Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2014–15: Denmark

Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst, Journalist, Associate Teaching Professor, and PhD Fellow in the Department of Communication and Arts at Roskilde University

Table of Contents

Executive summary: Denmark

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2014–15

The second Danish action plan had overall substantial completion at midterm. To raise the impact of OGP, Denmark can broaden government ownership of the OGP process and deepen in-person engagement with stakeholders. Future action plans may include commitments to address key issues such as political party financing, lobbying regulations, and access to information reforms.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a review at the mid and end point of the national action plan for each OGP-participating country.

Denmark began its participation in November 2011. This progress report covers the first period of implementation of Denmark's second action plan, from 1 October 2013 to 30 June 2015. Note that Denmark has been on an irregular review cycle, and the timescale for their participation was extended for the second action plan until 30 June 2016 to adjust to the even year country calendar.

The Agency for Digitisation (AFD), under the Ministry of Finance, coordinates the OGP process. Additionally, they are responsible for direct implementation of at least half of the commitments. Some actions are implemented in collaboration with other government bodies.

OGP process

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

The AFD issued a formal advance notice clearly indicating the format and timeline for public consultations and providing relevant government contact information, 33 days prior to consultation.

An online open consultation was held on the Danish public hearing portal. The government received 27 responses from government actors, nongovernmental organisation (NGO) representatives, and citizens, none of which directly addressed concerns about the OGP process. While many stakeholders were consulted for the development of the plan, no mechanism guarantees that received inputs would impact the government's final decision on included commitments. Additionally, no in-person consultations were held before or during implementation of the action plan.

The government provided a midterm self-assessment report in September 2015.

At a glance

Member since: 2011
Number of commitments: 16

Level of Completion:
Completed: 9 (56%)
Substantial: 5 (31%)
Limited: 1 (6%)
Unclear: 1 (6%)

Timing:
On schedule: 13 (81%)

Commitment Emphasis:
Access to information: 5 (31%)
Civic participation: 5 (31%)
Public Accountability: 0
Tech & innovation for transparency & accountability: 4 (25%)

Number of Commitments that Were:
Clearly relevant to an OGP value: 10 (63%)
Of transformative potential impact: 0
Substantial or complete in implementation: 14 (88%)

All three (✪): 0

This report was prepared by Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst, Journalist, Associate Teaching Professor, and PhD Fellow in the Department of Communication and Arts at Roskilde University

Commitment implementation

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. The Danish action plan contains commitments related to four policy areas that include local democracy and participation, digital communication, modernisation of the public sector, and open data. The four areas contain 16 commitments. The following tables summarise for each commitment the level of completion, potential impact, whether it falls within Denmark's planned schedule, and the key next steps for the commitment in future OGP action plans. Denmark completed 13 of its 16 commitments.

The Danish action plan did not contain starred commitments. These commitments 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 to raise the bar for model OGP commitments. In addition to the criteria listed above, the old criteria included commitments that have moderate potential impact. Under the old criteria, Denmark would not have received additional stars. See (http://www.opengovpartnership.org/node/5919) for more information.

Table 1: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

COMMITMENT SHORT NAME	POTENTIAL IMPACT				LEVEL OF COMPLETION				TIMING
✪ COMMITMENT IS CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS TRANSFORMATIVE POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.	NONE	MINOR	MODERATE	TRANSFORMATIVE	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	COMPLETE	
1. Implement service check of local government consultations	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
2. Promote advance voting	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
3. Promote participation of first-time voters	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
4. Meet user-friendliness requirements for self-service solutions	●	●			●	●	●		Behind schedule
5. Develop plan for inclusion	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
6. Launch digital communication campaign	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
7. Support modernisation of public sector	●	●			●	●	●		On schedule
8. Advance the "Free Municipality" project	●	●			●	●	●	●	Unclear
9. Present initiatives from growth teams	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	On schedule
10. Improve supply of digital welfare services	●	●			Unclear				On schedule
11. Implement charter on volunteering	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
12. Improve the "Open Data Innovation Strategy"	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
13. Develop a data distributor	●	●			●	●	●		On schedule
14. Carry out the "Open Government Camp"	●	●			●	●	●	●	On schedule
15. Provide assistance to Myanmar	●	●			●	●	●		On schedule
16. Provide access to key datasets	●	●	●		●	●			Behind schedule

Table 2: Summary of Progress by Commitment

NAME OF COMMITMENT	SUMMARY
✪ COMMITMENT IS MEASURABLE, CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS TRANSFORMATIVE POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.	
1. Implement service check of local government consultations • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete	This commitment aims to involve citizens in decision making processes at the municipal level. The Ministry of Economics and the Interior created a committee mandated to look into the possibility of adjusting the rules governing local government consultations. In 2014, it released a report with recommendations to improve municipal and government hearings. However, nongovernmental stakeholders believe that the report (1) did not provide actions for its implementation or enforcement, (2) delegated the responsibility to regulate consultations to municipalities without establishing standardized guidelines, and (3) has limited input from non-governmental stakeholders because the committee had no civil society representation. Moving forward, the government could carry this commitment to future action plans, broadening its scope to address the concerns from nongovernmental stakeholders.
2. Promote advance voting • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete **3. Promote participation of first-time voters** • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete	Due to a drop in election turnout in past local electoral cycles, the government sought to increase citizen participation by calling on municipalities to facilitate advance voting (commitment 2) and promoting participation among young voters (commitment 3). The government circulated a letter among Danish mayors urging them to widen the availability of advance voting and a letter to 100,000 randomly selected first-time voters to encourage them to participate in the regional elections of 2013. While the government's initiative is laudable, it is also important to note that their mandate in local and regional elections is limited. Therefore, any actions in this effect will only go as far as local authorities respond to encouragement. Future commitments could use the findings of reports on the electoral process to encourage participation in politics more broadly and not just as a matter of casting votes.
4. Meet user-friendliness requirements for self-service solutions • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial **5. Develop plan for inclusion** • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete **6. Launch digital communication campaign** • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete	These commitments are part of the Danish national IT strategy, which aims to provide access to public services and offices by enhancing citizens' ability to engage in digital self-service and communication. **Commitment 4** calls for the creation of conditions for better data quality and aims to improve access to data updating service platforms. Thus far, the AFD reports to have formulated a guide for self-service solutions, but recognizes that more work needs to be done for all mandatory self-service solutions to meet the minimum requirements stipulated in the guide. **Commitment 5** seeks to train citizens and authorities to increase access to information through technological improvements. The AFD created (1) the National Network for Digital Inclusion, which outlines the digital communication challenges, (2) an inclusion plan in collaboration with various civil society organisations, and (3) an online training site for citizens to get better acquainted with the portal (borger.dk) and self-service solutions. **Commitment 6** called for a digital communication campaign, which was launched in mid-august 2014 and ran through January 2015. Although laudable, this commitment is not relevant to OGP values because it does not contribute to openness in government, as written. All three commitments represent an incremental but positive step towards improving data quality, user-friendliness, and accessibility. The IRM researcher recommends that future commitments pertaining to self-service and e-government solutions should be framed in a way that directly respond to openness beyond the internal administrative focus.

Table 2 continued

7. Support modernisation of public sector • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial **8. Advance the "Free Municipality" project** • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial	To modernise the public sector, the government called for: (1) creating a centre for public sector innovation (CPI) (commitment 7) and (2) continuing the Free Municipality project (commitment 8). Thus far, the government created the CPI. A January 2014 midterm evaluation on the Free Municipality project stated that it is on schedule, but no other information was found. Although commitment language is vague, it seems to focus on studies and trial initiatives that eventually could justify policy change. Additionally, it is unclear how it contributes to open government values. Moving forward, the IRM researcher recommends that commitments to strengthen municipalities could address open local government practices, strengthen CPI's mandate to work at local level, and involve local governments in future action plan development.
9. Present initiatives from growth teams • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete	This commitment aims to strengthen the country's business environment and improve living standards. It suggests the creation of eight thematic growth teams composed of different stakeholders from the public administration, private sector, academia or associations. The teams concluded their work in 2014 and their recommendations have been incorporated in the Danish Growth Plan and individual growth plans for each business area covered. Identifying specific measures to improve companies' productivity and development opportunities is clearly important for growth and employment in Denmark. However, for the commitment to impact openness directly and to meet OGP value relevance standards, the government could carry it forward to future action plans using the structure of growth teams as a model to foster public engagement in policymaking.
10. Improve supply of digital welfare services • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Unclear	The digital welfare strategy aims to improve the quality and efficiency of government digital services in social, health, and educational areas. It consists of 24 initiatives to be fully implemented by 2020. At the time of writing, the agency has hosted 1,200 leaders in the public welfare field to debate the implementation of the strategy. However, due to the lack of specificity in commitment language, it is unclear what specific actions should be carried out to fulfill the commitment. Although relevance to OGP values is unclear, the strategy is significant in advancing the policy area. Moving forward, this commitment could have clearer relevance if it included the release of government-held information or involved citizens in the creation of a new policy structure.
11. Implement charter on volunteering • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete	This commitment calls for dialogue between the public sector and the volunteering community in Denmark to review how the volunteering charter can be implemented locally. Four hundred-forty people from the public sector and volunteering associations participated in a total of five meetings. Results were gathered in an idea bank and released as a catalogue. The Ministry of Employment announced implementation of ten initiatives to improve conditions in the workplace for volunteers and to decrease bureaucracy. This commitment represents a major step towards improvement of the volunteering policy. The IRM researcher suggests increasing consultations to influence decision making process on volunteering policy.

Table 2 continued

12. Improve the "Open Data Innovation Strategy" • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete **13. Develop a data distributor** • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial	These commitments support government institutions during implementation of the "Open Data Innovation Strategy." **Commitment 12**, the government amended the PSI Act on open data, in response to the revision of the EU PSI Directive. Parliament approved on 27 May 2014. Government officials as well as representatives from civil society organisations (CSOs), associations, academia, and media provided input during an online consultation. The amendment came into force on 1 July 2014, and the government led awareness-raising campaigns on the new legislation. **Commitment 13** is still ongoing, but at the time of writing, the government has met the milestones planned for the first year of implementation. A trial period of the distributor was officially launched at the end of 2015, and it is not expected to be fully functional until 2017. So far, only four government bodies are feeding data into the trial platform. The IRM researcher recommends government to develop guidelines that would assure uniformity in the publication of data across the different governmental bodies as well as train public officials and the general public on data collection. Overall, both commitments are positive but incremental steps in Denmark's efforts to increase sharing of digital resources, consistent with improvement of access to information.
14. Carry out the "Open Government Camp" • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete	The Open Government Camp aims to promote dialogue to address challenges on the implementation of open government values. The AFD held the Camp on 12 November 2013, and 170 people from the public, private and civil society sectors participated. Although valuable to raise awareness of OGP, stakeholders noted that the topics covered were very technical and undermined active engagement from participants. In the future, the IRM researcher suggests, this commitment could (1) define clear and measurable outcomes, (2) design mechanisms that guarantee results to be considered in policy design, and (3) organise workshops on a regular basis on a smaller scale, targeting stakeholders according to expertise.
15. Provide assistance to Myanmar • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial	Denmark published its plan to support Myanmar in their efforts to join OGP. Although this programme is relevant to the areas of access to justice, participation, non-discrimination, transparency, and accountability in Myanmar, it is not clear how it is relevant to OGP values in Denmark. If carried over, the government could consider a more domestic focus like promoting transparency and accountability in companies with a business interest in Myanmar.
16. Provide access to key datasets • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Limited	This commitment aims to increase transparency in government decision making through the release of data, updating the standard license for open government data and providing guidance tools. Currently, government-held data (especially related to public spending) is not easily accessible and varies in quality and format. By June 2016, the government expects to update the license for open data and develop guidance material to encourage its use. If fully implemented, it would be a major step to increase access to information in Denmark. The IRM researcher suggests including capacity-building activities for citizens, removing legal restrictions to open data, increasing collaboration between public bodies, and allocating proper funding to implement open data initiatives.

Based on the findings in the progress report, the IRM researchers made the following five: specific, measurable, accountable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) recommendations for improving the OGP process in Denmark.

TOP FIVE 'SMART' RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Increase the clarity of the action plans: Future action plans could follow a common language with (1) a specific timeline, (2) concrete milestones, and (3) a clear connection to OGP values, to better meet the goals of open government. For instance, the IRM researcher has noticed that open government is often confused with e-government, and the self-assessment report recognizes this tendency in the Danish action plan. The government should include commitments with explicit relevance to OGP values.
2. Place the political mandate of OGP in the Prime Minister's office: Although initially not recognized as an issue in the government's self assessment report, the IRM researcher finds that there is no real political ownership of OGP. Although the government has assigned a person responsible for OGP matters, it remains unknown by the majority of officials. The IRM researcher suggests that, to ensure its proper implementation, the OGP process be enforced directly by the Prime Minister's office.
3. Designate an OGP point-of-contact in each government institution: Relevant authorities in charge of fulfilling most of the commitments of the current action plan are unaware of the existence of OGP and Denmark's involvement in the program. The government could designate a point-of-contact in each institution who would be expected to contribute to the implementation of the action plan, to ensure a shared understanding of access to information, civic participation, and public accountability.
4. Promote regular stakeholder meetings: Assuring frequent meetings at regular intervals between stakeholders could be key to assuring stakeholder ownership of OGP values and challenges. Initiatives such as the Open Government Camp could be carried out on a smaller scale through regional meet-ups and local gatherings.
5. Include more ambitious commitments relevant to country context issues: The Danish government could consider pursuing commitments in future action plans that aim to (1) promote transparency in political party financing, (2) enact lobbying regulations, and (3) reform the Freedom of Information Act.

Eligibility Requirements 2014: 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.

Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst is a Journalist, Associate Teaching Professor, and PhD Fellow in the Department of Communication and Arts at Roskilde University.

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

Open Government Partnership

I. National participation in OGP

History of OGP participation

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary, multistakeholder 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 organisations (CSOs), and the private sector, all of which contribute to a common pursuit of open government.

Denmark began formal participation in November 2011, when Lars Frelle-Petersen, Deputy Director of the Agency for Digitisation (AFD), declared the country's intention to participate in the initiative.[1]

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 VIII on 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 ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

Denmark developed its national action plan from January 2013 to October 2013. The effective period of implementation for the action plan submitted in October was officially 1 October 2013 through 31 December 2014. Denmark has been on an irregular review cycle, and the timescale for their participation was extended for the second action plan until 30 June 2016. At the time of this extension the government included two new commitments, which are reviewed in this report along with the original 14 commitments. The government published its draft self-assessment report in September 2015. At the time of writing (September 2015), the self-assessment report is in public hearing.[2]

Basic institutional context

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Danish Prime Minister from 2009 to 2011 and re-elected in 2015, initially declared the intent for Denmark to join the OGP in 2011.[3] After the general election in September 2011, the then-newly elected Prime Minister Helle Thorning-Schmidt formally took over the OGP initiative. The government created the AFD under the Ministry of Finance (MOF) and appointed Cathrine Lippert as the head to oversee the elaboration and implementation of the initiative.[4]

The preparation of the second action plan began with a public hearing conducted in January 2013, during the implementation period of the first action plan. It was completed on schedule and released on October 2013, prior to the release of the first IRM report. Therefore, no recommendations from the IRM were integrated. It is important to note that most of the commitments in the second action plan are already existing projects. They were being implemented by different public offices and bundled into the plan.

Similar to the process during the first Danish action plan, there has been little focus on the OGP from other agencies and ministries in Denmark. The OGP initiative is unknown to the general population and most government officials. So far, it has had no traction in Danish media. The AFD has been involved directly in the implementation of eight

commitments, the rest have been carried out in collaboration with other government bodies.

Methodological note

The IRM partners with experienced, independent national researchers to author and disseminate reports for each OGP participating government. In Denmark, the IRM partnered with Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst, a Journalist, PhD fellow, and Teaching Associate Professor at Roskilde University. He 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 follows on an earlier review of OGP performance, "Denmark's Progress Report 2012-2013,"[5] which covered the development of the first action plan as well as implementation from the release of the report through the end of 2012.

To gather the voices of multiple stakeholders, the IRM researcher organised a stakeholder forum in Copenhagen, the capital of Denmark. Although the meeting was not held using a specific research model structure, the discussion followed a clear agenda, which contained guiding questions to learn about whether and what consultation activities were led by government.[6] The IRM researcher also performed a large online survey[7] with more than 600 invited respondents, as well as an open online survey, where anyone interested in reviewing the Danish action plan could participate. Additionally, the researcher reviewed two key documents prepared by the government: a report on Denmark's first action plan[8] and the draft government self-assessment report published in September 2015.[9] Numerous references are made to these documents throughout this report.

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

---

[1] "Denmark," Open Government Partnership (OGP), http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/denmark
[2] "Horing Om Selvevaluering Af Implementering Af Danmarks Nationale Handlingsplan for Open Government 2013-2014," Horing, https://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/58703
[3] "Lars Lokke Rasmussen," Folketinget, http://www.ft.dk/Folketinget/findMedlem/VLALR.aspx
[4] Cathrine Lippert, Special Advisor on Open Government and Open Data Innovation Strategy at the Danish Agency for Digitisation, interview with the IRM researcher, August 2015.
[5] Mads Kaemsgaard Eberholst, "Independent Reporting Mechanism: Danmark Statusrapport 2012-2013," OGP, 2014, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1ZEr3gp
[6] "Dagsorden – Stakeholdermode," Agenda, 23 September 2015, http://bit.ly/1PpHurb
[7] IRM online library, link to survey summary of responses. "Public_Denmark_IRM2_Library," Google Drive, http://bit.ly/1ZEqTWa; "General Survey Structure," http://bit.ly/1S4Pymj
[8] "Open Government," digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://www.digst.dk/Styring/Open-Government
[9] "Horing Om Selvevaluering Af Implementering Af Danmarks Nationale Handlingsplan for Open Government 2013-2014," https://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/58703

II. Process: Action plan development

While many stakeholders were consulted for the development of the second OGP action plan, no mechanism guarantees that received inputs will impact the government's final decision on included commitments.

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 written 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 discussed in section III on 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 discussed in the next section, but evidence for consultation before and during implementation is included here and in Table 1 for ease of reference.

Table 1: Action Plan Consultation Process

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the Government Meet this Requirement?
During Development	Were timeline and process available prior to consultation?	Yes
	Was the timeline available online?	Yes[1]
	Was the timeline available through other channels?	No
	Was there advance notice of the consultation?	Yes
	How many days of advance notice were provided?	33
	Was this notice adequate?	Yes
	Did the government carry out awareness-raising activities?	Yes[2]
	Were consultations held online?	Yes[3]
	Were in-person consultations held?	No
	Was a summary of comments provided?	Yes[4]
	Were consultations open or invitation-only?	Open
	Place the consultations on the IAP2 spectrum.[5]	Consult

During Implementation	Was there a regular forum for consultation during implementation?	No
	Were consultations open or invitation-only?	N/A
	Place the consultations on the IAP2 spectrum.	N/A

Advance notice and awareness-raising

The Danish Agency for Digitisation (AFD), the government body in charge of coordinating Denmark's participation in OGP, issued a formal advance notice clearly indicating the format and timeline for public consultations and providing relevant government contact information. It was not available through other channels. The agency provided 33 days' notice prior to the consultation, from 19 December 2012 to 20 January 2013, which was enough time to allow different stakeholders to plan for their participation in the process. Prior to this notice, the government held an Open Government Camp on 12 September 2012 as part of their awareness-raising activities. The Camp included several workshops with the participation of stakeholders from the public, private, and NGO sectors. Additionally, the AFD promoted participation using the government online forum for OGP (digitaliser.dk)[6] and social media. For example, Twitter was used to engage with civil society.[7]

However, the government explains in the self-assessment report that it has proven difficult for them to raise awareness amongst the general public because the concept of open government is too abstract and because no inter-ministerial task force is responsible for coordinating Denmark's participation in OGP.

Depth and breadth of consultation

The consultation process for the development of the second action plan occurred as expected, in a similar fashion to the process for the first action plan. The AFD organised an online open consultation held on the public hearing portal (online link and timeframe for hearing provided in table above) and sent invitations for multiple stakeholders from all different sectors and parties involved in the OGP Process to participate through a hearing list.[8] They welcomed NGO representatives, municipal and regional actors, government bodies, and private persons whose hearing answers are published online.[9] The government received 27 online hearing responses, none of which directly addressed action plan matters.

The weaknesses in the consultation process are similar to those identified in the first IRM progress report.[10] Although the Open Government Camp is a positive step forward, the AFD should enhance their engagement with participants. This would mean not only consulting through online public hearings, but also including in-person consultations and having interested stakeholders participate in the development and decision making process of individual commitments. This type of consultation is not customary in Denmark. Seldom does the government organise anything more than an online public hearing, which is devoid of the power to make change. The IRM researcher would recommend a more meaningful dialogue for the development of future action plans.

All activities were invitations to participate in the online public hearing. They did not include in-person interaction and dialogue between the government and potential stakeholders.

[1] Timeline available here: http://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/16324

[2] Awareness-raising activities available here: https://twitter.com/search?q=%23ogp_dk&src=typd & https://digitaliser.dk/resource/2428113

[3] Online consultation available here: https://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/16324

[4] Summary of comments available here: http://digitaliser.dk/resource/2508477

[5] "IAP2 Spectrum of Political Participation," International Association for Public Participation, http://bit.ly/1kMmlYC

[6] "Horingssvar Om OGP-Handlingsplan," Government 2.0 – Open Government, Digitaliser, http://bit.ly/1Vb2yGl

[7] "#ogp_dk," Twitter, https://twitter.com/search?q=%23ogp_dk&src=typd

[8] "Horing," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, 19 December 2013, http://bit.ly/1SzyxSv

[9] "Horingssvar Om OGP-Handlingsplan," http://bit.ly/1Vb2yGl

[10] "Denmark," OGP, http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/denmark/irm

III. Process: Action plan implementation

The government developed an online forum to discuss the implementation of the second action plan in Denmark. However, stakeholders believe this forum was insufficient and involved little uptake.

Regular multistakeholder consultation

According to the government self assessment report, there has not been a cross-cutting multi-stakeholder forum for ongoing consultation during the period covered by the action plan. However, for some specific commitments, the responsible authorities have reached out to civil society organisations and other stakeholders during implementation. Additionally, similar to the process during the first Danish action plan, the government used the web forum at digitaliser.dk to discuss OGP issues, to share thoughts and ideas, as well as to share documents, best practices, and software. Because the forum was online, there were no geographical or scheduling issues reported for parties interested in participating in the forum.

Stakeholders described the on-line forum as inefficient because of its old-fashioned web design, which is hard to navigate and lacks relevant information on the process. The fon-line forum is generally unknown to the public, so the discussion is limited to those with a specific interest and those selected to participate.

During the implementation of the action plan, the government held the Open Government Camp, an open participation conference that is reviewed as a separate commitment in this report. Some stakeholders described it as a better approach to consider using to consult during implementation.

Additionally, the IRM researcher did not find supporting documents or record of the individual consultation meetings for specific commitments as stated in the self-assessment report. According to the government official responsible for OGP, public offices in Denmark frequently hold informal meetings to integrate the views of CSOs and NGOs pertaining to different matters. Public offices are not accustomed to documenting the informal meetings. While this is customary in Denmark, for evidence in this review, the government of Denmark could consider documenting informal outreach or consultations with stakeholders.

For future consultation processes, the IRM researcher would recommend that the government adopt an approach to regular stakeholder meetings, avoiding a reliance on digital means or informal meetings. Stakeholders have found limited interest in participating in web consultations through the digitaliser.dk portal. The government could look into carrying out smaller, but more frequent, conferences like the Open Government Camp.

IV. Analysis of action plan contents

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP country action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period. Governments begin their OGP country action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs. Action plans then set out governments' OGP commitments, which stretch practice beyond its current baseline. These commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete 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;
- Should strive to meet the 5 Star for Open Data design (http://5stardata.info/).

Civic participation

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

Commitments addressing public participation:

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

- Can include elements of access to information to ensure meaningful input of interested members of the public into decisions;

- Often include the right to have your voice heard, but do not necessarily include the right to be a formal part of a decision making process.

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

- Reforms increasing freedoms of assembly, expression, petition, press, or association;

- Reforms on association including trade union laws or NGO laws;

- Reforms improving the transparency and process of formal democratic processes such as citizen proposals, elections, or petitions.

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

- Commitments that assume participation will increase due to publication of information without specifying the mechanism for such participation (although this commitment would be marked as "access to information");

- Commitments on decentralization that do not specify the mechanisms for enhanced public participation;

- Commitments that define participation as inter-agency cooperation without a mechanism for public participation.

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

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

- Disclosure of non-sensitive metadata on institutional activities (following maximum disclosure principles);

- Citizen audits of performance;

- Citizen-initiated appeals processes in cases of non-performance or abuse.

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

- Improving or establishing appeals processes for denial of access to information;

- Improving access to justice by making justice mechanisms cheaper, faster, or easier to use;

- Improving public scrutiny of justice mechanisms;

- Creating public tracking systems for public complaints processes (such as case-tracking software for police or anticorruption hotlines).

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

Technology and innovation for openness and accountability

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

- Promoting new technologies that offer opportunities for information sharing, public participation, and collaboration;

- Making more information public in ways that enable people to both understand what their governments do and to influence decisions;

- Working to reduce costs of using these technologies.

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

- May commit to a process of engaging civil society and the business community to identify effective practices and innovative approaches for leveraging new technologies to empower people and promote transparency in government;

- May commit to supporting the ability of governments and citizens to use technology for openness and accountability;

- May support the use of technology by government employees and citizens alike.

Not all 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 variables

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

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

1. It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have "medium" or "high" specificity.

2. The commitment's language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of access to information, civic participation, or public accountability.

3. The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented.

4. Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving a ranking of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, the Danish action plan received no starred commitments.

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

Finally, the graphs in this section present an excerpt of the wealth of data the IRM collects during its progress reporting process. For the full dataset for Denmark and all OGP-participating countries, please consult the 'OGP Explorer,' available at http://www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer/.

General overview of the commitments

Denmark's second action plan was an improvement from the first one (2012-2013), having a more realistic number of commitments (16 instead of 33) to be implemented and assigning clearer indicators to each of the commitments. However, as mentioned in the self-assessment report, and the IRM researcher agrees, many of the commitments continue to focus on the reform of internal processes including the promotion of e-governance, which are not always relevant to OGP values.[1] Originally, the action plan included 14 commitments, two were added when the action plan was extended to span until 1 July 2016.[2] These two commitments (15 and 16) are described on the AFD's webpage[3] and are a part of the Danish self-assessment report.

The commitments in the action plan are related to four policy areas: local democracy and participation (commitments 1, 2, and 3), digital communication and inclusion (commitments 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11), "Open data – innovation, transparency and enhanced efficiency" (commitments 12 and 13), and the "promotion of open government" (commitment 14). The two last commitments are not grouped under any theme.

Clustering

For this progress report, the IRM team has clustered commitments with similar goals, although with individual evaluations, as follows:

- Commitments 2 and 3 on advanced voting and participation of first-time voters have been clustered due to their focus on the promotion of citizen participation in local elections.
- Commitments 4, 5, and 6 are clustered in this review because they all include the promotion of citizen engagement with the use of digital self-service solutions.
- Commitments 7 and 8 have been clustered since they both modernise the public sector.
- Commitments 12 and 13 both focus on open data, specifically the potential release of government-held information and the appropriate mechanisms through which it could be done.
- Commitments 1, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 16 are not grouped under any cluster.

---

[1] Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, "Self-Assessment Report on Denmark's OGP Action Plan and OGP Work 2013-2014," OGP, September 2015, http://bit.ly/1ZC1jRA

[2] According to the government, the extension of the second Danish action plan was primarily to align the Danish timeframe with the OGP action plan time cycle. This extension enabled the inclusion of two additional commitments in the action plan.

[3] "Open Government Handlingsplan," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1KsS3Zf

Commitment 1: Local government consultations

Commitment text

1. Service check of local government consultations

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: Not specified   End Date: Not specified

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

What happened?

The government completed this commitment after establishing a committee to fulfil the implementation of a service check of local government consultations. The committee was established by the former Ministry of Economics and the Interior and headed by Ib Valsborg (a former permanent under-secretary). It included members from several ministries and local administrations, but none from the private sector or NGOs.

The committee ended work in 2014 and released a report in March 2015, which gave specific recommendations to improve future municipal and local government hearings. The recommendations are available in sections 2.2 and 2.3 of the summary report.[1]

Did it matter?

Following the local government reform in 2007, there was a call to strengthen democracy at the local level so that citizens could be more actively involved in decision making processes.[2] Through the establishment of a committee, this commitment aims to review the current consultation framework at the local level.

Understanding that the committee is only mandated to look into the possibility of adjusting the rules governing local government consultations, the potential impact is coded as minor. It is an incremental, but positive step towards improving public participation at the local level.

The government stated in the self-assessment report that the committee provided a number of recommendations on the design of existing and future legislation to support local democracy through real and relevant involvement of civil society. The IRM researcher and NGOs surveyed believe that a review of the current statutory local government consultation does not have a transformative impact unless it leads to actions to enforce or implement recommendations. Furthermore, the recommendations set out in the report propose to delegate regulation to municipalities without providing

proper standardized guidelines to follow.[3] Thus, individual implementation of consultations and public hearings will be uneven; some municipalities will probably succeed, but others likely will fall short.

Additionally, stakeholders indicated that the committee was composed of government officials, with no civil society representation, which limits input from non-governmental stakeholders in the content of the report. However, according to the government, in addition to the analysis of rules and regulations and the interviews held with relevant municipal staff, the report released by the committee was also based on input from workshops with a range of CSOs and NGOs that usually take part in hearings and consultation processes.

Moving forward

Moving forward, the IRM researcher recommends that the government include this commitment in the next action plan. If so, some considerations to include could be:

- Formal and direct participation of civil society and other local stakeholders in government committees established for future reviews;
- Provision of guidelines and standards for local level consultation regulations;
- Actions that will lead to enforcement and implementation of recommendations; and,
- Inclusion of municipal and local actors in the consultation process of future action plans.

---

[1] "Serviceeftersyn Af Kommunale Og Regionale Horingsregler," Social- Og Indenrigsministeriet, http://bit.ly/1Ue18dP
[2] "The Danish Local Government Reform," KL, http://bit.ly/1npVeMt
[3] *Servicing the Local and Regional Government Consultation Rules*, March 2015, 10, http://bit.ly/1Ue18dP

Commitment text:

2. Call on all municipalities to facilitate advance voting

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: Not specified   End Date: Not specified

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

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: Copenhagen University

Start Date: Not specified   End Date: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
2. Promote advance voting				✔		✔				✔						✔
3. Promote participation of first-time voters				✔		✔				✔						✔

What happened?

At the time of writing, the Danish Government completed the two commitments. Currently, individual municipalities are responsible for the promotion of civic engagement, and some local governments give it a higher priority than others. However, the government promoted advanced and first-time voting by circulating a letter among the mayors urging them to widen the availability for advance voting and suggested to offer advanced voting in familiar locations. According to the self-assessment report,

many municipalities accepted the call and organised advanced voting by postal vote at educational institutions, local libraries, and others. Additionally, the government sent a letter to 100,000 randomly selected, first-time voters for the regional elections in 2013.[1]

The government published two reports in June 2014 with detail regarding the execution of this commitment and samples of the letters distributed.[2]

Did it matter?

These commitments respond to a government concern regarding the drop in election turnout in past local (municipal and regional) electoral cycles. Understanding that participation is key in a democratic political system, the government has established these commitments to facilitate advance voting and to promote participation among young voters. Although the participation envisioned by this commitment is traditional and narrow, it aims at improving formal democratic processes that are relevant to the value of civic participation. However, the commitments are coded as minor as both letters are incremental but positive steps towards the promotion of civic participation.

Reports on the electoral process indicate an increase in young voter participation of 10 percentage points.[3] However, they also mention a substantial drop in voter participation outside the ethnic Danish group (15.2 percent). The reports mention that this as an increasing problem because voters outside the Danish ethnic group are a growing population. If this group's participation is not addressed, future elections may have an even lower turnout. According to the self-assessment report, the fulfilment of commitment three did not significantly impact the number of first-time voters.

It is unclear what the total effect of the advance voting effort and letter of invitation to first-time voters was. Stakeholders surveyed in many cases indicate that the commitments for democracy participation are positive and have a wide range of potential effects, but they also stress that sending out letters of encouragement will only do so much. While the government's initiative is laudable, it is also important to note that their mandate in local and regional elections is limited. Therefore, any actions in this effect will be if local authorities respond to encouragement.

Moving forward

Future commitments like this could address a broader understanding of participation. Stakeholders mention that participation could be understood not just as a matter of casting a vote in elections, but rather of more general involvement in politics. Future commitments could expand on the conclusions and possibilities in the published reports and could, for instance, address the drop in voter participation within specific ethnic groups. Stakeholders also mention the possibility of investigating the use of digital voting systems in future action plans.

---

[1] Margrethe Vestager, Okonomi Og Indenrigsministeriet, letter, 7 March 2013, http://valg.sim.dk/media/410178/brev-til-borgmestre.pdf

[2] Centre for Voting and Parties, *Hvem Stemte Og Hvem Blev Hjemme?* [*Who Voted and Who Stayed Home?]* by Yosef Bhatti, Jens Olav Dahigaard, Jonas Hedegaard Hansen, and Kasper Moller Hansen (Report, Copenhagen, 2014), 52, [Danish] http://bit.ly/20gQxCL; Center for Voting and Parties, *Kan Man Oge Valgdeltagelsen?* by Yosef Bhatti, Jens Olav Dahlgaard, Jonas Hedegaard Hansen, and Kasper Moller Hansen (Report, Copenhagen, 2014), http://bit.ly/1RBspsR

[3] *Hvem Stemte Og Hvem Blev Hjemme?*, 52, [Danish] http://bit.ly/20gQxCL

Commitment text

4: User friendliness requirements regarding digital self-service solutions

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

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

5: Plan for inclusion during the transition to digital communication

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

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

6: Common public sector digital communication campaign

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

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

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

Responsible Institution:	None specified for any commitment
Supporting Institutions:	Commitment 4: None specified Commitment 5: Senior Citizens Associations; Commitment 6: Senior Citizens Associations and organisations having ICT courses for special target groups

Start Date: Commitment 6 - November 2013　　　　End Date: Not specified

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

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
4. Meet accessibility requirements for self-service solutions		✔			✔			✔		✔					✔	
5. Develop plan for inclusion	✔				✔			✔		✔						✔
6. Launch digital communication campaign			✔		Unclear					✔						✔

What happened?

Commitments four, five, and six are part of the national IT strategy.[1] According to the government's self-assessment report, commitment four has been substantially met. Thus far, the AFD, responsible for the implementation of this commitment, reports to have formulated a guide for self-service solutions. The AFD recognizes that more work needs to be done for all mandatory self-service solutions to meet the minimum requirements stipulated in the guide. The government published the requirements and the guide on their open government website.[2]

Commitment five was completed in time, as per the self-assessment report. The government explains that the AFD did the inclusion plan in collaboration with various civil society organisations, following government-facilitated events like "Meetings of Generations," where the young and elderly learned about their differences in approaching the digital divide.[3] However, there is no evidence of how these views were included in the plan. As stated in section III, the self-assessment report mentions how various NGOs and civil society members were included in a set of meetings; however, there is no documentation of these meetings. According to the government OGP point-of-contact, this is because some public offices have informal dialogue meetings with open invitations to discuss policy issues.

As described in the self-assessment report, in 2015 the AFD established the National Network for Digital Inclusion, which outlines the challenges citizens encountered regarding digital communication. To ensure the most accurate results, the government organised events inviting targeted groups to design the inclusion plan. The groups ranged from senior citizens, to those with disabilities, youth, and immigrants, among others.[4] Additionally, now citizens have access to online training to become better acquainted with the portal (borger.dk) and self-service solutions. More details can be found in Danish on a government sponsored website.[5]

The last commitment was completed. The government launched a large-scale digital communication campaign in mid-August, which ran through January 2015.[6] The AFD describes working in close cooperation with local authorities to make a comprehensive media-based campaign (online, press and outdoor advertising), as well as Generation Rallies to encourage digital communication with public authorities.[7]

Did it matter?

Providing access to public services and offices, and enhancing the ability to engage in digital self-service and communication, is of great importance to both the citizens and the administration, as worded in the national IT strategy.[8]

The three commitments, as described by stakeholders, pertain to e-government with a specific focus in internal administrative activities and self-service solutions that do not directly impact in openness of government.[9] However, commitment four calls for the creation of conditions for better data quality and aims to improve access to data updating service platforms. In the same vein, commitment five seeks to train citizens and authorities to increase access to information through technological improvements. Commitment six focuses on a digital communication campaign, which represents a laudable effort to reach out to stakeholders. Nevertheless, it is not relevant to OGP values. The potential impact of all of these commitments is coded as minor, as they represent a positive but incremental step towards improving data quality, user-friendliness, and accessibility.

Different groups raised concerns with regards to the digital divide in Denmark and the potential exclusion of citizens from accessing important government information after the implementation of new e-government strategy. Some groups that have openly opposed this strategy include the DaneAge Association (Ældresagen, a senior citizens association) and leading Danish newspapers, claiming that this new strategy excludes different citizens.[10]

Moving forward

These commitments represent an incremental leap to digital communication with public offices and inclusion for all citizens. However, future commitments pertaining to self-service and e-government solutions should be framed in a way that directly respond to openness beyond the internal administrative focus.[11] The IRM researcher recommends that future commitments encourage the release of specific government-held information that could promote access to information and civic participation more broadly.

---

[1] "Om Digitaliseringsstrategien 2011-2015," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1dCtCJ9

[2] "God Selvbetjening," Losningsguider, Arkitektur Guide, [Danish] http://bit.ly/M2Gj8p

[3] "Digitalt Generationsmode: Unge Og Aeldre Kan Laere Af Hinanden," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1Qoa29q

[4] "Seniorsurf 2014 Med Flemming Jensen," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1WxGmHy

[5] Danish government website: https://www.borger.dk/om-borger-dk/Sider/Historie-og-baggrund-for-borgerdk.aspx?segmentid=0cc0873d-19b2-4e17-9a48-45f15705cb8b

[6] Further information available at: http://www.digst.dk/Loesninger-og-infrastruktur/Digital-Post/Om-Digital-Post-til-pressen

[7] "Digitalt Generationsmode: Unge Og Aeldre Kan Laere Af Hinanden," http://bit.ly/1Qoa29q

[8] Danish Agency for Digitalization, "The Digital Path to Future Welfare: The eGovernment Strategy 2011-2015," (Rosendahls-Schultz Distribution: Copenhagen, 2011), http://bit.ly/1WxFp1V

[9] "God Selvbetjening," http://bit.ly/M2Gj8p

[10] "God Selvbetjening," http://bit.ly/M2Gj8p

[11] "Om Digitaliseringsstrategien 2011-2015," http://bit.ly/1dCtCJ9; "Download Digitaliseringsstrategien," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1T8CUDp

Commitments 7 and 8: Modernisation of the public sector and Free Municipalities

Commitment text

7: Principles for collaboration on the modernisation of the public sector as well as the establishment of a centre for public innovation

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

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

8: "Free Municipality" pilot projects

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: Commitment 7: None specified

Commitment 8: The nine Free Municipalities

Start Date: Not specified   End Date: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
7. Support modernisation of public sector		✔			Unclear					✔					✔	
8. Advance the "Free Municipality" project	✔				Unclear					✔					✔	

What happened?

Commitment seven aims to contribute to the modernization of the public sector through the implementation of a series of initiatives already established by the government during the period 2014-2016. The government released a plan to be implemented by the Center for Public Sector Innovations (CPI) during the period of 2014-2016.[1] However, it makes no reference to the second OGP action plan. CPI's website provides a list of its main activities[2] and clearly indicates intent to change the culture within the administration with initiatives such as documenting results and sharing best practices for public innovation. Thus, the aim is to facilitate the exchange of best practices from one public office to the other.

The self-assessment report states that the first commitment was completed by means of the following activities:

(1) Inspiration events[3] carried out across the country;

(2) Governance workshops[4] to develop new models for governance focused on trust, collaboration, and civil engagement; and

(3) A Center for Public Sector Innovation[5] that produced the world's first Public Sector Innovation Statistic.[6]

The specificity of this commitment is low and milestones can be interpreted to be the activities described above per the commitment language. However, the IRM researcher finds this commitment substantially complete, whereas the evaluation of the adopted principles and implementation of initiatives to spread the principles is still ongoing through 2016.

Commitment 8, the Free Municipality project, predates the second Danish action plan since it was started 23 December 2012.[7] According to the self-assessment report, the government implemented 250 experiments were as part of the pilot project in almost all municipal tasks.[8] A midterm evaluation of the project released in January 2014 also confirms that, at that time, implementation of this project was advancing according to the timeline and was expected to be ready by December 2015.[9] No more information on the development of the project has been found.

Did it matter?

Stakeholders interviewed by the IRM researcher concluded that modernizing the public sector and promoting trust in public offices is important. When asked whether this commitment is important for open government in Denmark, more than 75 percent of those who participated in the online survey indicated that these commitments are "very important" or "important." However, the commitment language, as written, is vague, and it is hard for the IRM researcher to assess what potential the commitments have to move the modernization reform forward. What can be construed is limited, but seems to focus on studies and trial initiatives that eventually could justify policy changes. Therefore, the potential impact of both commitments is found to be minor.

Additionally, this commitment aims to carry out initiatives that contribute to spreading the principles on modernization. As worded, the IRM researcher finds no relevance to OGP values because it does not directly promote or improve open government. The self-assessment report states that while part of the project involves stakeholder engagement, the project does not call explicitly for civic participation. Moreover, it says that in practice the experiments have had limited relevance to OGP values.

The IRM researcher finds that including public sector modernization commitments in future action plans is important. Should the government move forward with this kind of commitment, it could consider the following:

- Outlining activities that clearly address OGP values and provide specific milestones.
- Establishing open local government practices in the Free Municipalities project. For example, it could include, among others things, open public hearings and citizen participation in the budget cycle.
- Strengthening the CPI's mandate to carry out work in local administrations.
- Increasing public agencies' awareness of the OGP process and involve them in the development and implementation of future action plans.

---

[1] "Handlings Plan," Center for Offentlig Innovation, May 2014, http://bit.ly/23gSDVy

[2] "Hovedaktiviteter," Center for Offentlig Innovation, http://coi.dk/hovedaktiviteter/

[3] "Faellesoffentlig Kampagne," Borger, http://bit.ly/1PFUID4

[4] "Styringslaboratorier," Center for Offentlig Innovation, http://coi.dk/hovedaktiviteter/styringslaboratorier/

[5] Center for Offentlig Innovation, http://coi.dk/

[6] "NYT Offentligt Innovationsbarometer," Center for Offentlig Innovation, http://bit.ly/1VaWRrJ

[7] Louise Tarp Thorgaard, "De 9 Frikommuner," KL, http://bit.ly/1lz7IQ5

[8] "Self-Assessment Report on Denmark's OGP Action Plan and OGP Work 2013-2014," 2015, http://bit.ly/1ZC1jRA

[9] Ramboll, *Tvaergaende Rapport Midtvejsevaluering Af Frikommunefor – SOG* by Kommunernes Landsforening (Report, Aarhus: 2014), [Danish] http://bit.ly/1JkAKyF

Commitment text:

9. Recommendations from growth teams

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: The business community

Start Date: Not specified End Date: Not specified

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

What happened?

Commitment nine feeds into Denmark's overall growth plan aimed at strengthening the country's business environment and attracting international investments, ultimately aiming to decrease unemployment and improve the living standards of the Danish community. Additionally, the growth teams' recommendations provided the backbone of an individual growth plan for each of the eight business areas covered. The growth teams predate the second Danish action plan and have been a part of the Danish innovation strategy since 2012. The eight growth teams concluded their work by 2014 and the government included the recommendations from these teams in the Danish Growth Plan.[1]

The growth teams are composed of different stakeholders from the public administration, private sector, academia, and associations. For instance, the growth team on ICT and Digital Growth is composed of board members and CEOs of major companies as well as renowned figures from think tanks.[2]

In 2014, the government released the Agreement on Growth Package 2014, launched individual growth plans for each of the eight teams and allocated DKK 150 million to initiatives that follow up the recommendations presented by the growth teams as well as the Productivity Commission. Overall, these aim to reduce the cost of doing business and boost productivity.[3]

This is the second Danish growth plan,[4] and at the time of writing this report, the government released a third plan.[5] As pointed out by both national and international media, the potential increased output of the second plan is around USD 1.1 billion.[6] This should be achieved by 89 concrete initiatives in four key areas: (1) making it easier and cheaper to run a company, (2) better access to financing, (3) lower prices for consumers and companies, and (4) more highly skilled workers and more advanced production.

Did it matter?

This commitment represents a major step forward for the policy area. Identifying specific measures to improve companies' productivity and development opportunities is clearly important for growth and employment in Denmark. However, this is not clearly relevant to OGP values. If those responsible had written the commitment with a clear aim to use the growth team model as a citizen participation mechanism to incorporate the views of different stakeholders in government decision making, then it would have clear relevance to the OGP value of civic participation.

The OECD praised the creation of growth teams in recent publications and qualifies Denmark as a "highly developed European economy with strong business innovation," referring to this initiative. The organisation mentions specific examples, such as the recommendation to create a single, transparent, and efficient means of accessing Danish health data that could attract medical research to Denmark.[7]

The government translated recommendations from growth teams into specific activities outlined in the eight individual growth plans for each of the eight business areas covered. In some cases, they made additional political agreements on various areas, such as tourism, digitisation, food, among others. However, these recommendations are not binding. Thus far, the government is implementing many of the recommendations, but the IRM researcher believes the process could be more transparent for it to become a standard procedure among different industries. The business community states that this commitment aims at transforming policy and indicates that the recommendations from the growth teams may be positive. However, due to a lack of funding for their recommendations, the business community is sceptical about the recommendations' implementation.[8] The impact of initiatives is smaller when they are not provided with sufficient funding. Additionally, the scope of growth teams only applies to business development. Therefore, this commitment is coded as having moderate potential impact.

Moving forward

The IRM researcher believes that the government could use the structure of growth teams as a base from which to construct a new model of public engagement for policy decision making. New growth teams could:

- Be organised around policy areas beyond business development, such as open data, freedom of information, transparency in local governments, welfare, political party financing, etc.;
- Involve different stakeholders including, but not limited to, government officials, CSOs, associations, academia, and think tank representatives, depending on the policy area;
- Produce reports with recommendations to be discussed formally by government officials and incorporated in government strategy;
- Develop clear guidelines explaining what mechanism or intervention would translate the growth teams' information into consequences or change.

[1] "Vaekstplan DK – Staerke Virksomheder, Flere Job," Finansministeriet, 26 February 2013, http://bit.ly/1FUi2vy

[2] "Vaekstteam for IKT og Digital Vaekst," Erhvervsstyreksen, http://bit.ly/1SxDqeZ

[3] Danish Ministry of Finance, *Report on Growth and Competitiveness* by the Danish Ministry of Business and Growth (Summary, September 2014), 11, http://bit.ly/1PpJsYz

[4] "Danish Government Presents New Growth Plan," Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, 13 May 2014, http://bit.ly/1RTp7Sf

[5] "Vaekst Og Udvikling I Hele Danmark," Erhvervs – Og Vaekstministeriet, 23 November 2015, http://bit.ly/1nyBoyn

[6] Peter Levring, "Danish Government Unveils Plan to Help Economy Exist Crisis," Bloomberg Business, 8 May 2014, http://bloom.bg/1JYC0aI

[7] OECD, *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2014* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2014), 308, https://goo.gl/ZqPMUw

[8] "Vaekstteams Skal Suppleres af Storre Initiativer," Dansk Erhverv, 6 February 2014, http://bit.ly/1SxCur5

Commitment text:

10: Strategy for Digital Welfare

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: Local Government Denmark and Danish Regions

Start Date: September 2013   End Date: Year 2020

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

What happened?

The Strategy for Digital Welfare was released in September 2013.[1] It consists of 24 initiatives distributed within seven main topics: the spread of telemedicine, the effective collaboration of medicine professionals, welfare technology for care, new digital possibilities for casework, digital learning and teaching, digital collaboration in teaching, and prerequisites for digital welfare.[2]

By December 2014, the government expected to have launched the strategy and commenced its execution. However, it is to be fully implemented by 2020 with a promise of new goals and new initiatives added on an ongoing basis. The Strategy for Digital Welfare has been released and the Agency for Digitisation (AFD) provides an online overview of its implementation.[3]

The IRM researcher finds this commitment to have unclear completion. It is unclear what specific actions should be carried out to fulfil the commitment. It could be interpreted either as furthering debate and dissemination on the strategy or as implementation of the 24 initiatives included in the strategy. Based on both interpretations, thus far the agency has hosted 1,200 leaders in the public welfare field to debate the implementation of the strategy and published the results along with all other work done pertaining this commitment. Complete implementation of the 24 initiatives surpasses the two-year implementation period of this action plan. However, out of the 24 initiatives, 19 are to be fully implemented by 2016. So far, based on the results in the self-assessment report, those initiatives have been substantially met.[4]

Did it matter?

The goal of the digital welfare strategy is to improve the quality and efficiency of government digital services in social, health, and educational areas. Due to the lack of specificity in the commitment's language, the IRM researcher finds it hard to assess relevance to OGP values. However, 75 percent of stakeholders interviewed by the IRM researcher report this commitment as being "important" or "very important" to welfare in Denmark. The government of Denmark is known to have a universal and inclusive approach to welfare, and the state provides a large number of subsidised services to all residents.[5] In turn, Denmark has the highest individual tax income rate among all 34 OECD countries.[6] This means, the government has to respond to a high demand of welfare services, which continues to record constant growth due to the aging population, and to effects of the financial crisis.[7] The development of a digital welfare strategy has moderate potential impact. The scope of the strategy is limited by its focus on digital improvements and could have greater potential if it included the release of government-held information or involved citizens in the creation of a new policy structure.

Moving forward

As the digital welfare strategy evolves until 2020, it will be valuable to investigate how it can connect with OGP values. For inclusion in future action plans, the IRM researcher recommends setting up specific and measureable milestones that do not span further than the implementation period of the action plan. For example, specific actions within the strategy could be included as individual commitments, as long as they promote transparency, access to information, civic participation, or accountability.

---

[1] Strategi for Digital Velfaerd," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1ZC7chP

[2] "Initiativer I Strategien, Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1KrvLHh

[3] "Status for Initiativer," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1OGE6bQ

[4] Strategi for Digital Velfaerd," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1ZC7chP

[5] "Welfare," Denmark, http://denmark.dk/en/society/welfare/

[6] Jeanne Sahadi, "Top Income Tax Rate: How U.S. Really Compares," CNN Money, 1 April 2013, http://cnnmon.ie/1wFn5GR

[7] "Strategy for Digital Welfare 2013-2020," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/20feSZm

Commitment 11: Volunteer Denmark and public sector integration

Commitment text:

11: Implementation of a new charter for interaction between Volunteer Denmark/Associations Denmark and the public sector

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

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: Not specified   End Date: Not specified

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

What happened?

In July 2013, the government released a new Charter for Interaction between volunteers and the public sector.[1] This charter was based on the work of a joint public effort, with hearings, brainstorm sessions, and public meetings (a camp) for developing the new charter. The charter and all information that pertains to it is available at a government-sponsored website (http://www.frivilligcharter.dk/).

After the release of the charter, the Danish Youth Council and the Voluntary Council held five regional dialogue meetings with the aim of determining how the visions of the charter could be translated into actions and implemented locally.[2] These meetings included representatives of national and local government, as well as thorough representation of volunteering associations and other CSOs. In total, 440 people participated in these meetings. An idea bank gathered the results, which included best practices for cooperating with volunteers in the public sector and released as a catalogue on 8 October 2014. [3]

According to the self-assessment report, a closing status meeting in the Charter Work Group was held on 5 May 2015 and marked the completion of the commitment.

Additionally, the Ministry of Employment announced the implementation of ten initiatives to decrease bureaucracy and improve conditions in the workplace for volunteers.[4] Amongst these initiatives, the government calls for extending the weekly hours volunteers are allowed to work and abolishing cumbersome requirements to become a volunteer.

Did it matter?

This commitment calls for dialogue between the public sector and the volunteering community in Denmark to transform the revised charter into a reality at the local level. Although this commitment does not request the execution of a concrete action that could have led to transformative impact, as worded, it represents a major step in the improvement of volunteering policies in Denmark. Therefore, it is marked with potential moderate impact.

These charters are not updated frequently, and their content generally is not subject to sudden and dramatic shifts in policy areas. The previous charter for interaction between volunteers and public offices is from 2001. The Ministry of Employment's list of ten initiatives are linked with changes in legislation, so the charter has had an important effect on policy.

Although there is no study that determines whether these specific changes led to an improvement of the volunteering world in Denmark, the situation in 2014 has improved greatly compared to 2012. According to reports from the Center for Voluntary Social Work funded by the Social Ministry of the Interior, 42 percent of the Danish population engage in volunteer work, compared to 35 percent in the year 2012.[5]

Moving forward

Looking ahead, future iterations of this commitment and future revisions of the charter could elaborate on the cooperation of volunteers to ensure openness, transparency, and/or accountability in public offices. Stakeholders agree that the commitment, as currently worded, has unclear connection to OGP. But stakeholders also agree that volunteers present an important resource to the public sector. The IRM researcher agrees that the cooperation of volunteers has interesting open government potential that is not captured in the wording of the commitment. For instance, wording of future commitments could focus on increasing volunteer participation in policymaking, particularly on promoting consultations and direct input to influence decision making processes.

---

[1] "Charter for Interaction Between the Volunteer World and the Public Sector," Working Group for the Renewal of the Volunteer Charter, http://bit.ly/1nn581C
[2] "Invitation Til Dialogmode Om Det Nye Frivillighedscharter," Frivilligcharter, [Danish] http://www.frivilligcharter.dk/node/39
[3] "Idekatalog," Frivilligcharter, October 2014, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1JYAt4n
[4] "Regeringsudspil: Lettere at Vaere Frivillig," Beskaeftigelsesministeriet, 8 October 2014, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1JiHHjC
[5] "Den Frivillige Sociale Indsats – Frivilligrapporten," Center for Frivilligt Socialt Arbejde, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Pi4len

Commitment text:

12: "Open Data Innovation Strategy" (ODIS)

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

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

13: Data Distributor for the distribution of basic data

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: Not specified   End Date: Not specified

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Tech. and innov. for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
12. Improve ODIS		✔			✔					✔						✔
13. Develop the data distributor		✔			✔			✔		✔					✔	

What happened?

Both commitments were a part of the first action plan and of the national e-government Strategy for 2011-2015.[1]

Regarding the Open Data Innovation Strategy (ODIS), the government executed a series of actions to revise the framework on open data and to promote it, fulfilling the commitment completely. The self-assessment report states that the government was

able to carry out the transposition of a revised Public Sector Information (PSI) Directive through an amendment to the PSI Act approved by the Parliament on 27 May 2014. Government officials as well as representatives from CSOs, associations, academia, and the media provided input during an online consultation. Responses can be found online.[2] The amendment came into force on 1 July 2014, and the government led awareness-raising campaigns on the new legislation.[3]

Additionally, the government held a workshop referred to as Data Lab during the Open Government Camp (an initiative under commitment 14 of this action plan) for public authorities and civil society participants, further promoting the use of open data under the new framework.

The government has outlined a strategy to build an online platform to consolidate public sector basic data. The data will be available for government agencies and general society. By the end of year 2015, the government expected to launch a trial period of the data distributor to test its technical capabilities.[4] By this time, the trial started with the publication of specific geospatial data and a digital "elevation model." By 2016, the government expects to have launched additional data. The official launch of the fully operation Data Distributor was postponed from end of 2016 to the first semester of 2017. All information regarding the schedule and advancement of the project can be found on the website (www.datafordeler.dk) in Danish. The government also released information through social media with a LinkedIn group and Twitter profile. Thus far, this commitment is still ongoing. At the time of writing this report, the government met the milestones planned for the first year of implementation. Therefore, the IRM researcher finds this commitment to have substantial progress. Meanwhile, the government continues to rely on the Data Catalogue, a rudimentary platform that aims to consolidate some of the datasets of public administration.[5]

Did it matter?

These commitments call for the release of public data and guidance on the new policies as well as on the new data distributor. For the first Danish action plan, stakeholders agreed by a large margin that the ODIS is "very important" and has clear relevance to the OGP values of access to information, and technology and innovation for transparency and accountability. However, the impact of this commitment is coded as minor because, as worded, it represents an incremental, although positive, step in Denmark's efforts to increase sharing of digital resources and the reuse of digital content, which is consistent with improvement of access to information.

The new Data Distributer should address some of the imperfections of the current data catalogue. For instance, stakeholders report that the data catalogue[6] has problems with both data formats (some datasets are available only in PDF instead of machine-readable formats) and lacks new data. Second, although the data distributor was developed as a high-performance mechanism for selected, high demand datasets, it could include additional public data. Four government bodies feed data; thus, the majority of public offices are not connected to the distribution network.

This commitment has been implemented with the support of different stakeholders, who have been important to the establishment of a new policy on open data. However, stakeholders believe that for this commitment to have a transformative impact, it should have a different approach, aiming not just at technological efficiency but also at cultural change. Currently, data from the public administration is usually not open for public use. The government makes the decision to open specific datasets on individual bases. Data should be open by default and should be confidential only if decided, which is the opposite of what currently occurs. Open data should be recognised as a sign of progress

among the public administration. Therefore, everyone must know the ODIS as well as the technical improvements (e.g. the new data distributor).

Moving forward

If the government of Denmark chooses to continue this effort in future action plans, it could expand these commitments to strengthen ODIS and bring about a cultural change in Denmark. The IRM researcher recommends (1) guidelines and common standards to ensure uniformity in the publication of data across the different governmental bodies, (2) a robust training plan for public officials and the general public on the collection of data and the possible uses of data for the improvement of local and national administrations, and (3) a plan to further involve stakeholders in the implementation of the ODIS and the Data Distributor scheme.

---

[1] "Open Data Innovation Strategy (ODIS)," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1Wv87R0

[2] "Horing Over Udkast Til Forslag Til Lov Om Aendring Af Lov Om Videreanvendelse Af Den Offentlige Sektors Informationer," Horing Portalen, 2 December 2013, http://bit.ly/1JYzukM

[3] "Bedre Mulighed For Genbrug af Offentlige Data," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, 27 May 2014, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1NkJVtC

[4] Datafordeler, "Datafordeleren I Provedrift Med Fem Webservices," Datafordeler, 30 October 2015, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Qn7311

[5] "Datakataloget," Digitaliser, https://data.digitaliser.dk/

[6] "Datakataloget," Digitaliser, https://data.digitaliser.dk/

Commitment 14: Open Government Camp 2013

Commitment text:

14: Open Government Camp 2013

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

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

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

Responsible Institution: None specified

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: 12 November 2013   End Date: 12 November 2013

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

What happened?

The commitment builds on the first action plan, in which a similar initiative took place yielding valuable results.[1] For the second action plan, the AFD held an Open Government Camp 2013 on 12 November 2013. One hundred and seventy participants came from the public, private, and civil society sectors.[2] Many of the experiments and workshops are referred to on the government forum (digitaliser.dk), and a video documentary was produced and published on YouTube.[3]

During the Open Government Camp, a series of workshops and activities addressed several issues related to the commitments of the second Danish action plan. According to the government forum, the activities were inclusions and dialogue using social media,

local democracy, public data and innovation, co-creation of public digital solutions, digital education, lean start-up methods, smart city, from cultural user to cultural citizen, co-creation, and civic participation.[4]

Many of these themes easily refer to themes in the second Danish action plan (for instance public data and innovation is directly linked to commitments 12, 13, and 16).

Did it matter?

Stakeholders widely agree that the Open Government Camp is a good initiative with promising possibilities for collaboration and exchange of best practices. Nevertheless, although the camp was well attended, some stakeholders report that it was confusing, mostly because of the very technical themes and the lack of expertise of some of the participants from civil society. This suggest that these difficulties limited the participation potential from stakeholders; potentially limiting the purpose of a forum to engage stakeholders and receive input to develop action plans or to discuss improvements in policies. Thus, while it is important to continue engaging with different stakeholders through these types of initiatives, this commitment represents an incremental, although positive, step in improving civic participation.

Moving forward

The Open Government Camp is a valuable forum of discussion; however, it should be improved to guarantee measurable and impactful results that could translate into government action. In future action plans, the government could improve the Camp in the following way:

1. Define a clear and measurable outcome. Provide detailed guidelines of expected results from the Camp, including a report with a recommendations section.
2. Enhance the impact of outcomes. Design a mechanism that guarantees the use of the report with recommendations in policymaking processes.
3. Organize additional Camp-like workshops. Some stakeholders report that they believe that a one-time arrangement like the Open Government Camp could have a broader impact if held on a regular basis.
4. Increase level of expertise. Understanding that the major concerns reported were the general lack of expertise of participants in certain areas, meetings that are focused on particular topics could attract experts and generate better results. The Camp could be run on a smaller scale, targeting stakeholders by region or expertise.

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

Commitment 15: Open government assistance to Myanmar

Commitment text:

15: Open Government assistance to Myanmar

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

(Commitment published 7 January 2015 at http://www.digst.dk/Servicemenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/Open-Government/Open-government-assistance-to-Myanmar.aspx)

Responsible Institution: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: 1 January 2015   End Date: 30 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 accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
				✔	Unclear					✔					✔	

What happened?

This commitment was added to the Danish action plan in January 2015, and was published on the website of the Danish Agency for Digitisation (AFD).[5] The government developed a strategy outlined in the report "Denmark – Myanmar Country Programme 2016-2020" (DMCP),[6] which includes activities that address three thematic objectives:

- Promotion of peace, democratization, human rights, and reforms
- Improvement of access to, and quality of, basic education
- Enhancement of inclusive and sustainable economic growth, including livelihoods for ethnic population

Although this initiative will not be completed until 2020, Denmark is on schedule in regards to the implementation of the timetable released in the DMCP. Representatives from the AFD met government members from Myanmar in February 2015 to discuss the Danish experiences with the Open Government Partnership.[7] Additionally, they increased monetary contributions to multilateral initiatives in Myanmar that aim to achieve the same goals as the DMCP. These include, among others:

- The Modernization of Public Finance Management (MPFM) and Public Administration Performance (PAP) projects within the World Bank's Multi Donor Partnership Trust Fund for Myanmar (MMTF);[8]
- The International Media Support program, promoting the development of a professional and independent media in the country;[9] and

- The Carter Center's project to support the electoral and political transition process in Myanmar.[10]

These activities were published on Denmark's Open Aid website, hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.[11] Therefore, it is coded to have substantial completion of commitment.

Did it matter?

Inclusion of new countries in OGP and building the capacity of potential new members are actions valuable to the initiative. Although Myanmar is placed among the countries perceived to be the most corrupt in Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index (ranked 156 from 175 countries), it has improved from scoring 15 points in 2012 to 21 points in 2014 (out of a maximum of 100 points).[12] Myanmar only meets six percent of OGP's eligibility criteria (75 percent is required to become part of the initiative). If the DMCP is fully implemented, it could be potentially transformative for Myanmar. However, within the national context in Denmark, this commitment has minor potential impact.

The strategic considerations outlined in the DMCP document included in the commitment text, articulate Denmark's efforts to promote judicial reform, building CSOs' capacity, non-discrimination, transparency, and accountability in Myanmar. However, the relevance to OGP values in Denmark is unclear.

Moving forward

The bilateral support for Myanmar to join OGP is scheduled to continue. If the government decides to carry this commitment over to the next action plan, it could add value by promoting transparency and accountability, especially access to justice and human rights, in Danish companies with business interests in Myanmar.

[1] Mads Kaemsgaard Eberholst, "Independent Reporting Mechanism Denmark: Progress Report 2012-13," OGP, 2014, 42, http://bit.ly/1Sxyirf

[2] Cathrine Lippert, "Vi Modtes Pa Pa Open Gov Camp 2013," Government 2.0 – Open Government, Digitaliser, 13 November 2013, http://digitaliser.dk/news/2541335

[3] "Open Gov Camp 2013 (Dansk Version)," Opengov Denmark, http://bit.ly/1nn0Yqy

[4] "Vi Modtes Pa Pa Open Gov Camp 2013," 2013, http://digitaliser.dk/news/2541335

[5] "Commitment: Open Government Assistance to Myanmar," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1SxzT0e

[6] Embassy of Denmark, *Denmark – Myanmar Country Programme 2016-2020* (Concept note, Yangon, 2015), http://bit.ly/23fok1y

[7] "Danish Ambassador meets with Government of Myanmar to talk about Open Government Partnership", Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 12 February 2015, http://goo.gl/Pe9YRJ

[8] "Denmark Supports the Improvement of the Public Sector in Myanmar with More than 4 Million USD," Udenrigsministeriet, 21 April 2015, http://bit.ly/1PFHcwA

[9] "Denmark Increases Its Support to Free Media," Udenrigsministeriet, 4 May 2015, http://bit.ly/1RTjIdQ

[10] "Denmark Provides Funding to Improve the Election Process in Myanmar," Udenrigsministeriet, 17 March 2015, http://bit.ly/1OGA9nx

[11] "Burma (Myanmar)," Danida OpenAid, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, http://openaid.um.dk/en/countries/MM

[12] A country or territory's score indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption on a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) and 100 (very clean). "Corruption Perceptions Index 2013: Results," Transparency International, https://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results

Commitment text:

16. Opening key public datasets

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

Milestones:

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

(Commitment published 7 January 2015 at http://www.digst.dk/Servicemenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/Open-Government/Opening-key-public-datasets)

Responsible Institution: Agency for Digitisation (Ministry of Finance)

Supporting Institutions: None specified

Start Date: 1 January 2015   End Date: 30 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 accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
				✔	✔			✔			✔			✔		

What happened?

This commitment was added to the Danish action plan in January 2015, and it was published on the website of the Agency of Digitisation (AFD).[1] It aims to (1) open data on government spending, (2) update the standard license for open government data and (3) to publish easy-to-understand guidelines for opening of data.

Government-held data in Denmark currently is partially available for public use on a number of platforms such as the Data Distributor (previously reviewed in commitment 13) Danish Statistics, the databank mentioned in commitment 13 or individual websites of different institutions. However, the available data varies in quality and format, which

makes it hard to know the general characteristics of the data. So far, according to the Global Open Data Index, in 2015 Denmark scored 10% out of 100 in the publication of data related to government spending. They state that data is not available under open license, since those interested would have to make formal FOI requests to get it.[2] News media and various start-up companies have used other type of data from government bodies. For instance, real estate agents could use government data to make their products better. Additionally, according to the government self assessment report, the standard license for open government data will be updated by June 2016, along with the publication of guidelines to support the opening of data.

In April 2015, the AFD organised a workshop to discuss the topic of open data in public administration.[3] The agenda shows the different issues covered such as best practices, metadata, licensing, and quality of data issues, among others. Twenty people from various public offices participated in the workshop.[4]

At the time of writing, the IRM researcher found this commitment to have limited completion.

Did it matter?

So far, hosting one workshop can be considered as an initial step towards identifying key public datasets to open. Work remains to open datasets effectively, determining (1) the quality and readability of the data released and (2) the criteria to identify key public data to be released. Echoing the first IRM report[5] and the review of commitments 12 and 13, opening more datasets and a cultural change in perception of data are very important. As such, a workshop is insufficient. But the workshop and the results of the commitment, if they open key public datasets when fully implemented, would be a major step forward. For now, according to the government's self-assessment report, it seems that the government will be focusing on opening data on government spending.[6] Stakeholders agree that this commitment has major potential impact but remains limited in scope and scale.

Moving forward

The government's self-assessment report indicates that the future steps of this commitment are updating a standard license for public data, publishing guidance for opening data (for public offices), and publishing guidance for accessing data (for civil society). These are promising future steps that the IRM researcher will assess in the end of term report.

In future action plans, this commitment could be taken forward adding new activities to broaden the scope and scale of the commitment:

- Calling for the development of a mechanism that ensures the systematic publication of data year by year;
- Organizing capacity-building activities to teach citizens how to access and use data, for example carrying out "hackathons," other activities that call for direct involvement of citizens, and other activities similar to the annual workshop on the public finances of 2016, arranged by Open Knowledge Foundation and the Danish newspaper, Information;[7]
- Removing legal restrictions to open data;
- Increasing collaboration between public bodies; and
- Allocating proper funding to implement open data initiatives.

[1] "Commitment: Opening Key Public Datasets," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1P6lyWb
[2] "Global Open Data Index 2015, Government Spending", Global Open Data Index, http://index.okfn.org/place/denmark/spending/

[3] "Workshop: Sadan Kan Du Som Myndighed Stille Open Data Til Radighed," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1ZC20dR
[4] "Deltagere ved Open Data Training," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, 22 April 2015, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Pi11zK
[5] "Independent Reporting Mechanism Denmark: Progress Report 2012-13," 2014, http://bit.ly/1Sxyirf
[6] "Self-Assessment Report on Denmark's OGP Action Plan and OGP Work 2013-2014," 2015, http://bit.ly/1ZC1jRA
[7] "Dataworkshop om Finanslov 2016," Open Knowledge Denmark, Facebook, https://www.facebook.com/events/450192911854060/

V. Process: Self-assessment

The Danish self-assessment report was published on time and is high quality, although there was a change in government in 2015 that led to a reorganisation of ministries and agencies. The self-assessment report states that future action plans will be on a corrected timeline in line with other cohort two countries.

Table 1: Self-assessment checklist

Was the annual progress report published?	Yes
Was it done according to schedule? (Due 30 Sept. for most governments, 30 March for Cohort 1.)	Yes
Is the report available in the administrative language(s)?	Yes
Is the report available in English?	Yes
Did the government provide a two-week public comment period on draft self-assessment reports?	Yes
Were any public comments received?	No
Is the report deposited in the OGP portal?	Yes
Did the self-assessment report include review of consultation efforts during action plan development?	Yes
Did the self-assessment report include review of consultation efforts during action plan implementation?	Yes
Did the self-assessment report include a description of the public comment period during the development of the self-assessment?	Yes
Did the report cover all of the commitments?	Yes
Did it assess completion of each commitment according to the timeline and milestones in the action plan?	Yes
Did the report respond to the IRM key recommendations (2015+ only)?	Yes

Summary of additional information

The government's self-assessment report was published on 29 September 2015.[1] Prior to its release, there was a public hearing, but no comments were received. A possible explanation for the lack of comments could be due to the limited awareness and ownership of the OGP process. However, shortly after the hearing, the Open Knowledge Foundation used this momentum to publish an official comment[2] criticizing the action plan for focusing on the efficiency in the public sector, rather than on openness and transparency.

The government's self-assessment report is available via the OGP and AFD websites,[3] where, at the time of writing of this report, it was prominently displayed.

Stakeholders from the meeting in Copenhagen and from the online survey organised by the IRM researcher indicate that the government's self-assessment report is of high

quality and, in general, is very accurate with regard to the Danish participation in OGP, although they echo the points from the Open Knowledge Foundation.

Follow-up on previous IRM recommendations (2015+)

Since the IRM progress report for the first action plan was published after the development of the second Danish action plan, the recommendations from the first IRM report were not included in the development of the second Danish action plan. However, key issues highlighted in the IRM report were addressed and articulated in the government's self assessment report, allowing for reflection on the foundation of OGP in Denmark as well as the lack of traction in civil society. For example, the scope of this action plan was substantially reduced, a decision that allowed for a better implementation of the commitments.

However, although the overall recommendations from the first IRM report were taken into account, key recommendations such as the lack of political ownership or mandate over OGP, still need to be addressed properly. OGP is housed in the AFD, and one leading official is charged with overseeing the government's role in the OGP. This official has been the driving force of OGP. Nonetheless, in the first IRM report, stakeholders agreed that the official needed further political backup and mandate. Furthermore, stakeholders echoed this view. Thus, this report disagrees with the government's self-assessment report, which considers their work in this area sufficient. Indeed, the government's self-assessment report does not prioritize ownership of OGP across various government bodies or the spread of OGP values to other public offices.

---

[1] "Open Government Partnership (OGP) Self-Assessment 2013-2014," News UK 29 September 2015, Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, http://bit.ly/1JiC70z
[2] Niels Erik Kaaber Rasmussen, "Kritik af Dansk Handlingsplan for Open Government," Open Knowledge Danmark, 26 September 2015, [Danish] http://bit.ly/20f67yA
[3] "Selvevaluering af Danmark OGP-handlingsplan 2013-2014," Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1T5GI8p

VI. Country context

Similar to many other European countries, Denmark has faced a period of recession in the years following the financial crisis.[1] However, in 2013 and 2014, it reported a positive growth in GDP and has forecasted a 2.1 percent growth for the year 2016.[2] In November 2015, the government released a new plan for growth in Denmark with 100 initiatives spanning across five themes: better possibilities for agriculture, good terms for production and investments, liberalization of the plan act, good possibilities for working and living in all of Denmark, and better balance in the placement of the state jobs.

Regarding transparency in government, in the past three years, Denmark consecutively has been ranked first out of over 170 countries in Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index[3] with scores of 90, 91, and 92, respectively.[4] Overall, Denmark is regarded to have a strong business climate, ranking as the easiest country in Europe to do business,[5] is considered among the safest places with free press and freedom of speech,[6] and is widely seen as having a strong legal foundation and solid public institutions for the protection of human rights.[7] The Ministry of Justice produced a report in 2014 stating that the citizens of Denmark, among 47 countries in the European Council, have the highest level of trust in their courts.[8]

The government of Denmark is known to have a universal and inclusive approach to welfare and provides a large number of state-subsidised services to all residents.[9] In turn, Denmark has the highest individual tax income rate among all 34 OECD countries.[10] Because of this, the government always has aimed for complete financial transparency. However, the Tax Justice Network's financial secrecy index describes rising concerns about the lack of transparency in corporate taxation and a number of important developments to tackle these.[11] Since 2012, the government has moved to make corporate tax payments and non-payments available for the public. In the beginning of 2014, the Parliament began discussing the Tax Haven Package to combat tax avoidance, add new corporate taxes, and increase transparency.[12]

During the implementation period of this action plan, there have been key issues under the public eye that are relevant to access to information, transparency, and accountability, but which are missing from the Danish OGP plan of action. The following areas are relevant to country context and could be prioritized in future action plans.

Freedom of information. There has been much discussion about the Danish Freedom of Information (FOI) Act.[13] The act is mentioned in the first IRM report, but commitments addressing issues discussed in the act were not included in the first or the second Danish action plan. The FOI act that was passed in June 2013, was followed by large demonstrations.[14] Experts and media organisations criticised its content for reducing the level of transparency by blocking access to information concerning "political decision making processes."[15] Additionally, the Ombudsman articulated a series of exemptions and problems.[16] The Ombudsman is expected to provide a review of the FOI Act by 2017. For this review, the Ombudsman publicly endorsed the idea that journalists should gather examples of the problems associated with the new act.[17] As access to information is key to transparency and accountability for media, companies, and citizens, the FOI Act and a potential revision could be included in future action plans.

Political campaign financing. Denmark had a regional election in 2013 and national election in 2015. A new government is in place. Electoral processes have opened discussions about legislation regulating political campaign financing.[18] Currently this law states that donations exceeding DKR 20,000 must be reported. The Danish press documented numerous examples when such reporting was not done.[19] The Council of Europe recently published a report qualifying Denmark's regulations on political

campaigning as "globally unsatisfactory." Among various conclusions, they report that Denmark does not have a monitoring mechanism that can review whether regulations are implemented and applied.[20] This causes less transparency in campaign funding and raises questions about the reliability and viewpoints of elected politicians.

Lobbying regulations. Currently there is no record of lobbying activity in the Danish Parliament or any local administrations. This has been an issue constantly referred to in the Danish press.[21] Although Danish lobbyists feel that a registry would not serve its purpose properly,[22] they have created a webpage giving guidelines and principles for lobbying.[23] The principles are positive and valuable. However, with no control mechanism and no registry to shed light on which politicians meet with which lobbyists, lobbyists and politicians must commit individually to "play by the rules."

Open data. During the review period for this action plan, we have seen the first preliminary effects of the ODIS. The first wave of use and reuse of open government data is sparking new usage of data within the media, the software industry, and the private sector. This is very promising for future iterations of Danish action plans. It suggests that more emphasis should be placed on releasing government-held information.

Stakeholder priorities

For the second Danish action plan, stakeholders agree that the commitments on open data (commitments 12, 13, and 16), as well as the commitments tied to local administrations, are important to OGP. Thus, future action plans could elaborate on the interesting aspect of OGP in Denmark. These developments could address the cultural underpinnings of open data (see commitment review 12 and 13) as well as the impediments caused by the renewed FOI act.

For the upcoming Danish action plan, stakeholders also agree that the commitments must be more specific and measurable. Furthermore, stakeholders agree that the understanding of e-government as open government commitments should be minimized.

Scope of action plan in relation to national context

The IRM researcher found that the action plan could have been more ambitious to cover adequately the values of access to information and civic participation. Additionally, it does not include commitments clearly relevant to public accountability. Future action plans could (1) involve citizens in accountability of political campaign financing, (2) reform the current framework of freedom of information to guarantee access to information, and (3) enhance the impact of citizen participation on public policymaking.

Additionally, while stakeholders and the IRM researcher agree that the Danish focus on utilizing information technology to foster transparency and accountability is a good focal point for future OGP action plans in Denmark, this focus is not as transformative as reforms to the freedom of information act, the disclosure and accountability of political campaign financing, and the standardized regulations on lobbyist activities.

---

[1] Christian Wienberg, "Denmark in Recession Mode as Budget Stunts Growth: Nordic Credit," Bloomberg Business, 12 November 2012, http://bloom.bg/1nmNKtF

[2] "Vaekst I BNP," EU-Oplysningen, [Danish] http://www.eu.dk/da/fakta-om-eu/statistik/vaekst-i-bnp

[3] "Corruption Perceptions Index 2014: Results," http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results

[4] Transparency International explains that a country or territory's score indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption on a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean).

[5] "World Bank: Denmark Best European Country for Business in 2015," Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, 29 October 2014, http://bit.ly/1tgvSAg

[6] "Human Rights in Danish Law," Danish Institute for Human Rights, http://bit.ly/1JiwUGd

[7] "Human Rights in Denmark," Danish Institute for Human Rights, http://bit.ly/1WuVdCJ

[8] "Openness and Transparency," Danmark's Domstole, http://bit.ly/1Uca03A

[9] "Welfare," Denmark, http://denmark.dk/en/society/welfare/

[10] "Top Income Tax Rate: How U.S. Really Compares," 2013, http://cnnmon.ie/1wFn5GR

[11] "Narrative Report on Denmark," Financial Secrecy Index, Tax Justice Network, September 2015, http://www.financialsecrecyindex.com/PDF/Denmark.pdf

[12] "Narrative Report on Denmark," Financial Secrecy Index, 2015, http://www.financialsecrecyindex.com/PDF/Denmark.pdf

[13] "Denmark," Freedominfo.org, http://www.freedominfo.org/regions/europe/denmark/

[14] Morten Skaerbaek, "Stotten Bag Offentlighedslov Slar Revner," Folketingsvalg, Politiken, 8 June 2015, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1dsqa9v

[15] "Danish Journalists Urge New Government to Improve Transparency," European Federation of Journalists, 19 June 2015, http://bit.ly/1nmJsmj

[16] Folketingets Ombudsmand, letter, 2 April 2013, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1ZMOolp

[17] Ojvind Hesselager, "Ombudsmanden: Hvis Jeg var Chefredaktor, Ville Jeg Vise, Hvor Loven er Darlig," Journalisten, 12 June 2015, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Qn0oE7

[18] "Corruption by Country/Territory: Denmark," Transparency International, https://www.transparency.org/country/#DNK_Overview

[19] Trine Duemose K. Simonsen, "OVERBLIK Sadan er Reglerne for Anonym Valgkamps Stotte," Politik, DR, 13 November 2013, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1lw3FUA

[20] GRECO, *Fighting Corruption: Political Funding* by Yves-Marie Doublet (Thematic review, Strasbourg Cedex, 2010), http://bit.ly/1G0IKB9

[21] Ritzau, "Lobbyregister Erstattes af Individuel Ordning," Information, 12 December 2012, [Danish] http://www.information.dk/telegram/319783, Nilas Heinskou, "Benny 'Abenhed' Engelbrecht er Lukket om Lobbymoder," Poltik, Politiken, 29 January 2015, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1V8XTVa; Ritzau, "Engelbrecht: Usikkert on Lobbyregister kan Fotsaette," Forside, Mediawatch, 2 September 2014, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Uc36eV

[22] Martin Vith Ankerstjerne, "Nej til Lobbyregister – Ja til Selvregulering," Debat, Berlingske, 11 January 2014, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Qn05sW

[23] "1. Lobbyister Overholder det Omgivende Samfunds Regler," Radgiverne, [Danish] http://bit.ly/1Uc2GF8

VII. General recommendations

While specific recommendations for each of the individual commitments are made in section IV of this report, the following are a more general set of crosscutting recommendations for Denmark's future steps in the OGP process.

Denmark is praised internationally for being among the most transparent countries in the world. However, much more could be done to encourage national dialogue on transparency, participation, and accountability. Overall, more ambitious action plans could be developed with a clearer relevance to OGP values. For example, there are many opportunities ahead if OGP commitments are tied to the national anticorruption strategy. Future action plans could be adapted in a number of ways to ensure openness of the Danish government.

First, current civil servants are unaware of the strategic value of OGP. The government could consider establishing official interdepartmental avenues of communication through the Agency for Digitisation. Additionally, the government could find ways to integrate different government agencies and departments, which would provide ownership of OGP values and contribute to the change of mindset about government openness.

Second, future action plans could contain more ambitious commitments that focus on confronting contentious matters such as a review of the Freedom of Information Act, incorporating the Council of Europe's (GRECO) recommendations to increase political campaign financing transparency, releasing more datasets, and building citizen capacity to improve data usability and scrutiny.

Finally, although CSOs and other stakeholders generally have been encouraged to participate in the OGP initiative, participation mechanisms should seek strategic engagement with experts in the development of policies. These mechanisms also should be accompanied with clear guidelines that outline the process of integrating stakeholder recommendations in policy.

Top SMART recommendations

Beginning in 2014, all OGP IRM reports should 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-assessment reports.

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

TOP FIVE 'SMART' RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Increase the clarity of the action plans: Future action plans could follow a common language with (1) a specific timeline, (2) concrete milestones, and (3) a clear connection to OGP values, to better meet the goals of open government. For instance, the IRM researcher noticed that open government often is confused with e-government, and the self-assessment report recognizes this tendency in the Danish action plan. The government should include commitments with explicit relevance to OGP values.
2. Place the political mandate of OGP in the Prime Minister's office: Although initially not recognized as an issue in the government's self-assessment report, the IRM researcher finds no real political ownership of OGP. Although the government has assigned a person responsible for OGP matters, it remains unknown by the majority of officials. The IRM researcher suggests that, to ensure proper implementation, the OGP process be enforced directly by the Prime Minister's office.

3. Designate an OGP point-of-contact in each government institution: Relevant authorities in charge of fulfilling most of the commitments of the current action plan are unaware of the existence of OGP and Denmark's involvement in the program. The government could designate a point of contact in each agency or institution that is expected to contribute to the implementation of the action plan, so as to ensure a shared understanding of the values of access to information, civic participation, and public accountability.

4. Promote regular stakeholder meetings: Assuring frequent meetings at regular intervals between stakeholders could be key to assuring stakeholder ownership of OGP values and challenges. Initiatives such as the Open Government Camp could be carried out on a smaller scale through regional meet-ups and local gatherings.

5. Include more ambitious commitments relevant to country context issues: The Danish government could consider pursuing commitments in future action plans that aim to (1) promote transparency in political party financing, (2) enact lobbying regulations, and (3) reform the Freedom of Information Act.

VIII. Methodology and sources

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

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

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

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 national contexts where the anonymity of informants—governmental or nongovernmental—is required, the IRM reserves the ability to protect the anonymity of informants. Additionally, because of the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary on public drafts of each national document.

Interviews and focus groups

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

The IRM researcher organised a meeting in Copenhagen on 23 September 2015,[2] where representatives from public offices, private companies, and civil society were invited (35 people were invited). The meeting was planned to last 1.5 hours, and during the meeting stakeholders primarily discussed the quality of the second action plan, as well as the perspectives for future commitments.

Because only two people were able to attend the meeting in Copenhagen, more interviews were made (via telephone and e-mail) to broaden the scope of the research. All stakeholders were invited to participate in the survey that is referred to below. A list of sources (with elaboration on how they participated) can be found in the document library.

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 Denmark at http://bit.ly/1ZEqTWa.

Survey-based data

For Denmark, with low attendance for stakeholder meetings for this and the previous IRM report, a survey is a good option for gathering inputs.

The IRM researcher conducted a survey[3] with 81 respondents. This survey evaluates the entirety of the Danish action plan, commitment by commitment, as well as the Danish context. It lets respondents elaborate on their perspectives on OGP. Two models were used to research for this survey. Each survey's structure is identical.

First an open survey was disseminated via Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, and e-mail.[4] This survey used a pop-in option, where each new respondent was allowed to answer the survey in full. This yielded nine respondents, only six completely answered the survey, and the remaining three answered partly.

Second, a similar survey was disseminated to a select group of 690 people. These respondents were identified from document research, found on the hearing list for the second Danish action plan, found to have made a hearing answer for the second Danish action plan, via direct contact to the IRM researcher, or suggested by other stakeholders (snowballing). Of the 690 invited, 72 responded (45 complete answers and 27 partly answered the survey). The link to the first survey was distributed for further spread.

It is worth noting that while respondent numbers are fairly high, not all respondents reviewed all commitments. It also is worth noting that while 72 of 690 may be a low respondent rate, but there was a high error rate for the e-mails from the original hearing list. Around 200 e-mails from this list were no longer functional and resulted in automated server responses. Therefore, the respondent rate is hard to calculate precisely.

The survey(s) had a general structure in which the first section was trivia on the respondent. The second section was a review of the individual commitments (allowing for a score as well as positive and negative free text on each commitment), and the third section was a perspective on OGP and wishes for the next Danish action plan. The frequencies (graphs) for each of the commitments as well as the first and third section are available in the online document library, but the free text is withheld and will not be disclosed to the general public. A list of survey respondents is part of the sources for this report and can be found in the document library.

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 includes the following:

- Yamini Aiyar
- Debbie Budlender
- Liliane Corrêa de Oliveira Klaus
- Hazel Feigenblatt
- Jonathan Fox
- Hille Hinsberg
- Anuradha Joshi

- Rosemary McGee
- Gerardo Munck
- Ernesto Velasco-Sánchez

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

IX. Eligibility requirements annex

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

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

Criteria	2011	Current	Change	Explanation
Budget transparency[2]	ND	ND	No Change	4 = Executive's Budget Proposal and Audit Report published 2 = One of two published 0 = Neither published
Access to information[3]	4	4	No change	4 = Access to information (ATI) Law 3 = Constitutional ATI provision 1 = Draft ATI law 0 = No ATI law
Asset declaration[4]	3	4	⬆	4 = Asset disclosure law, data public 2 = Asset disclosure law, no public data 0 = No law
Citizen engagement (Raw score)	4 (9.71)[5]	4 (9.41)[6]	No Change	EIU Citizen Engagement Index raw score: 1 > 0 2 > 2.5 3 > 5 4 > 7.5
Total / Possible (Percent)	11/12 (92%)	12/12 (100%)	⬆	75 percent of possible points to be eligible

---

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

[2] For more information, see Table 1 in http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/. For updated assessments, see http://www.obstracker.org/.

[3] The two databases used are Constitutional Provisions (http://www.right2info.org/constitutional-protections) and Laws and Draft Laws (http://www.right2info.org/access-to-information-laws).

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

[5] Economist Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat" (London: Economist, 2010), http://bit.ly/eLC1rE

[6] Economist Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2014: Democracy and its Discontents" (London: Economist, 2014), http://bit.ly/18kEzCt