixed broadband is available almost everywhere, only 51% of households are subscribers—the lowest level in the EU—and only 21% of households have access to faster, next-generation networks. Source: <http://www.euractiv.com/sections/innovation-industry/italy-approves-plan-boost-broadband-networks-312601>.

<sup>13</sup>See the second action plan, current situation of action 4.

## Action 5: Follow the Money (SoldiPubblici) (★)

### Commitment text

*Improving data usability; establishing communities for data re-use; communication and awareness-raising initiatives; and training for data re-use:*

- ⤴ *for citizens: a) greater transparency; (b) clear understanding of public expenditure (c) possibility to be involved in participative budgeting initiatives;*
- ⤴ *for public administrations: a) rationalization of expenditure; b) encouraging open data reuse; (c) greater confidence; d) possibility to compare expenditure with other administrations.*

### Specific objectives

*SoldiPubblici: a web platform to monitor and analyze financial information from public institutions such as budgets, expenses and contracts.*

*An open dataset which provides greater transparency and understanding of how public money is spent through a graphic representation of data and their processing. All the platform material will be released in open data format and open content. It will be mainly provided through open tools and available under an open license.*

*In particular, the site will allow citizens to:*

- ⤴ *interrogate public administrations' expenses using the SIOPE database;*
- ⤴ *interrogate central administration expenses;*
- ⤴ *display and interrogate local public administrations' budgets according to a uniform ranking;*
- ⤴ *explore the timeframe of spending with different levels of aggregation;*
- ⤴ *download the datasets of interest in an open format;*
- ⤴ *display charts and benchmarking indicators.*

**Responsible institution:** AgID

**Supporting institution(s):** None

**Start date:** January 2015

**End date:** December 2015

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	information	Civic participation	Public accountability	accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
			✓		✓			✓				✓				✓

**Editorial note:** This commitment is clearly relevant to OGP values as written, has transformative potential impact, and is substantially or completely implemented and therefore qualifies as a starred commitment.

## What happened?

Soldipubblici.gov.it aims to promote civic access to public expenditures from all public administration bodies, including all central and local government agencies. To date not all public administration entities are participating, particularly small municipalities that have a hard time finding the resources to implement the initiative. Based on the database SIOPE (<http://www.siope.tesoro.it/>) of the National Bank (Banca d'Italia), the portal was released for the first time in December 2014, and updated in January 2015, at the same time as the second action plan. SIOPE (Information system on the operations of government bodies—*Sistema informativo sulle operazioni degli enti pubblici*) is a system for the online collection of information on the cash transactions, payments, and collections made by every public administration treasurer and is the result of a collaboration among the State General Accounting Department (Ragioneria Generale dello Stato), the Bank of Italy (Banca d'Italia), and the National Institute of Statistics (Istituto Nazionale di Statistica - ISTAT).<sup>1</sup> To date, SIOPE, has tracked this information for the state since 2003, regional and local authorities (for populations in excess of 20,000 inhabitants) and universities since 2006, and smaller local authorities since 2007. In 2015 the General Accounting Department opened the access to the SIOPE database to the public.

The origins of this initiative pre-date the action plan. Its inclusion in the action plan is justified by its potential and meaningfulness, but the added value of the action plan to the existing commitment is unclear. The action aims at increasing usability of data through the creation of communities, communication initiatives, and provision of training for data reuse. Citizens can enter the website and find the expenditures—according to their coding—of many public authorities through a semantic search engine. According to the self-assessment report, soldipubblici.gov.it has had more than 1.5 million hits in a month. This initiative has raised awareness about the open data ecosystem and is seen as an innovative tool to fight corruption, although it is too early to find evidence on the use of the tool.<sup>2</sup>

According to the self-assessment, the combination of soldipubblici.gov.it and electronic invoicing in public administration (in force since March 2015) makes it possible to link the expenditure with the invoice, which contains details on the beneficiary and the description of the service or good provided. Furthermore, the system will be updated on a weekly basis and is upgraded regularly.

It is important to note that the commitment, while ambiguous, seems to focus on the tool itself, and to that extent it has been completed and is fully working. Ongoing efforts are being made to have all public administration bodies use this tool.

## Did it matter?

The opening of all public expenditures in a searchable web platform is a major shift in terms of increasing the government's transparency and accountability. Soldipubblici.gov.it is a service provided for free that reuses open data, and its potential impact is transformative because it creates the possibility of tracking single payments and linking them to electronic invoices and public contracts.<sup>3</sup> Although it is too early to assess the impact of results from this initiative, if fully implemented it will be highly transformative. As many other open data initiatives, the challenge this commitment has to achieve its full potential is the level of future engagement that citizens, civil society organizations, and journalists will have with this tool, which is closely related to their ability and motivation to use it.

## Moving forward

This is one of the best initiatives adopted by the government and AgID to achieve the objectives of OGP in Italy. IRM researchers recognize the value of this initiative and recommend the following actions for future action plans that could shift focus from the tool itself to the usability of the tool:

- The organization of public initiatives, especially at the local level, to train citizens and civil society organizations to use this tool; and
- Increase the number of public administrations included in the database and the quality of the information provided.<sup>4</sup> It is very difficult to detect missing information, and this gap could be used to hide corruption. The page, <http://soldipubblici.gov.it/it/developers>, contains a list of issues to be solved, such as local authorities uploading no data (usually very small municipalities) or discrepancies in the number of inhabitants for the calculation of the costs per inhabitant.

---

<sup>1</sup>Information on SIPE are available at: <http://www.rgs.mef.gov.it/ENGLISH-VE/SIOPE1/What-is-SIOPE.html>  
The full list of Public Administrations included in SIOPE is published on the official journal or here: [http://www.rgs.mef.gov.it/\\_Documenti/VERSIONE-1/e-GOVERNME1/SIOPE/Documentaz/Allegati-R/Elenco\\_delle\\_Amministrazioni\\_Pubbliche\\_-\\_09\\_set\\_2014.pdf](http://www.rgs.mef.gov.it/_Documenti/VERSIONE-1/e-GOVERNME1/SIOPE/Documentaz/Allegati-R/Elenco_delle_Amministrazioni_Pubbliche_-_09_set_2014.pdf).

<sup>2</sup>See <http://www.riparteilfuturo.it/blog/articoli/la-trasparenza-sui-soldi-pubblici-una-scelta-da-promuovere/> or [http://www.huffingtonpost.it/riccardo-luna/soldipubblici-sito-internet-combattere-corruzione\\_b\\_6364758.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.it/riccardo-luna/soldipubblici-sito-internet-combattere-corruzione_b_6364758.html).

<sup>3</sup>The toolbox of these different instruments derives from legal requirements to the PAs. When the system is in place, stakeholders will be able to track public spending from the tendering phase (available at the PA's website) to invoicing and payment (available in soldipubblici website).

<sup>4</sup>By law, all public administrations must be linked to SIOPE. The list is available here: [http://www.rgs.mef.gov.it/\\_Documenti/VERSIONE-1/e-GOVERNME1/SIOPE/Documentaz/Allegati-R/Elenco\\_delle\\_Amministrazioni\\_Pubbliche\\_-\\_09\\_set\\_2014.pdf](http://www.rgs.mef.gov.it/_Documenti/VERSIONE-1/e-GOVERNME1/SIOPE/Documentaz/Allegati-R/Elenco_delle_Amministrazioni_Pubbliche_-_09_set_2014.pdf).

## Theme 3. Technological Innovation

### Action 6: Digital Citizenship

#### Commitment text

*This action aims at providing citizens and businesses with the main tools needed to digitally interact among themselves and with the State. In addition to the goals of effectiveness, efficiency and cost-effectiveness, the goal is to obtain greater transparency in administrative processes, especially in those involving payments, and more generally to promote the evolution of citizenship towards the digital dimension.*

*The workshop "Government as a Service" will effectively help pursue this goal. The project will develop low-cost advanced cloud services and gradually provide them to all public administrations, partly using EU funds. A single modern and user-oriented portal relying on the best international practices is indispensable to rationalize the supply of digital public services and drastically reduce their cost.*

- *For Citizens:*
  - a) *more user-friendly digital services;*
  - b) *availability of innovative online services;*
  - c) *improved quality of life.*
- *For Businesses:*
  - a) *simpler payments;*
  - b) *greater transparency;*
  - c) *availability of innovative online services;*
  - d) *simplified relation with PA.*
- *For Public Administrations:*
  - a) *simplification of processes*
  - b) *better services through data analysis;*
  - c) *greater confidence;*
  - d) *encouraging the use of digital services.*

⤴ *For everybody: reduction of transaction costs for public services and increase of digital skills.*

#### Specific objectives

- ⤴ *Providing citizens with user-friendly tools to access online services.*
- ⤴ *Reducing costs for PAs when providing digital services.*
- ⤴ *Simplifying the online service delivery process.*
- ⤴ *Encouraging citizens and Administrations to use digital tools for delivering services.*
- ⤴ *Ensuring security and lawfulness of online services.*
- ⤴ *Gradually enhancing the availability of online services delivered by PA.*
- ⤴ *Making electronic payments available.*

**Responsible institution:** AgID

**Supporting institution(s):** All

**Start date:** January 2015      **End date:** June 2016

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	information	Civic participation	Public accountability	accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
		✓			Unclear					✓			Unclear			

### What happened?

It is very difficult to assess this action. It contains a wide range of initiatives that belong to other national initiatives, and most were in place before the adoption of the plan.<sup>1</sup> The “specific” objectives of this action are very generic (“providing citizens with user friendly tools to access online services” or “simplifying the online service delivery process”) or mandatory by law (“ensuring security and lawfulness of online services) or impossible to measure, as any innovation can be considered a deliverable of this action. Only part of these actions are ongoing. The IRM researchers consider its relevance and its level of implementation to be “unclear.” Furthermore, there is no direct relationship between the objectives of the action and the metrics. It is questionable if a workshop can have a substantial impact in achieving the general objective. IRM researchers find this commitment to have low specificity. The government recognizes in its self-assessment that action 6 includes a wide range of services, the Public System of Digital Identity (*Sistema Pubblico d'identità Digitale* or SPID), the electronic invoicing mandate for public administrations (*fatturazione elettronica*), the electronic payments to PAs (*pagamenti elettronici*), and the General Register Office (*Anagrafe Nazionale della Popolazione Residente*). AgID is responsible for all these activities, which are all included in the Plan for Digital Growth released on November 2014. None of the described activities show a meaningful connection with the commitment. In particular:

- The SPID was scheduled to start in the first half of 2015, and it is expected to cover 70% of population by 2020.
- The electronic invoicing was set up in 2007 (law 244/2007) and is mandatory since 31 March 2015.<sup>2</sup>
- The electronic payment system for the PAs started in 2012, was mandatory since 31 December 2013, and was expected to be the only means of payment to the PAs from 31 December 2015.<sup>3</sup> In September 2015, however, the AgID had to postpone this deadline to 31 December 2016.<sup>4</sup>
- For the last year, the General Register Office strategy is under the responsibility of the Ministry of Interior.<sup>5</sup> On November 2014 (before the action plan), the communications between ANPR and the municipalities was already set up,<sup>6</sup> while the phases of project development, implementation, and deployment are scheduled to be completed by March 2016.

Given the lack of clarity and indication of specific deliverables for the assessment of this commitment, IRM researchers find this commitment to be of unclear completion.

### Did it matter?

This action describes the digital evolution of the public administration with some transformative potential. It is unclear what the added value of the OGP action plan is to the pre-existing commitment.

According to the IRM researchers and some stakeholders' opinions, the presence of this action in the action plan adds no value to existing strategies.

The progressive digitalization of the public administration and its services is changing the relationship between the state and citizens, in particular when the initiatives are mandatory by law. The infrastructural initiatives described in the action plan will have a positive effect in the coming years. The use of electronic invoices will bolster the SIOPE system, and that will, in turn, have a positive effect on other initiatives more focused on OGP values and objectives.

The initiatives of the action plan form part of the government's wider strategy for the modernization of the country (see Section V). The CSOs consulted in the review phase favor this set of measures in general, but recognize the wide ambition and the complexity of measuring its impact. One expert believes this action should not be included in the plan because it describes the normal evolution of the society and brings no potential for change within the OGP framework.

Given the unclear relevance to OGP values, the vagueness of how this commitment is written, and uncertainty as to whether this commitment is completed, the IRM researchers foresee a minor potential impact of this measure. Regardless of whether it refers to a workshop, a tool, or various digitalization service tools, all will probably be incrementally helpful in increasing transparency by reducing the risk of manipulation in public documents.

## Moving forward

The current strategies to modernize Italy can only have positive effects.

IRM researchers believe that the action should be more focused on citizens' engagement. They recommend including an initiative aimed at reinforcing stakeholders' awareness and capacity to exploit the opportunities offered by the technological infrastructures and the digital citizenship in the next action plan. To date, citizens know little about open government, transparency, and accountability. A 2014 survey of 3,700 newspaper readers (as part of a research project on the impact of open data in the fight against corruption in Europe) has revealed that the most important initiatives on open data reuse are well known among the experts but are almost unknown by the larger public, suggesting that initiatives should target non-experts.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The initiatives are included in the Digital Growth Master Plan 2014-2014, presented by the Italian government on November 2014, one month before the publication of the OGP action plan. The master plan is available here:

[http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documenti\\_indirizzo/crescita\\_digitale\\_2020.pdf](http://www.agid.gov.it/sites/default/files/documenti_indirizzo/crescita_digitale_2020.pdf).

<sup>2</sup>See the legislation related to electronic invoicing here:

<http://www.fatturapa.gov.it/export/fatturazione/it/normativa/f-1.htm>.

<sup>3</sup>See <http://www.agid.gov.it/faq/quali-sono-scadenze-previste>. See also <http://www.agid.gov.it/agenda-digitale/pubblica-amministrazione/pagamenti-elettronici>.

<sup>4</sup>See <http://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/2015/09/23/pagamenti-elettronici-slitte-al-2016-lobbligo-per-le-pa-comuni-in-ritardo/2060378/> and [http://st.ilfattoquotidiano.it/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/cs\\_spid\\_incontro\\_amministrazioni.pdf](http://st.ilfattoquotidiano.it/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/cs_spid_incontro_amministrazioni.pdf).

<sup>5</sup>Between November 2014 and November 2015.

<sup>6</sup>See the Digital Growth Master Plan, pg. 52.

<sup>7</sup>Source: RiSSC, 2015, Revolution Delayed, final report of the TACOD project, available at

<http://www.rissc.it/sites/default/files/images/2015%20TACOD%20REPORT.pdf> The question was "Do you know these initiatives: Confiscati Bene, Monithon, OpenEXPO, OpenParlamento, Partecipa.gov.it," with possible answers being "No," "Yes, I heard about it," and "Yes, I normally visit their website." Considering that visiting does not mean people use the website, responses to this last question for each site were: Monithon 1%; Confiscatibene 2%; OpenExpo 2%; Partecipa.gov.it 6%, Openparlamento 11%.



## V. Process: Self-Assessment

The government adopted second action plan in December 2014, and to date the government has not published the self-assessment report. However, DPA provided a draft report to the IRM researchers. The draft self-assessment includes a description of the progress and outcomes of each of the commitments. However, some actions report loosely related or repeated activities and initiatives as evidence of progress or completion.

**Table 2: Self-Assessment Checklist**

Was the annual progress report published?	N
Was it done according to schedule? (Due 30 Sept. for most governments, 30 March for Cohort 1.)	N
Is the report available in the administrative language(s)?	N.A.
Is the report available in English?	N.A.
Did the government provide a two-week public comment period on draft self-assessment reports?	N
Were any public comments received?	N
Is the report deposited in the OGP portal?	N
Did the self-assessment report include review of consultation efforts during action plan development?	Y
Did the self-assessment report include review of consultation efforts during action plan implementation?	N
Did the self-assessment report include a description of the public comment period during the development of the self-assessment?	N
Did the report cover all of the commitments?	Y
Did it assess completion of each commitment according to the timeline and milestones in the action plan?	N
Did the report respond to the IRM key recommendations (2015+ only)?	N.A.

### Additional Information

The draft self-assessment recognizes that activities 1, 2 and 3 had not yet started a year after the plan's implementation began. On the other hand, activities 4 and 5 have achieved significant progress, but it is difficult to assess if they are completed given the unclear distinction between ongoing and completely new activities included in the plan. The government provided limited (or sometimes no) information for a precise assessment, and none of the possible metrics indicated in the action plan were available. The self-assessment does not reference any participatory processes in the implementation of the plan or the mid-term self-assessment of the plan.

The Plan was adopted after the schedule set by OGP, and it includes activities to be implemented in 15 months. Nevertheless, some of them have not yet started, while others have already been completed, but their timing suggests the plan has included activities almost completed at the time of its publication. Indeed, the self-assessment report justifies the delays in the execution of the plan, noting the change of government in February 2014 and the new period of reforms, the most important of which was the reform of the public administration approved in August 2015.

## VI. Country Context

Italy faces an ongoing, never-ending phase of reforms. This is true also in 2014–2015 when a new government set up its own list of priorities, including reforming public administration.

One of the results of the uncertainty following this situation is the progressive loss of trust in the public institutions, which causes a reduction in voting and shifts to extreme or populist groups.<sup>1</sup> In Italy, aside from a somehow surprising sound affirmation of the main left-wing party, and the fragmentation of the left wing coalition, recent years have seen the growth of a political movement (called Five Stars), completely antagonistic to the existing system.<sup>2</sup> One of its strong demands is full transparency and the direct participation of citizens, through technology, in political decisions.

While several positive actions have been carried out since Italy joined the OGP, the overall context for implementing the open government principles remains difficult. Some areas where challenges remain are:

**Access to information.** Italy has reached levels of transparency and openness that were inconceivable until recently, but despite these positive signs there is still room for improvement. Since 2009, a series of different regulations<sup>3</sup> introducing several proactive disclosure mechanisms have been adopted with the potential to improve overall transparency and to facilitate access to information. Additionally, in 2013 the “Transparency Law” (legislative decree 33/2013) defined transparency for the first time as full access to information concerning the organization and activities of public authorities, with the purpose of enabling an array of control mechanisms to monitor government performance and use of public resources. It also introduced the “right to civic access,” which legally entitles anyone to ask public institutions to publish information and data that has not yet been made publicly available. Italy lacks a Freedom of Information Act, and the rules on transparency and open data do not cover much information that could be relevant for economic development and for more effective monitoring of public-sector activity, such as corporate data, beneficial ownership data, register of meetings, political non-profit organizations (foundations and associations).

**Transparency on media regulation.** Media ownership and political leadership have played a central role in Italian politics for the last two decades due to the political activity of the controversial media tycoon, Silvio Berlusconi. Appointments to independent public regulatory bodies, such as the Communications Regulatory Authority (AGCOM), the Data Protection Agency (Garante della Privacy), and the Antitrust Authority, were made without public scrutiny or consultation. As a result, civil society has become increasingly vocal on the issue.<sup>4</sup>

**Accountability.** In Italy the estimated cost of corruption is €60 billion per year.<sup>5</sup> Until recently, citizens and media had no way of tracking public spending because they did not have the necessary data to hold their representatives accountable. Since January 2013, in an attempt to cut public spending and fight corruption within government agencies, all public offices—from national government to local administrations—have been required to disclose in open and machine-readable formats all payments over €1,000. Nowadays, the SIOPE system allows users to easily track all the expenditures, but it’s too early to measure its effects on accountability.

**Open Data.** To date, increasing transparency is arguably “the best way to fight corruption.” European countries are moving to levels of transparency inconceivable until recently, with significant differences in countries’ legal frameworks, political

commitment, public investments, and civic engagement.<sup>6</sup> Italy ranks 84 (out of 89 countries) in the Global Right to Information Rating, 20 (out of 77) in the Open Data Barometer, 15 (out of 70) in the Open Data Index. In general, the quality of datasets is not very high and does not seem to be improving.<sup>7</sup>

Datasets that are important for anti-corruption are not open, such as the calendars of politicians or the beneficial owners of companies. They are not accessible for free, such as the company register, and the government shows resistance to opening up this information. In 2014, only 17% of the public administrations contacted by Transparency International Italy replied to a survey on open data. The vast majority of public administrations only provide open data to comply with the law, providing the minimum set of data required by transparency duties. The current action plan does not appear to push toward more data or data of a higher quality, and it does not specify what type of data should be released. This is in line with the State Silence study of 2013, where public-sector answers to public access requests were not satisfactory in 77% of the cases.<sup>8</sup>

The Italian open data supply is rather “primitive,” far from the benchmarks of the U.K. and the U.S., the demand side of data is also very underdeveloped. Driven by IT experts and journalists rather than citizens. Open data demand is in the hands of a very small, active, and engaged community of experts that play a leading role not only in asking for high quality data to be opened but also in reusing and combining it. Members of this group often evaluate the public sector on its degree of openness and publicly urge it to publish open data they are interested in. Most of the main Italian open data initiatives come from this small group of experts, which leads to difficulties in maintaining public interest after the start-up phase. Local initiatives of open data reuse are growing and show greater impact on public administration bodies. Among these experts, almost no one has anti-corruption expertise, and no anti-corruption expert has IT skills. The IRM researchers have found a deep gap between the two communities and see the need for specific projects to fill this gap.

Citizens—the largest group of potential users—are not interested in open data: only 7% of citizens use online databases as a source of information, 12% have used open data, mainly to monitor politics, and a majority (76%) have never requested access to a public document.<sup>9</sup>

The number of open data initiatives is growing, but the research has found no evidence of impact on detecting corruption, despite open data’s potential for flagging grey or suspicious areas, especially for local government.<sup>10</sup> There are no open data initiatives that report corruption by reusing open data.

### Stakeholder Priorities

The main priority for civil society stakeholders has been the reform of the current access to information law and the adoption of an Italian Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). An online petition by the coalition called Foia4Italy had more than 41,000 signatures.<sup>11</sup>

With the passage of the Public Administrative Reform last August, parliament mandated the Italian government to write a legislative decree that regulates access to government-held information. The Italian government had approximately 180 days to fulfil its mandate.

Participants in the focus group and the interviews stressed the need to enlarge the number of stakeholders involved in the process. Most of them perceive the role of civil society organizations both as contributors to the process and as watchdogs of the government’s action. Almost all the delegates from the CSOs have expressed their

availability to be involved in this and in the next action plan, if invited by the government.

In general, their view of the second action plan is positive but weak, believing the plan to be of limited ambition and to have a low potential impact. They recognize, however, that there has been progress in the participatory process since the first action plan. (The IRM researchers note that the level of participation in the first action plan was very low, almost non-existent). One organization that was invited to participate in the second action plan process declined to do so because it disagreed with the practical implementation of the OGP methodology for CSO engagement. They did not suggest an alternative to the current methodology. Many interviewees highlighted the absence of the business sector.

Since the second action plan is still in its early development phase, there are no specific requests from stakeholders in respect of the content of the forthcoming action plan.

### Scope of Action Plan in Relation to the National Context

The IRM researchers recognize that the second action plan and its commitments are for the most part in line with the OGP values of transparency, accountability, and civic participation, as articulated in the OGP Declaration of Principles and the Articles of Governance, and fall within a wider strategy of modernization. The second action plan covers much of the same ground as this modernization strategy, which is widely supported by the government and coordinated among many institutions, and because of this it will be almost impossible to distinguish whether the results come from the action plan or from other initiatives.

IRM researchers stress the need to invest adequate resources in the modernization process and to train civil servants to acquaint them with the concepts of accountability, participation, cooperation, and service to the citizens. This is particularly true at the national level because the distance from the citizens is bigger.

The new government—in place since February 2014—has adopted major reforms that are slowing the initiatives in this short-term period but appear to be promising in the medium/long term. Changes on the executive side did not directly affect the OGP team, but there have been changes. For instance, the number institutions involved and a clearer division of labour are differences between the two action plans.

The heads of AgID and ANAC have changed with the new government, and the priorities of the new government appear to have supported the commitments included in the action plan. There is no evidence that the crisis has had a direct impact on the OGP action plan.

There are many promising aspects to open data. Access to open data facilitates civic scrutiny, reduces information asymmetry that hides corruption, and increases political commitment, public-sector accountability, and behavioural change. It also facilitates comparability of public-sector performance and contributes to shifts in participatory mechanisms.

In Italy, there are a few areas of open data that deserve priority: data on beneficial ownership and a register of conflict of interests—supported by an adequate right to information—on the supply side and the growth of civic engagement, open data communities, and digital skills for anti-corruption institutions on the demand side.

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.repubblica.it/politica/2014/12/28/news/partiti\\_istituzioni\\_europa\\_la\\_fiducia\\_va\\_a\\_picco\\_cittadini\\_sempre\\_pi\\_soli\\_il\\_papa\\_unica\\_speranza-103904923/](http://www.repubblica.it/politica/2014/12/28/news/partiti_istituzioni_europa_la_fiducia_va_a_picco_cittadini_sempre_pi_soli_il_papa_unica_speranza-103904923/).

---

<sup>2</sup>The Five Star movement is a political party founded by Beppe Grillo, a comic actor. Among the main principles, politicians must not be “professionals” (maximum ten years of career). The party, originally born as an dissident, fringe movement, is now around the 30% of votes at national level.

<sup>3</sup> The 27 October 2009 legislative decree, n.150, Implementation of Law March 4th, 2009, n.150, on the optimization of public work productivity and efficiency and transparency of public administrations, also known as the Transparency Law, introduced new duties and requirements on the public administrations concerning transparency. Every public administration had to draft a triennial plan for transparency and integrity where times and modalities for administrative proceedings are outlined for public knowledge. A new section of the administrations’ websites was to be created, called “transparency, evaluation, and merit.” The section had to include the triennial plan for transparency, the bonus for performances of employees, names and curricula of public managers, members of the team of evaluation of performances and of elected politicians, and assignments to external subjects. Sanctions for not adhering to these duties were the non-awarding of allowances related to results. This decree also opened up the framework to a review concerning the use of open data. The law passed November 6th, 2012, n.190, Provisions on Prevention and Repression of Corruption and Illegality in the Public Administration, introduced a set of regulations, tools, and internal procedures for public administrations. Among the actions the public administrations need to implement are some activities to increase publicity and transparency. In particular article 1, paragraph 35, provides that *“The Government has a mandate to adopt, without further public financial burdens, within six months from the approval of this law, a legislative decree to reorganise the provisions on the duties of publicity, transparency and diffusion of information by public administrations, through the amendment or the integration of existing laws or through new forms of publicity, respecting the directives: (...)”*

<sup>4</sup>The parliament is discussing a bill to control the use and the publication of recordings, threatening the freedom of information and the independence of the press. Opposition parties, public prosecutors associations, and the the National Association of the Press have raised many concerns about the bill. See <http://www.fnsi.it/Contenuti/Content.asp?AKey=17868>.

<sup>5</sup> The figure is an estimate of the 3% of GDP, calculated for the first time by the Supreme Audit Institution in 2009, then neglected by the same court. The figure is now considered a current estimate of corruption in Italy, and it has been reported in the 2014 anti-corruption report of the European Commission.

<sup>6</sup>This paragraph reports an extract from the findings of a research project (2015) on the impact of open data in the fight against corruption in Italy, United Kingdom, Austria, and Spain. The report is available here: <http://www.rissc.it/sites/default/files/images/2015%20TACOD%20REPORT.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup>See the Strategy for Digital Growth 2014–2020 of the Italian government, pg. 70.

<sup>8</sup>The report is available here: [http://www.dirittodisapere.it/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/DDS\\_SilenziDiStato\\_ITA.pdf](http://www.dirittodisapere.it/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/DDS_SilenziDiStato_ITA.pdf).

<sup>9</sup>RiSSC, “Revolution Delayed”(2015). Details the impact of open data in the fight against corruption. The findings of the report were presented at the 16th IACC in September 2015. The report is available here: <http://www.rissc.it/sites/default/files/images/2015%20TACOD%20REPORT.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> The research has found that investigations in the recent scandals of MPs’ expenses in UK, or EXPO in Italy were based on leaks or whistleblowing rather than on the analysis or reuse of open data, which were fully available in both cases.

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.change.org/p/matteo-renzi-subito-una-legge-sulla-trasparenza-per-battere-la-corruzione-e-costruire-una-democrazia-più-forte>.

## VII. General Recommendations

While specific recommendations for each of the individual commitments are made in Section IV of this report, these are more general recommendations that outline steps for Italy and the OGP process.

### Crosscutting Recommendation

Another effect of the continuous reforms is that, while plans and strategies (including OGP) get launched, their future implementation, results, and impact remain uncertain. Many reforms presented and promoted in the past by the government have never made it past the development stage. The current plan is smart, insofar as it included almost-completed actions and less un-achievable actions. In future action plans, government could find a balance between achievable, yet more ambitious commitments.

Civil society silence around the delays in the implementation of the action plan—and the absence of debates and engagement with civil society on its implementation could be a result of the potential conflict of interest raised when civil society leaders are offered “official roles” by the government. Although these roles are often not paid, there are members of the small community of open government activists who have become less critical of the government once they occupied these positions.

The IRM researchers' cross-cutting recommendation is that government should do more to bring civil society into the process, to increase civil society participation in each stage of the OGP action plan. Also, Italian civil society needs to engage and involve itself more, keeping a clear separation between public and private roles.

### Top SMART Recommendations

*Beginning in 2014, all OGP/IRM reports should include five key recommendations about the next OGP planning cycle. Governments participating in OGP will be required to respond to these key recommendations in their annual self-assessments.*

Based on the above, the top five SMART recommendations are as follows:

<b>TOP FIVE 'SMART' RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
1. Increase participation and engagement of civil society and the business community in the OGP process and in the development of new action plans.
2. Institutionalize a multi-stakeholder forum for regular consultations in order to engage with stakeholders, involve new actors, and set up a feedback process.
3. Adopt accountable metrics to track implementation of transparency, accountability and anti-corruption reforms.
4. Increase disclosure in government activities and contracts, including more open data on beneficial ownership and of conflict of interests.
5. Determine clear roles and resources for the different institutions involved in the OGP process.



## VIII. Methodology and Sources

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

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

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

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

### Interviews and Focus Groups

National researchers carried out a focus group in Rome on 05 October 2015, inviting a variety of stakeholders. Supplementary follow-up interviews were carried out in the following month. The questions for the CSOs were the following:

1. Please describe your role, if any, in the making of the action plan?
2. What is, in your opinion, the role of civil society in the development of the action plan?
3. Should the participation of civil society be for contribution or control of government's OGP activities?
4. Can one of the two functions remain if the other is missing?
5. Action Plan 1—have you been involved?
6. Action Plan 2—after its presentation, have you been involved in the implementation of the action plan?
7. Have you been involved in the first review mechanism?
8. Do you know the actions of the plan? Which one is, in your opinion, most interesting or challenging?
9. What is your judgment on CSO participation in the development of the second action plan? What was missing?
10. Who is missing in the process?
11. Do you think that the process should include the business community?
12. Has the presence of more agencies (DFP, AGID, ANAC) been an advantage or a limitation?
13. What is your general evaluation of the plan? Is it ambitious, realistic, SMART?
14. What are the main obstacles to the plan?

A specific interview with ANAC took place on 26 October 2015, and the last interview was conducted on the 28 October 2015.



The IRM researchers received the draft self-assessment report from the DPA on 26 October 2015 and filed further requests for information to the DPA on 20 November 2015.

The list of people consulted is the following: Ugo Bonelli, Fernanda Faini, Claudio Cesarano, Simona De Luca, Carlo Amati, Davide Del Monte, Roberto Gabrielli, and Stefano Epifani.

### **Document Library**

The IRM uses publicly accessible online libraries as a repository for the information gathered throughout the course of the research process. All the original documents, as well as several documents cited within this report, are available for viewing and comments in the IRM Online Library in Italy, at <http://www.funzionepubblica.gov.it/la-struttura/dipartimento-della-funzione-pubblica/attivita/attivita-internazionali/ogp/presentazione.aspx>.

### **About the Independent Reporting Mechanism**

The IRM is a key means by which government, civil society, and the private sector can track government development and implementation of OGP action plans on a biannual 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:

Anuradha Joshi

Debbie Budlender

Ernesto Velasco-Sánchez

Gerardo Munck

Hazel Feigenblatt

Hille Hinsberg

Jonathan Fox

Liliane Corrêa de Oliveira Klaus

Rosemary McGee

Yamini Aiyar

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

---

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

## IX. Eligibility Requirements Annex

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

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

Criteria	2011	Current	Change	Explanation
Budget Transparency <sup>2</sup>	4	4	No change	4 = Executive’s Budget Proposal and Audit Report published 2 = One of two published 0 = Neither published
Access to Information <sup>3</sup>	4	4	No change	4 = Access to information (ATI) Law 3 = Constitutional ATI provision 1 = Draft ATI law 0 = No ATI law
Asset Declaration <sup>4</sup>	4	4	No change	4 = Asset disclosure law, data public 2 = Asset disclosure law, no public data 0 = No law
Citizen Engagement (Raw score)	4 (8.53) <sup>5</sup>	4 (8.53) <sup>6</sup>	No change	<i>EIU Citizen Engagement Index</i> raw score: 1 > 0 2 > 2.5 3 > 5 4 > 7.5
<b>Total / Possible (Percent)</b>	16/16 (100%)	16/16 (100%)	No change	75% of possible points to be eligible

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

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

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

<sup>4</sup> Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, “Disclosure by Politicians,” (Tuck School of Business Working Paper 2009-60, 2009): [://bit.ly/19nDEfK](http://bit.ly/19nDEfK); Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), “Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level Of Transparency,” in *Government at a Glance 2009*, (OECD, 2009). [://bit.ly/13vGtqS](http://bit.ly/13vGtqS); Ricard Messick, “Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries” (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009). [://bit.ly/1clokyf](http://bit.ly/1clokyf); For more recent information, see <http://publicofficialsfinancialdisclosure.worldbank.org>. In 2014, the OGP Steering Committee approved a change in the asset disclosure measurement. The existence of a law and *de facto* public access to the disclosed information replaced the old measures of disclosure by politicians and disclosure of high-level officials. For additional information, see the guidance note on 2014 OGP Eligibility Requirements at <http://bit.ly/1EjLJ4Y>.

<sup>5</sup> Economist Intelligence Unit, “Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat” (London: Economist, 2010). Available at: [://bit.ly/eLC1rE](http://bit.ly/eLC1rE).

<sup>6</sup> Economist Intelligence Unit, “Democracy Index 2014: Democracy and its Discontents” (London: Economist, 2014). Available at: <http://bit.ly/18kEzCt>.