



Hungary's action plan complemented its existing anti-corruption programme. 2 out of 5 commitments were completed at the mid-term report and no significant progress was made on the 3 unfinished commitments. Initially, stakeholders welcomed the collaborative consultation process, but changes in the political agenda led to a breakdown in government-civil society cooperation. Going forward, the government will need to re-establish trust, collaborate with stakeholders, and include commitments on transparency and participation.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a review of the activities of each OGP participating country. **This report summarizes the results of the period July 2012 to June 2014 and includes some relevant developments up to September 2015.**

Initially, the OGP process in Hungary was co-ordinated by the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice (MPAJ), whose role was later taken over by the National Protection Service (NPS), an agency under the Ministry of Interior in June 2014. Civil society groups were involved in the Action Plan development as well as in the implementation period. A significant number of the commitments and milestones were carried out by the MPAJ, in cooperation with some state agencies (Hungarian State Treasury, Public Procurement Authority, National University for Public Administration, State Audit Office).

Consultation with civil society

Countries participating in the OGP follow a process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan and during implementation. The consultation process during the implementation was a centralised process, with most consultation events taking place at the MPAJ or through exchanging comments and recommendations in written form. Due to changes in the general Public Sector Information regulation (in effect, limiting access to public data) the previously most active civil stakeholders opted out of the OGP working group and left this consultation forum as a protest act in Spring 2013. As a consequence of this development two commitments have "lost their importance" since the activist-type NGOs, which left the government working group in 2013, were the commitments' primary champions and responsible for monitoring their implementation. The remaining and most of the former CSO members of the government working group consistently monitored progress on the first action plan. An online public consultation process of the second

Table 1: At a Glance

	Mid-term	End-of-term
Number of commitments	5	
Number of milestones	16	
Level of completion (milestones)		
Completed	8	9
Substantial	2	2
Limited	6	5
Not started	0	0
Number of commitments with:		
Clear relevance to OGP values	5	
Moderate or Transformative potential impact	0	
Substantial or complete implementation	3	4
All three (★)	0	0

Table 2: At a Glance

Commitments carried over to next action plan:	0
Milestones significantly modified or updated to the next action plan:	5
Milestones left out of next action plan:	3
Unclear relationship to next action plan:	0

action plan was launched by the NPS in May 2015 with significant input from NGOs on a variety of issues. The government approved the second action plan in the Government decree 1460/2018 (VII.8.).

Table 3: Action Plan Consultation Process

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the government meet this requirement
During Implementation	Regular forum for consultation during implementation?	Yes –OGP Working Group (OGP WG)
	Consultations: Open or Invitation-only?	Invitation-only, but open to other/new stakeholders by recommendations of the OGP WG members
	Consultations on IAP2 spectrum	Involve

Table 4: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm End of term		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsens	None	Minor	Major	Transformative
1. Fiscal data			✓		✓					✓						✓			✓		
2. Public procurement data				✓	✓					✓						✓			✓		
3. Disclosure obligation compliance					✓		✓			✓				✓			✓				
4. Public sector integrity control system						✓	✓			✓					✓				✓		
5. Anti-corruption and integrity dissemination strategy					✓		✓			✓				✓		✓		✓			

IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS THAT WERE INCOMPLETE AT MID-TERM REPORT

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. Table 4 summarizes each commitment, its level of completion, its ambition, whether it falls within Hungary's planned schedule, and the key next steps for the commitment in future OGP action plans. The tables below summarize progress on milestones that were not complete at the mid-term report. Previously completed milestones have been omitted for brevity. Hungary's plan focused on three key areas – Improvement of the integrity of public administration agencies; improvement of the quality of public services, and improvement of the efficiency of using community resources.

About “Did it Open Government?”

Often, OGP commitments are vaguely worded or not clearly related to opening government, but they actually achieve significant political reforms. Other times, commitments with significant progress may appear relevant and ambitious, but fail to open government. In an attempt to capture these subtleties and, more importantly, actual changes in government practice, the IRM introduced a new variable ‘did it open government?’ in End-of-Term Reports. This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the practice of governing has changed as a result of the commitment. This can be contrasted to the IRM's “Starred commitments” which describe *potential* impact.

IRM Researchers code the “Did it open government?” variable using the same scale as the “potential impact” variable. This allows for comparisons of intention (potential impact) with outcomes government. A variable scale also allows categorization of results along a spectrum, as some commitments may have mixed results. The scale is as follows:

- Worsens: worsens government openness
- None: maintains the same degree of government openness
- Minor: an incremental but positive step for government openness in the relevant policy area
- Major: a major step forward for government openness in the relevant policy area, but remains limited in scope or scale
- Transformative: a reform that has transformed ‘business as usual’ in the relevant policy area by opening government

To assess this variable, researchers establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan. They then assess outcomes *as implemented* for changes in government openness.

Readers should keep in mind limitations. IRM End-of-Term Reports are prepared only a few months after the implementation cycle is completed and focus on government practice, so the variable does not capture longer term changes and on-the-ground impacts. Second, as with all assessments of OGP commitments, the variable assesses only the outcomes of the commitment. It should therefore not be interpreted as an evaluation of open government on the whole in the national context as the scope of each action.

I. Fiscal Data

Commitment Text:

In order to provide better information to citizens about fiscal issues, Hungary undertakes to present the data of the draft central budget and its amendments as well as the actually implemented budget through figures and charts as well, broken down to items according to Level 2 of the COFOG (Classification of the Functions of Government) developed by the United Nations.

- Presenting the data of the draft central budget and its amendments as well as the actually implemented budget through figures and charts.
- Presenting government expenditure data according to Level 2 groups of the UN Classification of the Functions Of Government [COFOG].

Responsible institution: Ministry of Public Administration and Justice

Supporting institution(s): Ministry for National Economy, Hungarian State Treasury

Start date: 1 September 2013 End date: 30 June 2014

Relevance: Clear.....

Specificity: Medium

Potential Impact: Minor

I. Overview	End of term completion				Did it open government?				
	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	Worsens	None	Minor	Major	Transformative
				✓			✓		

Did it open government?

The government successfully uploaded the draft central budget documents and expenditure data. Although the database is on the Hungarian Treasury's website, it is not located in an easy-to-find place (i.e. the dataset is behind many 'click walls' and there is no noticeable message on the starting page that would indicate the publication of the dataset). The lack of such elements or a broader communication campaign using the country's OGP website or any other governmental channel means that significant dissemination of the dataset is unlikely. The manifestation of this assumption is the result of the IRM researcher's stakeholder survey that shows that interested stakeholders are in general not aware of the publishing of the dataset. The IRM researcher made a few suggestions in the Progress Report concerning the cross-sectional comparability and chronological consistency of the database. We warmly welcome the new version of the database on the Treasury's website, which is now more consistent with the COFOG definitions. Due to the lack of dissemination activities and the fact that very few people know about the existence of the databases, however, the IRM researcher found that this commitment had only a minor impact on opening government.

2. Public Procurement Data

Commitment Text:

In order to secure the publicity of public procurement data, Hungary undertakes to ensure that public procurement announcements and communications (data published in relation to public procurement tenders in an official journal or on a central state website for public procurement tenders as required by statutory provisions) are disclosed in a way that every single contractor (except for the case of legal succession) is allocated a permanent unique identification code and every single public procurement procedure is allocated a unique identification code that is permanent in the given procedure. This will make it easier to search and query any disclosed public procurement document based on the unique identification code of the agency or procedure in question.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Public Administration and Justice

Supporting institution(s): Ministry of National Development, Public Procurement Authority

Start date: 25 February 2013.....

End date: 30 June 2014

Relevance: Clear

Specificity: High

Potential Impact: Minor

Commitment Overview	End of term completion				Did it open government?				
	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	Worsens	None	Minor	Major	Transformative
2. Overall				✓			✓		
2.1. Contractor ID				✓			✓		
2.2. Procedure ID				✓			✓		

Did it open government?

The government assigned specific ID codes for the public procurement agencies. The Public Procurement Authority has refined this data but it has not communicated the changes to the broader public. The effectiveness of this commitment in opening public procurement practices is limited by the fact that unique identifiers have been introduced only for procurers –and not bidders –and that the identifiers are not used consistently across different procurement documents. The IRM researcher therefore found this commitment to have a minor impact on opening government.

3. Disclosure obligation compliance

Commitment Text:

Improvement of the publicity of contracts concluded for the utilization of public property and with the use of public funds, Hungary undertakes to provide for the following even through legislative amendments, if necessary:

- The examinations of independent and governmental state organs authorized to carry out compliance check should always extend to compliance with disclosure obligations
- Experience gained concerning the implementation of the Public Procurement Act as well the rules of national and community budgetary financial assistance should be reviewed, with special respect to compliance with statutory provisions on the freedom of electronic information and paying special attention to the form and content of the eventual further increase of publicity
- The utilization of local government property and procurements should be discussed in open meetings, except for meetings convened for the evaluation of tender procurement results where the bidder or applicant excluded the disclosure of part of its application because it qualifies as business secret which relates to its own activities but does not relate to substantial elements of the contract to be concluded, or if an open meeting would breach secrecy of a business company owned by the local government
- Public motions by local government bodies should be disclosed on the local government's website after sending out the invitations and together with such invitations.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Public Administration and Justice

Supporting institution(s): State Audit Office of Hungary, Public Procurement Authority

Start date: 25 February 2013 End date: 30 June 2014

Relevance: Clear

Specificity: Medium

Potential Impact: Minor

Commitment Overview	End of term completion				Did it open government?				
	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	Worsens	None	Minor	Major	Transformative
3. Overall		✓				✓			
3.1. Compliance checks extended to disclosure obligations		✓					✓		
3.2. Review of the Public Procurement Act (PPA)				✓			✓		
3.3. Hold open meetings about the utilization of local government property		✓				✓			
3.4. Disclosure of public motions by local government bodies		✓				✓			

Policy Aim

This commitment aimed at improving the disclosure practices of state-owned enterprises (SOE) and local governments as well as contributing to the transparency of public procurement procedures. More specifically, the commitment set out to

- Expand the scope of the compliance checks of the State Audit Office (SAO) to the disclosure obligations of SOEs (3.1). This milestone aims at contributing to the transparency and accessibility of information in the broader circle of public bodies
- Review the Public Procurement Act with the aim of improving the online accessibility of procurement information (3.2)
- Make open meetings a regular practice of local governments to discuss the utilisation of local government property and procurements (3.3), and make the disclosure of public motions a regular practice before holding local government meetings (3.4). The two measures aim at extending the notion of transparency to the local level of state administration

Status

Mid-term: Limited

3.1 Checking the compliance with disclosure obligations (limited)

According to official government sources, internal rules of procedures determining the independent control agencies' (SAO) practice were not yet amended. Government sources informed the IRM researcher that although no new regulation was put into force, the SAO has already begun to incorporate this activity into its operations. It would be useful to monitor and evaluate the SAO's practice on a regular basis.

3.2. Review of the Public Procurement Act (PPA) (complete)

For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

3.3 Hold open meetings about the utilization of local government property (limited) and

3.4 Disclosure of public motions by local government bodies (limited)

The implementation of these two milestones was halted at a very early stage due to the opposition of lobby groups, such as the representation of cities (Association of Cities with County Rights). For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

End of term: Limited

Based on government self-assessment report and media monitoring conducted by the IRM researcher, there was no further progress on the implementation of the unfinished milestones (3.1, 3.3, and 3.4). Milestones 3.3 and 3.4 lost importance and ownership in the course of implementation after some CSO members of the government working group, who could have pressed for the implementation of these milestones, resigned in protest. Since the mid-term IRM report, no further consultations with the Association of Cities, the government stakeholder group that opposed the activities in these milestones since the action plan development stage, have taken place. The IRM researcher could not find evidence of any further attempts by the government to make progress on these two milestones.

Did it open government?

Overall, the disclosure obligation activities – especially 3.3 and 3.4 - under this commitment may have been counterproductive in terms of opening government. Stakeholders were enthusiastic about disclosure obligation reforms, but some of the milestones were met with strong opposition by lobbying groups, which effectively froze all progress on implementing this commitment. For milestone 3.1, the compliance checks only included municipalities, not central authorities or state-owned enterprises. For milestone 3.2, some aspects of the PPA were improved. However new simplifications to the PPA Act were initiated regularly and the overall process remained opaque and difficult for the majority of the public to monitor. The government has included some of the milestones from this commitment in the new action plan, indicating a possible renewed effort to implement obligation disclosure reform.

Carried forward?

Yes, the unfinished milestones are carried forward in part to Hungary's second National OGP Action Plan (AP)¹.

3.1 *Checking the compliance with disclosure obligations* (Not carried forward).

3.3 *Hold open meetings about the utilization of local government property* (Yes, with changes).

3.4 *Disclosure of public motions by local government bodies* (Yes, with changes).

The new AP suggests that strengthening the disclosure practices of local governments and the transparency of the local decision-making processes is going to be on the agenda of the Hungarian government in the following years. These actions are covered – though the language of the commitment is modified– in commitments 3, 6, 7 and 9 of the new AP. The newly formulated commitments are highly relevant to the OGP values but many of them lack details and specific milestones (i.e.: target group characteristics, timing of milestones and volume of deliverables). Therefore, the potential impact of these new commitments is unclear. The new AP sets out to:

- Make local decision-making more transparent by promoting more efficient public disclosure through the publication of a handbook and via series of workshops offered to local authorities (Commitment 3),
- Provide e-learning on freedom of information matters for local governments (Commitment 6),
- Promote corruption prevention and integrity for local governments (Commitment 7), and
- Contribute to the searchability and processability of local government decrees and records of municipal council sessions (Commitment 9).

The IRM researcher suggests the following steps to reach a full completion of the unfinished milestones:

- Compliance with disclosure obligations (milestone 3.1): it would be helpful to extend explicitly the competences of the independent control bodies (the Government Control Office and the SAO) to make enforcement of disclosure obligations more effective.
- Disclosure practices of local governments (milestones 3.3 and 3.4): relevant national regulations on transparency provisions need to be standardized across the country to promote open government practices at the local and national level. In addition, evangelisation in form of trainings and workshops within the public sector on the benefits of transparency would be crucial to enforce compliance with the corresponding legal provisions already in place.

1 A Kormány 1460/2015. (VII. 8.) Korm. határozata Magyarországnak a Nyílt Kormányzati Együttműködés kezdeményezés keretében a 2015–2017. évekre tett vállalásairól szóló második akciótervről¹ [Government decree 1460/2018 (VII.8.) on Hungary's Second Action Plan on the commitments for the years 2015-2017 made under the Open Government Partnership initiative.

4. Public sector integrity control system

Commitment Text:

Hungary undertakes:

- to ensure the participation of public sector organizations and state-owned business companies in the Integrity Survey of the State Audit Office
- to introduce an integrity control system into the central public administration
- to create the institutional system for the protection of whistleblowers
- to determine the rules of keeping contact between state organs and interest representation groups
- to ensure the pre-decision analysis of corruption risks of motions to be discussed by the Government and draft ministerial decrees, within the framework of a preliminary impact assessment
- to prepare Codes of Professional Conduct for government officials and law and order personnel in a form approved by competent public corporations independent from the Government.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Public Administration and Justice

Supporting institution(s): State Audit Office of Hungary, National University of Public Service, Hungarian Chamber of Government Officials, National Development Agency, Office of Public Administration and Justice

Start date: 25 February 2013.....

End date: 1 January 2014

Relevance: Clear.....

Specificity: Medium

Potential Impact: Minor

Commitment Overview	End of term completion				Did it open government?				
	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	Worsens	None	Minor	Major	Transformative
4. Overall			✓				✓		
4.1. Extend integrity survey			✓				✓		
4.2. Launch of integrity control system			✓					✓	
4.3. Protection of whistleblowers				✓		✓			
4.4. Lobby regulation				✓		✓			
4.5. Corruption risk assessment module		✓				✓			
4.6. Codes of ethics for government officials and law and order personnel				✓			✓		

Policy Aim

This commitment aimed at putting in place a number of reforms that would help reduce corruption in the public sector; to institutionalise the system of whistleblower protection and the system of keeping contact between state organs and interest representation groups.

More specifically, the commitment sets out to:

- To ensure the participation of public sector organizations and state-owned business companies in the Integrity Survey conducted annually by the State Audit Office. (4.1) The State Audit Office has conducted this survey since 2010, originally only involving Public Authorities.
- To introduce an integrity control system into the central public administration (4.2) with the aim of making civil servants more aware of transparency and integrity issues and to ensure the development of an ethics-based organizational culture. The language of this milestone is rather misleading since the activities of the milestone are aimed primarily at mapping integrity/corruption risks rather than effectively monitoring risks.
- To create the institutional system for the protection of whistleblowers. (4.3) This new regulation aimed at strengthening the protection of whistleblowers primarily by introducing a system of electronic reporting. The language of this milestone was targeted at creating a comprehensive whistleblower law and creating a reporting mechanism. But the milestone, as implemented, while succeeded in passing the new whistleblower law, did not set up the necessary institutional framework for either an effective reporting mechanism, or for effective protection of future whistleblowers.
- To determine the rules of keeping contact between state organs and interest representation groups. (4.4). Prior to the adoption of the NAP there was no Lobbying Law in place in Hungary, therefore, this commitment had a significant responsibility in making negotiations between the government and interest representation groups more transparent.
- To ensure the pre-decision analysis of corruption risks of motions to be discussed by the Government and draft ministerial decrees, within the framework of the ex ante impact assessment. (4.5) The aim of this milestone is to make the assessment of the corruption risk of certain regulatory changes a regular practice.
- To prepare Codes of Professional Conduct for government officials and law and order personnel in a form approved by competent public corporations independent from the Government (4.6).

Status

Mid-term: Substantial

4.1 Extended integrity survey (substantial)

While the coverage of the integrity surveys (e.g.: response rate, number of government authorities participating in the survey) has improved to a considerable degree, the coverage among state owned enterprises is limited. We have evaluated the progress of this commitment as 'substantial', because the commitment does not only aim at the involvement of state-owned enterprises in its Integrity Survey as a target, but also at the increased participation of public authorities in the Survey. Approximately 2,000 public institutions have been involved in the 2015 survey.

4.2 Launch of integrity control system (substantial)

The integrity management system was officially introduced to the Hungarian public administration in February 2013.¹ The National University of Public Service was in charge of educating official integrity advisors. The main responsibility of those advisors is to ensure the smooth introduction of the integrity management system and to support the development of a work-ethics-based organizational culture.² The original target indicators were not met at the time of writing the mid-term report. The university launched a postgraduate course in integrity management in 2013. By May 2014, approximately 120 participants graduated as qualified integrity advisors.³

4.3 Whistleblower protections (complete)

For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

4.4 Lobby regulation (complete)

For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

4.5 Corruption risk assessment module (limited)

The Hungarian Government has been working on updating the regulatory impact assessment system since 2010. While the preparation of a "corruption risks assessment sheet" had already been started ahead of the launch of the 2013 AP, based on the IRM researcher's interview with the government representative, finalization of the corruption risk assessment module was in progress during the preparation of the mid-term report. Since the aim of this milestone—to make the assessment of the corruption risk of certain regulatory changes a regular practice—was not met by the end of the implementation period in June 2014, the IRM researcher evaluated this milestone as having limited completion.

4.6 Codes of ethics for government officials and law and order personnel (complete)

For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

End of term: Substantial

Based on government self assessment report and media monitoring, the implementation of the unfinished milestones (4.1, 4.2 and 4.5) has not progressed since the time of writing the mid-term report. In case of milestone 4.1, the responses to the Integrity Survey 2015 have not yet been processed and therefore, the breakdown of respondents by type-of institution is not yet available by the time of writing the end of term report. In case of milestone 4.4, monitoring information on the operation of integrity frameworks in public authorities is still not available. As for milestone 4.5, the publication of a "corruption risks assessment sheet" was completed but the findings from the assessment were not promoted nor were changes put into practice. Since the original, explicit government goal was to change the *practice* in this field, the IRM researcher found that this milestone had limited completion.

Did it open government?

The mandate to extend the integrity survey had the potential for some real potential impact, however in practice it was mostly awareness raising. The integrity control system could have a major impact on opening government if there is independence of budget and control over personnel decisions. As for the protection of whistleblowers, the language of the law does not contain provisions for a sufficient degree of protection of whistleblowers (the anonymity or the sufficient financial/judicial support of whistleblowers is not ensured) nor is there a process for implementing the protections. The Law also does not establish the institutional background of whistleblowing cases.⁴ Similarly, the lobby regulation milestone has no technical reporting standards so while it is complete in letter, it does not have any impact on opening government. The corruption risk assessment module is not ready for public use (the final version of the module is under preparation) and therefore did not contribute to a more open government. As written, the code of ethics is too vague to be enforceable and is not justiciable and therefore only has a minor impact on opening government.

Carried forward?

Yes, the unfinished milestones are carried forward in part to Hungary's second National OGP Action Plan.

4.1 Extended integrity survey (Yes, but with changes)

The National Anti-Corruption Programme for 2015-2018⁵ includes this commitment. It suggests that the State Audit Office has to extend the scope of the participating organisations to the State Owned Enterprises by developing a survey targeted at SOEs. Furthermore, the new program states that a pilot survey tailored for state owned enterprises has to be conducted in the second semester of 2015 and the survey will be conducted annually at least for three years starting 2016.

4.2 Launch of the integrity control system (Not carried forward)

There is no indication that the Government in the framework of the next action plan would carry on with this action. However, the level of completion was substantial and the key stakeholder (National University of Public Service) still runs the postgraduate course in integrity management (after launch in 2013) that is key to sustainability and later policy impact.

4.4 Lobbying law (Completed, but carried forward)

Though the Lobbying law has been adopted, the government intends to contribute to the enforcement of the lobby regulation through the publishing of clear guidelines on keeping contact with interest representative organisations (*commitment 5 of the Second AP*).⁶ This commitment is especially welcome, since it is in line with the IRM researcher's suggestions in the mid-term report. Though the wording of the new commitment does not reveal specific details about the implementation of this commitment, it has high relevance to the OGP values. Successful enforcement of the lobby regulation could significantly reduce corruption in the public sector and greatly impact the successful completion of the milestones left incomplete at the end of term.

4.5 Corruption risk assessment module (Not carried forward)

The implementation of the *corruption risk assessment module* (milestone 4.5) has not been carried forward into the next AP.

With respect to the incomplete milestones, the IRM researcher suggests taking the following steps:

- Extended integrity survey (milestone 4.1): Increase the participation of state-owned enterprises that opt out of the SAO's integrity survey by introducing positive incentives (e.g. national award to leading firms in terms of public disclosure practices, reference use of transparency rankings of state-owned enterprises published by the HU Chapter of Transparency International) and/or sanctions in cases of noncompliance.
- Launch of integrity control system (milestone 4.2): Continue the education of integrity advisors and make sure that individuals appointed for this position are independent from the institution at hand.
- Lobbying law (milestone 4.4): Improvement of the quality and the effectiveness of the legal framework on lobbying is essential. The regulation should be more detailed and should involve positive incentives on publication and monitoring (i.e., enhancing the enforcement of the legal obligations of reporting lobby events). The establishment of an accurate database for lobbying events would also be very useful.
- Corruption risk assessment module (milestone 4.5): Ensuring that corruption risk assessments actually are attached to preliminary impact assessments, revisiting the commitment if fulfilment is not possible, and enforce the publication of the results of the assessments are necessary steps to complete this milestone.

1 "50/2013. (II. 25.) Az Államigazgatási Szervek Integritásirányítási Rendszeréről És Az Érdekérvényesítők Fogadásának Rendjéről Korm.rendelet [Government Decree No. 50/2013. (II. 25.) on the Integrity Management System of Organs of Public Administration and on the Procedural Rules Applicable to Dealing with Lobbyists]," 2013, [Hungarian] <http://.2it.ly/15B6yvU>

2 "Integrity Officer Postgraduate Program," Hungarian Corruption Prevention Program, [Hungarian] <http://.2it.ly/1tecyFE>

3 "A Kormány Korrupcióellenes Intézkedései [Hungary's Measures in the Field of Corruption Prevention]," Hungarian Corruption Prevention Program, <http://.2it.ly/1uOjTwT>

4 IRM Mid-Term Report, Hungary, <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/HU%20IRM%20Progress%20Report%202015%20EN%20for%20public%20comment.pdf>

5 A Kormány 1336/2015. (V. 27.) Korm. Határozata a Nemzeti Korrupcióellenes Program és az azzal összefüggő intézkedések 2015–2016. évre vonatkozó terve elfogadásáról [Government decree on the adoption of the National Corruption Prevention Program and the related measures for the year 2015-2016]. <http://www.kozlonyok.hu/nkonline/MKPDF/hiteles/MK15072.pdf>

6.../2015.(...) Korm.határozata Magyarországnak a Nyílt Kormányzati Együttműködés kezdeményezés keretében a 2015-2017. évekre tett vállalásairól szóló második akciótervéről [.../2015(...) Governmental Decree on the Second OGP Action Plan of Hungary for years 2015-2017.]

5. Anti-corruption and integrity dissemination

Commitment Text:

Hungary undertakes

- to provide training for public officials in the topics of integrity, anti-corruption and ethics
- to provide, within the training system of state organs, training elements for public administration, local government and judicial sector workers on the freedom of information which also give clear guideline for the independent, proactive disclosure of data of public interest
- to launch a credible, transparent, cost-efficient awareness raising campaign which builds on the involvement of citizens and NGOs and provides information differentiated by target groups, in order to increase the knowledge and consciousness of members of society about corruption phenomena as well as the attitudes and counter-measures that may be applied against them
- to ensure that the values and knowledge relating to corruption phenomena as well as the attitudes and counter-measures that may be applied against them are incorporated in school education, including the revision of course books in this topic and amplifying them with anti-corruption information

Responsible institution: Ministry of Public Administration and Justice

Supporting institution(s): National University of Public Service

Start date: 25 February 2013.....

End date: 30 June 2014

Relevance: Clear

Specificity: Low

Potential Impact: Minor

Commitment Overview	End of term completion				Did it open government?				
	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	Worsens	None	Minor	Major	Transformative
5. Overall			✓			✓			
5.1. Trainings for public officials				✓		✓			
5.2. Freedom of Information training		✓				✓			
5.3. Awareness-raising campaigns				✓		✓			
5.4. Revision of the National Curriculum				✓		✓			

Policy Aim

The overall policy aim of this commitment is to raise public awareness and disseminate information on public integrity and government anticorruption measures.

More specifically, the commitment sets out:

- The National University of Public Service was appointed to hold integrity trainings for public officials (milestone 5.1.). The aim of this milestone was to raise the awareness of public officials on matters of integrity, transparency and anticorruption measures.
- The National University of Public Service was appointed to hold Freedom of Information trainings (milestone 5.2) for public officials with the aim of providing practical guidance on FOI matters to civil servants.
- The government committed to launching an awareness-raising campaign (milestone 5.3), which builds on the involvement of citizens and NGOs in order to increase the knowledge

and consciousness of the society about the corruption phenomenon and about related questions.

- The government committed to revising the National Curriculum (milestone 5.4) through broadening the scope of ethics classes with elements on the corruption phenomenon.

Status

Mid-term: Limited

This commitment had very mixed progress in implementation: While two milestones (*Trainings for public officials – milestone 5.1* and *Revision of course books – milestone 5.4*) have been implemented, some others were still in progress (*Freedom of information training - milestone 5.2* and *Awareness-raising campaign – milestone 5.3*).

5.1 Trainings for public officials (complete)

For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

5.2 Freedom of Information Training (limited)

Based on an interview with a Government official, the draft curriculum on the freedom of information trainings was still in progress at the time of writing the mid-term report.

5.3 Awareness-raising Campaign (limited)

According to official government sources, work plans of this measure were under revision at the time of writing the mid-term report.

5.4 Revision of course books (complete)

For more information, please see the 2013-2014 mid-term IRM report.

End of term: Substantial

The IRM researcher was unable to find evidence that the implementation of the milestone 5.2 has progressed since the time of writing the mid-term report.

The government has, however, completed the awareness raising campaign (milestone 5.3) by the time of writing the End-term Report. The campaign targeted law enforcement authorities and students in police academies with a series of lectures on corruption prevention. The National Protection Service (NPS) was participating at various festivals in Hungary with stands and awareness raising activities targeting the younger generation. In August 2015 the NPS launched a communication campaign, which involved television and radio spots, online banners and advertisements in the printed media with corruption-prevention content.¹ Due to lack of data on the costs of the campaign, it is difficult to assess its cost-effectiveness. As opposed to the original plans, the government has not involved civil society organisations in the planning and implementation of the campaign and it cannot be described as a target-group specific, differentiated campaign. We have evaluated the final level of execution of the milestone as 'complete' and modified the overall completion level to substantial.

Following an open consultation conducted by the government in January 2015, the awareness-raising campaign has become one of the top priorities of the government in the next action plan cycle.

Did it open government?

Some revisions were made to the national curriculum including basic definitions of civic duty in textbooks but overall the focus of the commitment was entirely public facing with limited connection to the opening of government agencies. Therefore the IRM researcher found that this commitment has had only little indirect impact on opening government.

Carried forward?

Based on the second Hungarian action plan, the government intends to undertake the following actions in relation to the unfinished milestones:

5.2. Freedom of information training (Yes, but with changes)

Commitment 6 of the new AP sets out to develop an e-learning training on freedom of information for civil servants in public authorities and at the local level. It shall provide clear guidance on legal and practical issues. The deadline is June 2016.

5.3 Awareness-raising Campaign (Yes, but with changes)

Commitment 7 of the new AP sets out to organize awareness-raising trainings on corruption-prevention for local municipalities and for the wider public in the 2015-2016 period.

The commitments of the second AP are highly relevant to the OGP values, but they lack specific details and milestones. Therefore, the potential impact of these commitments is vague.

Based on the recommendations of CSOs and experts, the IRM researcher suggests extending the scope of integrity trainings to managers and employees of state-owned enterprises and to specify the aims and the target groups of the planned awareness-raising trainings more precisely (expected impacts, quantified indicators).

¹ Corruption-prevention, governmental website, August 19, 2015.

<http://korrupciomegelozes.kormany.hu/tisztessagesen-veled-zarokonferenciajához-erkezett-a-korrupciomegelozesi-kiemelt-projekt>

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Commitments are clustered based on the original OGP action plan. This report is based on a desk review of governmental programmes, draft laws and regulations, governmental decrees, review of the government self-assessment report, analysis of the commitments, as well as on monitoring the process of elaboration of the 2nd Action Plan. The IRM researcher also relied upon written consultation with the National Protection Service and reports from the Hungarian media to evaluate completion of the Action Plan.

[Petra Edina Reszkető](#) is co-director and senior researcher at the Budapest Institute. Her main fields of interest are development of business environment (better regulation), measuring government efficiency and transparency. She has a strong background in related quantitative and qualitative methodologies. During elaboration of this report [Anna Orosz](#), junior colleague of the Budapest Institute provided excellent support.

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.



BUDAPEST
INSTITUTE

