



Cabinet Office

Open Government Partnership National Action Plan 2013-15: mid-term self- assessment report

March 2015

This document is available
in large print, audio and
braille on request. Please call
+44 (0)207 123 4567 or email
transparencystategy@cabinetoffice.gov.uk

Cabinet Office
70 Whitehall
London SW1A 2AS

Publication date: March 2015

© Crown copyright 2015

You may re-use this information (not including logos)
free of charge in any format or medium, under the
terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit
www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

or write to the Information Policy Team,
The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU,
or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication
should be sent to us at
transparencystategy@cabinetoffice.gov.uk

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Open government in the UK | 5 |
| Process summary | 7 |
| Implementation of the NAP..... | 9 |
| Conclusion and next steps..... | 13 |
| Annex A: Self-assessment online survey – summary of results from 23 respondents | 15 |
| Annex B: Commitment links to grand challenges | 20 |

Introduction

Prime Minister David Cameron launched the second [UK Open Government Partnership \(OGP\) National Action Plan \(NAP\)](#) at the OGP summit in London on 31 October 2013. In doing so he credited the OGP, “a truly exciting institution”, with “helping to drive this transparency revolution around the world”. He made clear that the priority in the UK was to practice what we preach, in order to enact real change.

In the UK we see this as the absolute heart of the OGP – it empowers domestic reformers, both in and outside government, to make concrete commitments to greater openness. Minister for the Cabinet Office, Francis Maude, is responsible for this work across government and has often declared that “transparency is an idea whose time has come”. Through the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) OGP provides the independent means by which to assess whether governments fulfil their commitments.

Our NAP sets out our vision for a more open government where the public:

- understands the workings of their government (‘transparency’);
- can hold the government to account for its policy and service delivery performance, and inform choice of public services (‘accountability’); and
- can influence the workings of their government and society by engaging with policy processes and service delivery programs (‘participation’).

This self-assessment looks at progress 15 months into implementation of this two-year plan and reflects on our experiences of developing and implementing the NAP. The final section sets out where we see our priorities over the next few months and how we will develop the UK’s next NAP to ensure we continue to achieve our ambition to be the most open and transparent government in the world.

To help inform this self-assessment we have consulted both government and civil society commitment leads, as well as seeking views from civil society organisations (CSOs) not as actively involved. The headline results of an online survey, completed by 23 respondents, are published at annex A.

A draft version of this self-assessment was published for consultation from 10 to 23 March 2015. Two responses were received and we will work with the respondents to take their comments on board as we continue implementation of this NAP and look forward to the development of our next NAP.

Open government in the UK

2013 was a significant year for transparency and open government in the UK. As lead co-chair of the OGP from September 2012 until November 2013, we focused on incentivising change, encouraging more radical action among OGP members, and engaging with target potential members.

During our OGP chairmanship we hosted the global summit in London from 31 October to 1 November 2013. This brought together over 1,500 decision-makers, leaders and reformers from OGP participant countries and beyond. It secured 37 ambitious new commitments to open government from attendees; demonstrated new mechanisms for communicating the opportunities that open government provides, through an exciting and varied agenda, developed in conjunction with the community; and developed the working relationships between participating governments and CSOs.

In July 2014, the UK was re-elected to the OGP Steering Committee for a further three-year term.

Our OGP co-chairmanship overlapped with UK presidency of the G8, during which transparency, and specifically the ambition to “drive a transparency revolution in every corner of the world”¹, was a central theme. At the G8 summit, hosted in Lough Erne, Northern Ireland, world leaders committed to transparency in company ownership, payment for natural resources and open data.

The [Open Data Charter](#), agreed by the G8, sets out five principles for the release of government data, recognising that the benefits of open data can and should be enjoyed by the citizens of all nations. We published our [action plan](#) for implementing the Open Data Charter at the same time as the NAP. Since then, we have been fulfilling these commitments and have continued to encourage adoption of the principles within the charter through other international fora.

¹ Speech by Prime Minister David Cameron at G8 ‘Open for Growth Event’, June 2013
<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prime-ministers-speech-at-g8-open-for-growth>

This international context set our ambition for the NAP and our desire to set a high standard for others to emulate.

The NAP is structured around five priority areas:

- open data
- government integrity
- fiscal transparency
- empowering citizens
- natural resource transparency

The UK is recognised as a world leader in transparency and open data, and has recently topped the Global Open Data Index 2014² and the World Wide Web Foundation's Open Data Barometer³. We have continued to take steps to strengthen this, both through the Open Data Charter and through commitments in our NAP. We were the first country to commit to a publicly accessible register of UK company beneficial ownership and to develop a National Information Infrastructure (NII), which contains an inventory of the data, held by government, likely to have the broadest and most significant economic and social impact if made available and accessible outside of government. This helps us prioritise the use of open data for science, as a raw material of new business, and for research.

However, the IRM had concluded that our first NAP (2011-13) had too heavy a focus on open data and recommended broadening the focus of our second plan to include commitments relevant to the broader scope of open government. The process of engagement we ran with CSOs during the drafting of the second plan meant we were able to incorporate other ideas and develop a much wider set of ambitious commitments.

The 21 commitments within the NAP address the five OGP grand challenges, with each one relating to two or more of these challenges. An overview of this is available at annex B.

² Open Knowledge Foundation Global Open Data Index 2014, <http://index.okfn.org/place/>

³ Open Data Barometer Second Edition January 2015 <http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/>

Process summary

Leadership of the OGP in the UK sits with the Cabinet Office Transparency Team. The Minister for the Cabinet Office, Francis Maude, is the UK representative on the OGP steering committee. Among other things, the team is responsible for overseeing the development and implementation of our NAP.

CSOs in the UK responded to our first OGP NAP by calling for greater involvement and opportunity for participation in the process. Recognising the scope to engage better outside government and the potential this would provide for a more ambitious action plan, Francis Maude agreed that CSOs should work with government officials to develop the UK's second NAP. The UK civil society network is coordinated by [Involve](#).

The civil society network's document [Story of the UK NAP 2013-15](#) provides more detail on the development process and the lessons we learnt, although a summary is given below. Reflecting on the process at different stages and capturing what we're learning has helped ensure that the implementation of the NAP is developing and improving.

We worked with the civil society network, through a series of meetings and working groups, to determine the scope and commitment areas for the plan. There were commitments that both government and civil society agreed on but also some priority areas for CSOs, which were more difficult to negotiate. There was an important role for the Cabinet Office Transparency Team, as the co-ordinators, to ensure that policy leads from within government were brought into conversations so that new ideas could be robustly tested. This approach meant that our final plan contained a number of stretching and ambitious commitments, which we might not otherwise have considered including, particularly on anti-corruption, open contracting and whistleblowing.

Working with CSOs to develop the plan ensured that we drew on a wealth of advice and expertise so that the commitments themselves were achievable but ambitious, and we got continued input from the community of people who are crucial to helping us achieve them.

Our draft NAP was published for consultation in June 2013.

We have built on the success, and things we learnt, from the development of the plan to ensure we embed a sustainable, on-going process of engagement and consultation throughout the implementation of our commitments. In order to publish the NAP we needed to seek collective agreement across government. It was a good idea to reflect this by asking CSOs to also agree and sign up to commitments they had an on-going interest in.

While the relationship between government and civil society has worked well, and has significantly improved since our first NAP, there are still things we are learning and improving, as we understand more about the process. A few of the most significant areas we have identified as important lessons are:

- The co-ordinating team in government should not act as a gatekeeper between government and CSOs. In order to ensure genuine and meaningful commitment to the open government process, officials across government need to be encouraged to be involved and take responsibility for areas and specific commitments. It is, however, important to have strong facilitation and a consistent point of contact to help make the connections between relevant government and civil society interests. This is the role played by the Cabinet Office.
- Bringing together a group of CSOs and drafting a plan with them does not, in itself, constitute all the external engagement that needs to be done. The process of public consultation is important to ensure a wider community has the opportunity to comment and feed in. In the UK we have a standard 12-week consultation timeline, as encouraged by [the Compact](#). For consultation to be meaningful it needs to happen as early in the process as possible, to make sure ample time is available to incorporate the feedback received from it. We published our NAP for consultation later than we should have done, which meant the time available to respond to changes was more limited than it might have been.
- Due to the fact that a number of policy areas in the UK are devolved, commitments within the NAP do not necessarily impact across the UK. While there was engagement with the devolved administrations, more could be done in the future. Stronger engagement would have allowed us to further investigate how the commitments impact in the different parts of the UK and broaden participation. Developing this is a priority for us over the next few months.

Since publishing our NAP we have had approaches from a number of other OGP members, including New Zealand, Norway and Sierra Leone, to learn about how we engaged CSOs to develop the NAP and how we are taking forward implementation.

Implementation of the NAP

Since publication of the NAP, government officials and civil society representatives have been working together to implement the commitments. The Transparency Team do not dictate how this on-going engagement should happen but we remain the central point of contact and frequently provide advice and connect people to ensure that we continue to apply the principles of the OGP throughout implementation.

It has been helpful to request regular updates on individual commitments. This not only increases transparency about the progress being made, but also helps ensure we can provide advice where commitments are not on track and provides CSOs with the information necessary to hold government to account. It also means that the NAP can continue to develop as we see where milestones are being completed, which enables us to talk to departments and CSOs about what more can be done. To date we have published three rounds of progress updates on the [OGP website](#).

We learnt from our first NAP that where commitments and milestones were not clear it was difficult to measure progress. Ensuring commitments in this NAP had clear milestones, including dates where possible, has meant government departments have been able to reflect better the status of each commitment in their regular updates.

Progress on implementation of NAP commitments to date has been good, with 68% of milestones completed or on track⁴. 81% of those who responded to our survey agreed that implementation to date has gone well or very well. However, none felt implementation was 'excellent' and we agree there is more to do.

| Status | Number (%) of milestones |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Completed | 27 (32%) |
| On track | 30 (36%) |
| Behind schedule | 23 (27%) |
| Closed | 4 (5%) |

⁴ A full summary of progress updates for all commitments is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ogp-uk-national-action-plan-2013-to-2015-progress>

In November 2014, we held a meeting with Francis Maude and representatives from the civil society network to discuss progress and agree on next steps. A summary of that meeting is available [here](#).

One of the challenges we have experienced in implementing some commitments is continuity of people. For a number of commitments, the people now responsible for implementation are different from the people who helped to develop the commitments. In some instances this has simply meant a loss of knowledge of how the commitments developed. In others, it has meant that the initial commitment agreed has not been as straightforward as initially thought, as the people responsible for implementation were not adequately involved in its development. An example of this is commitment 8 about transparency and accessibility of police records.

Engagement between government and civil society has varied across commitments. Where there are formal stakeholder groups in place, for example the requirement to have a [multi-stakeholder group](#) for implementation of the Extractives Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), it has worked particularly well. This is not to say that engagement isn't working well elsewhere but we have learnt it is difficult to mandate what should be happening due to the differing nature of commitments. The solution we have used so far is to make sure we are clear about what we consider the minimum level of engagement to be (regular updates with interested CSOs) and encouraging individual commitment leads to do more.

At the meeting with Francis Maude in November, CSO attendees reflected on the positive developments so far and the marked difference in the level of constructive engagement during the process of developing the NAP, since the creation of the civil society network. However, they also asked how we could achieve greater consistency across government departments' approaches to civil society engagement. Francis Maude agreed to write to departments to emphasise the benefits of a more open, collaborative way of working and the responsibility the UK has as a vocal advocate for this approach internationally.

The progress updates published alongside this self-assessment, provide the detail on progress to date across all our commitments, but we would like to particularly reflect on the implementation of the following commitments.

Local government transparency code

This is the first of our commitments to have been fully implemented, with the [local government transparency code 2014](#) (the code) issued on 3 October 2014, the regulations coming into force on 31 October 2014 and guidance published for local authorities to support implementation of the code.

This was a major step in achieving this Government's goal of enabling local people and community groups to play a greater role in democratic processes, shaping public services and holding their local authority to account. To play a greater role in society, people and community groups often need information about how their local authority spends money and takes decisions. So for the first time, the code guaranteed that local people could see regular information about spending, the use of land and assets, how decisions are taken and issues of direct interest to them such as parking

charges. The public's ability to scrutinise and influence has been strengthened through the code.

Since the code was published, we have gone further:

- we published the [transparency code for smaller authorities](#) on 17 December 2014. This covers parish councils, internal drainage boards, charter trustees and port health authorities with an annual turnover not exceeding £25,000. From 1 April 2015 it will be a legal requirement for these bodies to publish the data specified in the transparency code for smaller authorities
- we have extended the Local Government Transparency Code 2014 to include a new dataset on the value of social housing assets. This data will enable local people to hold local housing authorities to account for how they are managing their social housing assets and whether the authorities can do more with them to enable the development of new homes and to reduce the number of people on a waiting list for a council home. As a result, the [local government transparency code 2015](#) was issued on 27 February 2015 and regulations come into force on 1 April 2015 making it a requirement for local authorities to publish data specified in Part 2 of the code.

We are not yet in a position to look at the impact of this work but with mandatory publication by local authorities due at the end of 2014 and in early 2015, we will soon be in a position to start assessing this. We will continue to work with Department for Communities and Local Government and other interested parties to understand more about their experience of accessing information and to explore ways of making more commitments to local government transparency.

UK anti-corruption plan

The UK anti-corruption plan was published on 18 December 2014, bringing together all of the UK's activity against corruption. It is the first time any major western country has produced such a comprehensive plan and marks a significant step in further strengthening the UK's response to corruption at home and abroad.

This work was one of the commitments made following the publication of the draft NAP and demonstrates the benefits of the OGP as a platform for civil society to encourage governments to commit to action not already underway.

Resource is now in place to implement and monitor progress on this plan, and the next steps for this work are reflected in the progress update.

Extractives transparency

New regulations and Financial Conduct Authority guidelines are in place requiring UK extractives companies to report on payments made to governments from 1 January 2015. This achieves early implementation of both the Accounting and Transparency Directives. The UK is the first EU member state to implement the directives, again demonstrating the standard we are setting internationally.

The UK was successfully admitted as an Extractives Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) candidate country on 15 October 2014, meeting its G7 commitment to extractives transparency. The UK will now have until April 2016 to produce its first EITI report and until April 2017 to commence validation to become a fully compliant EITI country.

Whistleblowing

Whistleblowing was another priority area for civil society. At the time of publication of the NAP, we were awaiting the outcome of a call for evidence on whistleblowing framework so we weren't able to develop substantive milestones. The government response, published in June 2014, set out a number of new measures to strengthen whistleblowing legislation. We updated the milestones for this commitment to reflect these measures.

Despite being in support of these additional measures, civil society signatories for this commitment are keen to see the government do more. Their comments are reflected in the progress updates.

Police records

This is another piece of work that was not underway before publication of the NAP.

Due to a change in the people responsible for implementing the commitment, and a better understanding of what it entails, the initial timescales have been delayed. We are working with the Home Office to develop the milestones accordingly, while being open about doing so. This reflects our priority to ensure the work is implemented in a meaningful way, rather than being rushed to meet the original deadline.

National Information Infrastructure (NII)

The UK is the first country to have committed to publishing a NII, and we published our first iteration on 31 October 2013 alongside the NAP. Since then we have been working with departments to continue to identify the data they hold that is of the highest potential impact and value and help them meet necessary commitments. We are now working on our second iteration of the NII.

The priority for the second iteration has been to enhance the level of external engagement, which has been hugely valuable in determining the direction of the work. A number of [workshops](#) were held to define the scope and help ensure this commitment continues to develop and be ambitious.

Conclusion and next steps

On the whole we feel proud of the way we have developed and implemented our NAP to date. This is not to say everything has always run perfectly but we have tried to reflect throughout the process on the things we could have done better and how we can improve this work and have been open to suggestions and input on how to do this.

Although some commitments have not yet been realised we are progressing well as 80% of respondents to our self-assessment survey agree. There is a balance to strike and we would not want our next NAP to lack ambition simply to assure all timetables could easily be met. NAP 3 must be as stretching as this NAP.

There are numerous factors that have meant we have been able to do this in an open and iterative way. We consider the following important conditions for successful open government reform:

- **High-level political and official commitment.** At the beginning of this self-assessment we reflected on the role our Prime Minister has played in championing open government, and the encouragement he gave to this work when the NAP was launched. This, coupled with continued determined commitment from the Minister for the Cabinet Office, has meant that we have felt empowered to try new things, to work with different groups and to challenge how government has typically previously consulted externally.
- **Strong working relationships with the civil society network.** Investing time in working closely with the organisations that are part of the civil society network has been invaluable. It has given us the opportunity to access real expertise and constructive challenge about what we're doing. We have not established a formal OGP forum or council in the UK but the way the Cabinet Office works with Involve to coordinate and connect this work across government has been instrumental in the reform we've achieved so far. Working with CSOs can take both civil servants and CSOs out of their comfort zone. Maturity is needed on both sides to build relationships of trust.

- **OGP as a platform.** Some of the work we have achieved through our NAP could, and might, have happened regardless of our participation in the OGP. However the commitment we have made to this partnership, and the framework it puts in place for collaboration and commitment to reform, has undoubtedly allowed and encouraged us to go much further than we would otherwise have done.

We are committed to continuing to do more and develop our open government ambition. As such there are a few specific areas we are planning to address as we continue implementation of this NAP and work to develop our third plan, although we remain open to input and further suggestions.

- We welcome the support of the civil society network in providing us with a coordinated means of engagement with CSOs but we are conscious that it does not reflect the full breadth of potential participation and are keen to find ways to incorporate views and priorities from a wider community.
- We need to find ways to make the notion of open government relevant to different people in other regions, and find ways to demonstrate that it's possible to incorporate a wider breadth of input. We will raise the profile of the OGP and broaden engagement across government, particularly to the devolved administrations. The launch of the Northern Ireland Open Government Network on 5 November 2014 demonstrated the growing level of interest in open government there. The Scottish Government published '[One Scotland: the Government's Programme for Scotland 2014-15](#)' which sets out their main goals for the future, including passing power to people and communities. We will work with representatives across the devolved administrations to ensure that our next NAP truly is a NAP, reflecting the work going on across the UK.
- In development of our third NAP we will make sure we are able to dedicate more time to consultation and have already been working on a timeline to enable us to do this.

Our next NAP is due to be published in January 2016. The Independent Reporting Mechanism report due in the summer will help us reflect more on our progress to date as we look to set ourselves ever more ambitious commitments for open government in the UK.

Annex A: Self-assessment online survey – summary of results from 23 respondents

| Are you responding as a representative of government or civil society? | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Government | 43% | 10 |
| Civil society | 57% | 13 |

| How well do you think the UK has done to date overall in implementing the NAP? | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Excellently | 0% | 0 |
| Very well | 50% | 8 |
| Well | 31% | 5 |
| Fairly well | 13% | 2 |
| Poorly | 6% | 1 |
| Skipped question | | 7 |

| To what extent is there an on-going joint process in place to monitor the progress of the implementation of the NAP? | | |
|---|-----|---|
| To a large extent (meetings are held at least every 3 months with a senior official or minister to review overall progress on implementation) | 12% | 2 |
| To a moderate extent (meetings are held every 3 to 6 months with a senior official or minister to review overall progress on implementation) | 44% | 7 |
| To some extent (irregular meetings are held with government officials to review overall progress on implementation) | 44% | 7 |
| Not at all (no meetings are held with government officials to review overall progress on implementation) | 0% | 0 |
| Skipped question | | 7 |

| Which NAP commitment(s) are you involved in or have a particular interest in? | | |
|--|-----|---|
| 1. National Information Infrastructure | 19% | 3 |
| 2. Health information standards | 0% | 0 |
| 3. Local Authority Transparency Code | 0% | 0 |
| 4. Social investment | 0% | 0 |
| 5. Digital records | 6% | 1 |
| 6. Anti-corruption | 19% | 3 |
| 7. Beneficial ownership | 19% | 3 |
| 8. Police records | 6% | 1 |
| 9. Construction transparency | 6% | 1 |
| 10. Legislation | 6% | 1 |
| 11. Whistleblowing | 0% | 0 |
| 12. Open contracting | 6% | 1 |
| 13. Open contracting Scotland | 0% | 0 |
| 14. Aid transparency | 13% | 2 |
| 15. Better information about health and care | 0% | 0 |
| 16. Open Policy Making | 25% | 4 |
| 17. Sciencewise | 6% | 1 |
| 18. Draft legislation | 13% | 2 |
| 19. OpenDataCommunities | 0% | 0 |
| 20. Public Sector Information directive | 0% | 0 |
| 21. Extractives | 19% | 3 |
| Skipped question | | 7 |

| To what extent is there on-going collaboration between government officials and civil society on the implementation of individual commitments? | | |
|--|-----|---|
| To a large extent (meetings are held - or other methods of engagement are instigated - between relevant government officials and relevant civil society organisations at least once every 4 months) | 44% | 7 |
| To a moderate extent (meetings are held - or other methods of engagement are instigated - between relevant government officials and relevant civil society organisations at least once every 6 months) | 37% | 6 |
| To some extent (meetings are held - or other methods of engagement are instigated - between relevant government officials and relevant civil society organisations less than once every 6 months) | 19% | 3 |
| Not at all (no meetings are held - or other methods of engagement are instigated - with government officials to review progress) | 0% | 0 |
| Skipped question | | 7 |

| In your opinion, how would you judge the strength of the partnership between key government officials and engaged civil society organisations in the implementation of individual commitments? | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Very strong (government and civil society have productive and strong working relationships with at least a high level of trust and disagreements are negotiated with mutually agreeable solutions found in all cases) | 25% | 4 |
| Strong (government and civil society have fairly productive and strong working relationships with at least a moderate level of trust and disagreements are negotiated with mutually agreeable solutions found in most cases) | 44% | 7 |
| Moderately strong (government and civil society have a basic working relationship with at least a low level of trust and attempts have been made to negotiate disagreements with mutually agreeable solutions found in some cases) | 19% | 3 |
| Weak (government and civil society have not been able to establish a working relationship and/or no attempts have been made to negotiate disagreements) | 12% | 2 |
| Skipped question | | 7 |

| Were you involved in the development of the NAP? | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Yes | 69% | 11 |
| No | 31% | 5 |
| Skipped question | | 7 |

| To what extent did civil society organisations have a significant level of involvement and influence in the development of the narrative (ie the story that connects the commitments and describes the UK's approach to open government) for the action plan? | | |
|--|-----|----|
| To a large extent (government and civil society co-drafted the narrative for the action plan) | 55% | 6 |
| To a moderate extent (civil society was able to comment on the draft narrative with government taking on board a majority of comments) | 27% | 3 |
| To some extent (civil society was able to comment on the draft narrative with government taking on board a minority of comments) | 18% | 2 |
| Not at all (civil society had no involvement in the development of the narrative for the action plan) | 0% | 0 |
| Skipped question | | 12 |

| To what extent did civil society have involvement in the development of individual commitments for the action plan? | | |
|---|-----|----|
| To a large extent (government and civil society worked together to develop all of the commitments with the action plan) | 27% | 3 |
| To a moderate extent (government and civil society worked together to develop the majority of commitments within the action plan) | 64% | 7 |
| To some extent (government and civil society worked together to develop a minority of the commitments within the action plan) | 9% | 1 |
| Not at all (civil society had no involvement in the development of commitments) | 0% | 0 |
| Skipped question | | 12 |

| To what extent was it communicated to civil society organisations why inputs were or were not taken into account regarding specific commitments? | | |
|---|-----|----|
| To a large extent (government responded to each input, stating the reasons they could or could not be adopted) | 18% | 2 |
| To a moderate extent (government responded to the majority of inputs, stating the reasons they could or could not be adopted) | 73% | 8 |
| To some extent (government responded to a minority of inputs, stating the reasons they could or could not be adopted) | 9% | 1 |
| Not at all (government was not forthcoming about why inputs were or were not adopted) | 0% | 0 |
| Skipped question | | 12 |

| In your opinion, how would you judge the strength of the partnership between key government officials and engaged civil society organisations in the development of NAP commitments? | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Very strong (government and civil society developed productive and strong working relationships with at least a high level of trust and disagreements were negotiated with mutually agreeable solutions found in all cases) | 27% | 3 |
| Strong (government and civil society developed fairly productive and strong working relationships with at least a moderate level of trust and disagreements were negotiated with mutually agreeable solutions found in most cases) | 55% | 6 |
| Moderately strong (government and civil society developed a basic working relationship with at least a low level of trust and attempts were made to negotiate disagreements with mutually agreeable solutions found in some cases) | 18% | 2 |
| Weak (government and civil society were not able to establish a working relationship and/or no attempts were made to negotiate disagreements) | 0% | 0 |
| Skipped question | | 12 |

| Is there a clear direction of travel for the commitments you are involved in beyond the work already set out in the NAP? | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Yes | 73% | 11 |
| No | 27% | 4 |
| Skipped question | | 8 |

Annex B: Commitment links to grand challenges

| No | Commitment | Grand challenges | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| | | 1. Improving public services | 2. Increasing public integrity | 3. More effectively managing public resources | 4. Creating safer communities | 5. Increasing corporate accountability |
| Open data: radically opening up government data for greater accountability, public service improvement and economic growth | | | | | | |
| 1. | National Information Infrastructure | X | X | X | X | X |
| 2. | Health information standards | X | X | X | | |
| 3. | Local Authority Data Transparency Code | | X | X | | |
| 4. | Social investment | X | | X | X | X |
| 5. | Digital records | | X | X | | X |
| Government integrity: fighting corruption and strengthening democracy through transparent government | | | | | | |
| 6. | Anti-corruption | X | X | | X | X |
| 7. | Beneficial ownership | | X | | | X |
| 8. | Police records | X | X | X | | X |
| 9. | Construction transparency | X | X | X | X | |
| 10. | Legislation | X | X | | | X |
| 11. | Whistleblowing | X | X | X | X | X |

| No | Commitment | Grand challenges | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| | | 1. Improving public services | 2. Increasing public integrity | 3. More effectively managing public resources | 4. Creating safer communities | 5. Increasing corporate accountability |
| Fiscal transparency: helping citizens to follow the money | | | | | | |
| 12. | Open contracting | | X | X | | X |
| 13. | Open contracting Scotland | X | X | X | | X |
| 14. | Aid transparency | X | X | X | | X |
| Empowering citizens: transforming the relationship between citizens and governments | | | | | | |
| 15. | Better information about health and care | X | X | X | | |
| 16. | Open Policy Making | X | | | | X |
| 17. | Sciencewise | X | | X | | X |
| 18. | Draft legislation | | X | | | X |
| 19. | OpenDataCommunities | X | X | X | X | X |
| 20. | Public Sector Information Directive | X | X | | | |
| Natural resources transparency: ensuring natural resources and extractive revenues are used for public benefit | | | | | | |
| 21. | Extractives | | X | X | | X |