

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): Denmark's Implementation Report 2017–2019

Mikkel Otto Hansen, Nordic Consulting Group, Denmark

Table of Contents

Executive Summary: Denmark	2
I. Introduction	4
II. Action Plan Implementation	5
1. More Open Data for Citizens and Media	6
2. Basic data registers will be made available on a shared public distribution platform	8
3. Information portals for day-care facilities	10
4. Better use of open data and Smart City forum	12
5. Open Data DK	14
6. Overview of own cases and services	16
7. Nationwide deployment of telemedicine	18
8. MyLog	20
9. National Strategy for a Stronger Civic Society	22
10. Report a rule	24
11. Open Government Partnership-network meetings/OGP network meetings	26
12. Anti-corruption and transparency in Denmark's country programme for Uganda	27
13. The 18 th International Anti-Corruption Conference	29
14. IATI (International Aid Transparency Initiative)	30
III. Multi-stakeholder Process	32
VI. Methodology and Sources	34
Annex I. Overview of Denmark's performance throughout action plan implementation	35
Annex II. IRM Indicators	37



Executive Summary: Denmark

Denmark’s third action plan focused on increasing open data, improving transparency in the public sector, and promoting open government globally. Notably, the action plan resulted in the creation of a new portal with data on day-care facilities (Commitment 3) as well as strengthening the volunteer sector in Denmark (Commitment 9). However, while most commitments were either fully or substantially completed, their influence on opening government was generally marginal.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Denmark joined OGP in 2011. Since, Denmark has implemented three action plans. This report evaluates the implementation of Denmark’s third action plan.

General overview of action plan

Denmark fully completed half of the commitments from its third action plan, and remaining milestones have been initiated to various degrees. As lead agencies tend to be public institutions charged with digitization and technical solutions, the role of civil society was limited during implementation.

Most commitments in Denmark’s third action plan saw marginal results, due to their generally modest levels of ambition. However, Commitment 9 provided sustainable mechanisms for civic participation while strengthening the infrastructure of volunteerism throughout Denmark.

Table 1. At a glance
 Participating since: 2011
 Action plan under review: Third
 Report type: Implementation
 Number of commitments: 14

Action plan development
 Is there a Multistakeholder forum: Yes
 Level of public influence: Involve
 Acted contrary to OGP process: No

Action plan design

Commitments relevant to OGP values	12 (86%)
Transformative commitments	0
Potentially starred:	0

Action plan implementation
 Starred commitments: 0
 Completed commitments: 7 (50%)
 Commitments with Major DIOG*: 0
 Commitments with Outstanding DIOG*: 0
 Level of public influence: Consult
 Acted contrary to OGP process: No

*DIOG: Did it Open Government?



Table 2. Noteworthy commitments

Commitment description	Status at the end of implementation cycle.
<p>1. More open data</p> <p>Publish datasets of historical significance in dialogue with stakeholders, and provide video instructions on the use of this data.</p>	<p>The implementation was limited due to the legal constraints of the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). A more pragmatic approach to dissemination of historical data with a focus on usability is planned for 2020.</p>
<p>3. Information portals for day-care facilities</p> <p>Develop a common platform to collect data from municipal and day-care institutions across the country. Present the data in publicly available and easily accessible portals.</p>	<p>The Ministry of Children and Education created a portal that provides parents with a user-friendly overview of day-care facilities, as well as the ability to compare facilities. However, the available data is limited and there is no consensus among stakeholders that the portal will serve its intended purpose.</p>
<p>9. National strategy for a stronger civil society</p> <p>Implement the national civil society strategy to improve collaboration between the public sector and civil society, particularly in local communities.</p>	<p>Implementation of the national strategy has so far led to improvement on more locally anchored volunteerism in Denmark through a gradual restructuring of the sector. The process facilitated dialogue and collaboration between local communities and national authorities.</p>

Five Key IRM Recommendations

The IRM key recommendations are prepared in the IRM Design Report. They aim to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. In Denmark's 2017–2019 Design Report, the IRM recommended the following:

- | |
|--|
| 1. Expand participation in the multi-stakeholder forum. |
| 2. Introduce whistleblower protection measures in the next action plan. |
| 3. Address the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation. |
| 4. Take measures to improve beneficial ownership transparency. |
| 5. Focus on further strengthening foreign aid transparency. |

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mikkel Otto Hansen is a consultant and researcher at Nordic Consulting Group, Denmark (NCG), specializing in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of interventions related to governance, transparency, and civil society support in Denmark and abroad.

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 (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.



I. Introduction

The Open Government Partnership is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. Action plan commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their own progress and determine if actions have made an impact on people's lives.

The Independent Reporting Mechanism of OGP has partnered with Mikkel Otto Hansen and Nordic Consulting Group, who carried out this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of the IRM's methodology please visit <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism>.

This report covers the implementation of Denmark's third action plan for 2017–2019.

As discussed in the IRM 2017–19 Design Report, Denmark continues to rank among the most open and least corrupt countries in the world. However, recent corruption scandals in both the public and private sectors have dominated the media, and may affect public trust in the government moving forward. During implementation of Denmark's third action plan, a new government was elected in the summer of 2019. While this has not severely affected commitments, it has caused some delays in relation to OGP procedures.

Denmark's third action plan focused on four key themes: 1) more and better open data, 2) tailored data to ensure a basis for citizen participation, 3) working together for a better public sector, and 4) a global effort for openness.

II. Action Plan Implementation

The IRM Implementation Report assesses “Completion” and “Did it Open Government?”. These two indicators are based on each of the commitment’s implementation progress at the end of the action plan cycle. This report does not re-visit assessments for “Verifiability”, “Relevance” or “Potential Impact”. The former are indicators assessed in IRM Design Reports. For more details on each of the indicators, please see Annex II in this report.

2.1 Overview

Similar to previous action plans, Denmark’s third plan saw high levels of completion. Seven commitments have been fully completed, while three others were substantially completed. The remaining commitments have been initiated to various degrees. In some cases, delay in implementation was caused by the legal and technical challenges ingrained in digitization efforts and solutions that require standardized data systems to be more sustainable. In other case, commitments were contingent upon broader policy reforms or national strategies.

The action plan had a strong focus on open data and improving the transparency and public administrations. Several commitments saw improvements in the area of open data, such as the creation of a day-care facilities portal (Commitment 3) and improving the Open Data DK platform for regional and municipal data (Commitment 5). Most commitments in this area saw marginal improvements to access to information due to their emphasis on administrative efficiency and data management. Some commitments represented one-time initiatives, such as the “report a rule” campaign (Commitment 10), the creation of a multi-stakeholder forum for OGP (Commitment 11), and hosting the annual International Anti-Corruption Conference (Commitment 13). The implementation of Commitment 9 has helped to strengthen the infrastructure for volunteerism and local-level civic participation in the country.

2.2. Commitments

Theme I: More and better open data

I. More Open Data for Citizens and Media

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“The Danish National Archives will, in dialogue with OGP stakeholders (potential users and competent persons) select 10 data sets (archive versions) within certain social themes (labour market, environment, traffic, energy supply, health, etc.) This data will be made searchable and ready for download, by means of a publicly available data catalogue.

On its website www.sa.dk, the Danish National Archives will present itself as a contributor to the national OGP initiative and create an “inspiration page” to support the active use of open public data by citizens and media within the selected themes. The Danish National Archives will also be offering instruction to users in relation to the specific use of data. The Danish National Archives will mark the launch of the data and inspiration page with a short video that will present the OGP objective and will demonstrate open data in active use, based on accessible data and the inspiration site.”

Milestones:

- I.1 Selection of ten data sets in dialogue with stakeholders
- I.2 Clarification of needs in relation to IT support for searches and accessibility in a freely available data catalogue
- I.3 Publication of data in a freely available data catalogue
- I.4 Presentation of OGP initiative on the Danish National Archives website, including setting up a page as inspiration for the use of data
- I.5 Production of presentation video of the Danish National Archives OGP initiative

Start Date: 1 August 2017

End Date: 1 June 2019

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, p. 8, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Relevant: Access to information• Potential impact: Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Limited• Did it Open Government? Did Not Change

This commitment aimed to improve citizens’ and the media’s access to a specific collection of documents and data of historical significance.¹ The goal was for increased access to historical data to contribute to public debate on relevant issues.

The 10 datasets were designated by the National Archives with inputs from relevant stakeholders, and subsequently expanded to a total of 18. Furthermore, it was decided to align datasets with topics found on the European Data Portal,² including “health” and “traffic.” The milestones related to IT support and the release of raw data were changed to make way for an alternative approach that focused on releasing summarized data instead of raw data.

Over the course of implementation, it became evident that the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) constituted a significant administrative challenge in terms of releasing personal data. Consequently, no data catalogue is available on the webpage of the National Archives, nor has the accompanying instructive video on data searches been fully finalized. To overcome these challenges, the National Archives opted for a more pragmatic approach to data publication by means of historical and summarized data that relate to the initial selection of datasets—e.g., on transport and health. These studies will be presented on the National Archives webpage with a focus on communicating their use and purpose for end-users instead of releasing data in a raw format.³ At the time of writing this report, this work is in-progress and the presentation of the above-mentioned studies in an accessible web format is currently being finalized.

As the implementation of the commitment has been halted due to the regulatory constraints of GDPR, the commitment has not led to any changes in access to information by the end of the action plan period. However, the focus of communicating the purpose of selected historical studies as an alternative solution could to enhance discoverability and usability and make data relevant for a broader audience.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² For a full overview of these topics see: “Home”, European Data Portal, <https://www.europeandataportal.eu/en/homepage>.

³ Anne Sofie Fink Kjeldgaard (National Archives), interview by IRM researcher, 7 November 2019.

2. Basic data registers will be made available on a shared public distribution platform

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“With its basic data programme in 2012, a unified public sector took on the task of refining Denmark’s digital raw material. Consistency and quality of basic data about persons, enterprises, geography, addresses and real estate properties have since been improved by standardising data formats, increasing the quality of data and presenting data on one common platform. In 2017 and 2018, a large amount of this basic data will be available on the new data distribution platform, which is called “Datafordeleren”.”

Milestones:

- 2.1 Real estate basic data on the Data Distributor
- 2.2 Basic data about persons on the Data Distributor
- 2.3 Basic enterprise data on the Data Distributor
- 2.4 Address basic data on the Data Distributor
- 2.5 Geo ground data on the Data Distributor

Start Date: Third quarter 2017

End Date: Second quarter 2018

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 9–10, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Access to information • Potential impact: Minor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment aimed to enable authorities to register data in one place and to improve and manage inter-agency data. Thus, the data would be standardized and available in different combinations. Furthermore, the commitment aimed to make it easier for citizens and businesses to access information.¹

The distribution platform (“Datafordeleren”) is now fully operational, as reported to the finance committee responsible for overseeing implementation.² The distribution platform can be found online and contain the datasets mentioned in the commitment’s milestones.³

The implementation of basic data on the distribution platform was a complex process involving a wide range of state and private institutions. Everyone can now access data within the overall rules of data protection, but users are responsible for the legal implications once it has been retrieved. According to the Danish Agency for Digitisation, the main users of the platform are primarily larger public institutions who benefit from the standardized data for improving social services, as well as private users like the banking sector. In the long term, the intention is to focus on user-friendliness of the portal to make it relevant for other types of users, including citizens.⁴

The commitment has contributed to improving the transparency and quality of already existing public data in an open and centralized format. Every Danish citizen or institution can now freely access, download, and combine data from a single location, in contrast to the previously dispersed and incompatible information available. However, the basic administrative character of data on the

portal (addresses, properties, businesses, etc.) makes it more relevant for institutional efficiency than citizen engagement.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² See: “Document no. 16”, Folketinget, available [in Danish] at https://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20191/aktstykke/Aktstk16/20191_aktstk16_anmeldt.pdf.

³ For an overview of the centralized data see: “Data overview”, Datafordeler.dk, available [in Danish] at <https://datafordeler.dk/dataoversigt/>.

⁴ Per Gade (Danish Agency for Digitisation), Interview by IRM Researcher, 22 November 2019.

3. Information portals for day-care facilities

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“One unified platform will be developed in the form of an information portal that collects data from local governments and day-care facilities across the country and presents this data publicly and easily accessible, i.e. in so-called dashboards, so that parents can make an informed decision based on the factors that matter the most to their family.

The development of the information portal will be done in several stages:

A feasibility study will be carried out in autumn 2017 to identify the information about day-care facilities that are most in demand, and whether they can be integrated into the portal. The results of the pre-analysis will be available in October 2017.

Once the results of the feasibility study are available and a decision has been made as to which types of information the portal is to show, the technical development of the portal will commence. This development is expected to run from the end of 2017 up to and including the first six months of 2018.

The intent is to launch the information portal before the end of the 3rd quarter of 2018 with selected key figures for information broken down at municipal level.

Continuous efforts will be undertaken to make the information available at institution level as well and, where possible, at unit level. However, in order to succeed, existing data from various registers will need to be compiled accurately. It is expected that an institutional register can be established during 2019.”

Milestones:

- 3.1 Preliminary analysis
- 3.2 Technical development of the portal
- 3.3 Launch of the daytime childcare portal
- 3.4 Establishment of the new daytime childcare register

Start Date: July 2017

End Date: 2019

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 11–12, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Access to information • Potential impact: Moderate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment aimed to develop a common platform to collect data from municipalities and day-care institutions across the country. This data would then be presented on publicly available and easily accessible portals (dashboards). This data would provide parents in Denmark with better information in order to help them to better choose daycares.¹

The Ministry of Children and Education Education has developed the data portal for day-care facilities, and it is now online.² During the preparatory phase, stakeholders were able to provide inputs and comments with regards to the selection of data sets and information to be published on the dashboards. The data portal can be accessed under a subsite of the Ministry of Children and Education’s webpage, and is visualized as an interactive dashboard that provides basic information at the level of individual institutions. Finally, a daytime childcare register has been established to facilitate standardization of day-care data from municipalities (Milestone 3.4).

Individual day-care facilities can now publish basic information via the portal which is limited to basic information such as lunch schemes, age groups, and pedagogical profile.³ Data on numbers of educated pedagogues and average norms are also available but only at the municipal level. Additional information will be added once the new daytime childcare registry has been implemented in municipalities, which is scheduled for 2022.⁴ However, it is unclear what type of data will be included.

The data portal approach to day-care facilities does not have universal support from all stakeholders within the educational sector. For example, an interviewed representative of the Danish Union of Early Childhood and Youth Educators (BUPL) stated that the newly established portal may be in conflict with the values of the recently adopted Danish Child Care Act. A further argument is that the data itself is unlikely to promote quality in the sector, as it cannot effectively capture the complexities within pedagogical environments. Hence, the data portal may not be the most effective approach to empower parents’ choices.⁵

The commitment constituted an innovative approach to improving parents’ overview of childcare options through an easily accessible information portal. As it stands, the portal provides a single overview of local data that was limited and difficult to retrieve prior to the action plan. While the portal now provides parents with a user-friendly tool to obtain an overview of day-care facilities and compare them, the data currently available is limited, and there is no consensus among stakeholders that the portal will serve its intended purpose.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² “Institutions near you”, Ministry of Children and Education Education Statistics, accessed 20 October 2019, available [in Danish] at https://uddannelsesstatistik.dk/Pages/dagtilbud_institutioner.aspx.

³ The IRM researcher cannot ascertain whether this includes each facility in the country.

⁴ “End-of-term report on Denmark’s OGP Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, forthcoming.

⁵ Rikke Wettendorff (the Danish Union of Early Childhood and Youth Educators (BUPL), interview by IRM researcher, 31 October 2019.

4. Better use of open data and Smart City forum

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“The commitment involves implementation of various initiatives divided into several projects to support local governments’ work with open data and to increase use of open data:

- Assistance to local governments
- Support publication and standardised displaying of data
- Increase transparency and opportunities for businesses and citizens to use data
- Knowledge sharing of new, data-driven solutions”

Milestones:

4.1 Completion and implementation phase

Start Date: April–May 2017

End Date: 2020

Editorial note: The commitment text above has been shortened for the purposes of this report. For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 12–13, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: No • Relevant: Access to information • Potential impact: Minor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Did it Open Government? Marginal

Denmark’s Smart City initiative covers a range of projects intended to support municipalities’ work with open data. This includes improving data presentation and transparency, the public’s ability to use data, and knowledge sharing. Activities under this commitment included introductory events to explain to citizens how to use Smart City, the finalization of a Smart City map of Denmark, best practice guidelines, workshops about relevant themes, and collaboration with schools and universities.¹

While this commitment’s planned activities were vague in the action plan, their implementation is tied to Denmark’s broader Digitization strategy running from 2016–2020.² Most projects and activities mentioned in the commitment’s narrative have been carried out, while others are ongoing in accordance with the strategy.

During implementation, Local Government Denmark (KL) brought together key stakeholders from several Danish municipalities in the Smart City Forum to exchange best practice and foster knowledge sharing. Since its establishment in 2017, the Smart City Forum has been well-received by local authorities³ and appreciated as a platform with which enterprises, local authorities, and citizens can share ideas on the use of local data. However, during implementation, it became clear that Smart City solutions will need standardized data to become more valuable across locations and sectors.⁴ Hence, in 2019, emphasis was put on finding common solutions to be implemented across all municipals in Denmark based on four Smart City themes: easy parking, ‘Smart Mobility,’ traffic in roundabouts and junctions, and street lighting.⁵

The commitment has directly contributed to improving access to and use of local data through ongoing events and knowledge-sharing activities, primarily with local authorities. Despite creating opportunities for citizens to become involved, the main results of the commitment relate to strengthened inter-municipal co-operation in the area of “smart cities.”

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² “A Stronger and More Secure Digital Denmark – Digital Strategy 2016-2020”, Agency for Digitisation, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/digital-strategy/>. Smart city forum is the municipal and Initiative 5.2: “Smart City partnership”.

³ “Bjerregaard: Smart cities er ikke kun et anliggende for kommunalpolitikere men også for folketinget”, Altinget, 7 December 2018, available [in Danish] at <https://www.altinget.dk/forsyning/artikel/borgmester-staten-skal-paa-banen-behov-for-faelles-standarder-for-smart-cities>.

⁴ “Bjerregaard: Smart cities er ikke kun et anliggende for kommunalpolitikere men også for folketinget”, Altinget, 7 December 2018, available at: <https://www.altinget.dk/forsyning/artikel/borgmester-staten-skal-paa-banen-behov-for-faelles-standarder-for-smart-cities>.

⁵ “End-of-term report on Denmark’s OGP Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, forthcoming.

5. Open Data DK

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“Open Data DK helps local governments and regional governments get started working with open data. It is a new area in many local governments and regional governments, so it may be difficult to get the process started. Open Data DK provides a framework for knowledge sharing about open data between public authorities – and businesses.

The purpose is to create transparency in the public administration and provide a basis for data - driven growth by making data freely available for public authorities, private businesses and civil society in general. Municipal and regional data is made open and freely available on a shared data platform (open source) so that it can be easily accessed and used as raw material in the development of applications and services, or serve as the foundation for analyses, trend assessments, research, etc. Open data can create increased transparency in the public administration so that citizens and businesses can become even more active coplayers in their local democracy.

In autumn 2017 and in 2018, a number of initiatives will be put in place to promote publication and use of public data. The initiatives include:

- Information meetings for local governments and regional governments, which deal specifically with releasing the data which the local governments/regional governments possess: How to get started? What potential does public data hold?
- Individual introduction meetings for local governments and regional governments
- Updating and development of existing guidelines
- Inspiration and dialogue meetings with businesses
- Development of the open data platform, which serves to make it easier to release and use data, e.g. with focus on standardisation of data
- Collaboration with educational institutions

Open Data DK is organised with a board and a number of working teams that promote sharing among its members. It also focuses on regional/local needs, which means that Open Data DK’s finances are organised so that funds are earmarked for regional initiatives. This makes it possible to have an overall regional focus on tourism data in all of North Jutland and mobility data in all of East Jutland. Currently participating in the commitment are: 31 local governments, 3 regional governments and partners such as the Danish Business Authority, Local Government Denmark, GeoFyn and GeoSjælland. Besides the participation of public authorities, considerable focus is aimed at including businesses and citizens, e.g. in the form of dialogue meetings, hackathons, data drinks¹ and collaboration with educational institutions.”

Milestones:

- 5.1 60 local governments have joined Open Data DK
- 5.2 Four regional governments have joined Open Data DK
- 5.3 Seven dialogue meetings have been held
- 5.4 Study related to mapping tool (standardisation) has been initiated

Start Date: 2016

End Date: Unspecified

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 14–16, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Access to information, Civic participation • Potential impact: Minor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment sought to improve transparency in public administration and data-driven growth by providing free municipal and regional data on a shared open-source data platform (Open Data DK). The aim was for data to then be used by civil society, private businesses, and public authorities for applications, services, analyses, and research.

By the end of 2019, Open Data DK includes 40 municipalities, two regions, and a number of public institutions, including Local Government Denmark (KL) and the Danish Business Authority. However, these numbers are less than were originally envisioned in the action plan (60 municipalities and four regional governments), so the commitment is considered to be substantially—but not fully—complete. Eight dialogue meetings have been conducted with municipals and enterprises and single events (hackathons and “data drinks”) have been held and overseen by Open Data DK in accordance with the commitments’ milestones. Remaining activities concern ongoing dialogues with enterprises and regions as part of the Danish Digitization Strategy (2016–2020). The final milestone concerns technical consolidation of the data platform, which is still in progress as of the end of 2019.²

The strategies to raise awareness of open data through multi-stakeholder activities have emphasized both the need for and potential of sharing locally-available information. The activities (dialogue meetings with enterprises, hackathons, etc.) conducted by Open Data DK have been especially valuable in facilitating collaboration with data users and municipal representatives. Open Data DK and KL have documented examples of projects that have emerged from the commitment (e.g., hackathons), including data visualization tools and maps, traffic applications, and a general overview of municipal services.³

According to Open Data DK, the main challenges that have occurred during implementation primarily concern the need for more dialogue between enterprises and municipalities. Another concern is the lack of resources in smaller municipalities to cope with the open data agenda,⁴ which explains the limitations in Open Data DK membership (Milestones 5.1 and 5.2).

Overall, the commitment has had a positive contribution towards data use at the local level resulting from closer dialogue between municipalities, regions, enterprises, and citizens. This ultimately increases the accessibility of information, as these projects present local data through open-source applications. However, given the focus on municipalities’ capacities to utilize open data and the nature of projects (infrastructure, energy, and geography), the commitment has had a marginal impact on improving access to information.

¹ A “data drink” refers to an event during which coders, programmers, public employees, designers, academics, entrepreneurs, and students meet over a drink to discuss cases and scenarios regarding open data. See, for example, “Aarhus Data Drinks”, Alexandra Institutet, <https://alexandra.dk/dk/aktuelt/arrangementer/2013/aarhus-data-drinks-2>.

² “End-of-term report on Denmark’s OGP Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, forthcoming.

³ “Små åbne data succeser – Konkrete eksempler på anvendelser af åbne data”, KL & Open Data DK, available at [in Danish] at <http://reader.livedition.dk/aarhuskommune/874/html5/>.

⁴ Birgitte Kjærgaard (Open Data DK), interview with IRM researcher, 14 November 2019.

6. Overview of own cases and services

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“A joint-public reference architecture will be developed for the case and benefits overview. Use of the joint public architecture will create coherence in data display across Danish authorities so that citizens can, for example, get an overall overview of cases and benefits managed by various authorities. This will allow the authorities to develop overview solutions individually and jointly. The national portals, borger.dk and VIRK are required to display the data that authorities wish to display via the overview.

From 2017, a joint-public reference architecture will be developed for authorities to use. In 2018 and until 2020, authorities will use pilots to develop the overview and display relevant data to citizens and businesses.”

Milestones:

- 6.1 Analysis of users’ needs
- 6.2 Development of reference architecture
- 6.3 Implementation of pilots in collaboration with the authorities, in order to test architecture and concepts for user interfaces
- 6.4 Implementation of the initiative to be agreed with partners in further detail

Start Date: October 2016

End Date: December 2020

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 17–18, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Relevant: Access to information• Potential impact: Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Complete• Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment aimed to provide citizens with a common public-sector overview of cases and services, in order to allow easier access to information and increased security in dealing with the public sector.¹

The commitment’s technical milestones have been implemented by the Agency for Digitisation (AfD), including all preparatory work to the final product in collaboration with stakeholder authorities. Pilots of the concept have been tested and evaluated by Local Government Denmark (KL) in five Danish municipalities by early 2019.² Dates for full implementation of the solution are set for mid-2020 (Milestone 6.4). Full implementation of the solution is not part of the commitment as originally laid out in the action plan.³

The pilot provided participating citizens with a centralized overview of economic and social cases based on municipals’ choosing. The evaluation of the pilot conducted by KL found a high degree of user satisfaction with the overall design of the solution while it contributed to a sense of trust in the administrative procedures of local authorities. Municipal staff generally acknowledged the contribution enhanced insight into public files, but experienced limited inquiries from citizens during the pilot. When asked what could be improved, users requested more detailed insight into personal files as well as log entries stored by municipal staff.⁴

This commitment has laid the foundations for better access to personal data in a centralized and more user-friendly manner than previously possible, and thus contributed to transparency of the

public administration. Despite the positive feedback on the pilot’s design from the evaluation, citizens highlighted the need for better and more detailed insight into active cases. In addition, the commitment did not lead to a tangible mechanism with which to address potential mishandlings of cases. However, it should be noted that the “My Overview” initiative under Commitment 5 in Denmark’s fourth action plan (2019-2021) builds upon the work carried out under this commitment.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² ”Borgernes Adgang til Egne Data – Pilotprojekt for borgerblikket”, Evaluation Report, Kommunernes Landsforening (KL), April 2019, available [in Danish] at <https://www.kl.dk/media/19514/evalueringsrapport-borgernes-adgang-til-egne-data.pdf>.

³ “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, Open Government Partnership, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

⁴ ”Borgernes Adgang til Egne Data – Pilotprojekt for borgerblikket”, Evaluation Report, Kommunernes Landsforening (KL), April 2019, available [in Danish] at <https://www.kl.dk/media/19514/evalueringsrapport-borgernes-adgang-til-egne-data.pdf>.

7. Nationwide deployment of telemedicine

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“The Government has reached an agreement with Local Government Denmark and Danish Regions that telemedicine for pregnant women experiencing complications and patients with COPD will be provided as a treatment option country-wide.”

Milestones:

- 7.1 Telemedical solution for patients with COPD has been purchased and is ready for operation
- 7.2 Telemedicine for patients with COPD is widespread nationwide
- 7.3 Telemedicine for pregnant women with complications has been disseminated to all maternity departments

Start Date: 1 July 2017

End Date: 31 December 2020

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 18–19, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: No• Relevant: Access to information• Potential impact: Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Limited• Did it Open Government? Did not Change

This commitment aimed to offer telemedicine to patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and to pregnant women with complications, for a more citizen-centric treatment. Telemedicine is a method to deliver health services remotely, either as an independent offer or part of a larger package. Danish citizens have increasingly demanded to be involved in their own medical treatment and demand that it be adapted to their needs.¹

The dates of the commitment’s milestones, as described in Denmark’s action plan, were revised due to delays in the government’s mid-term self-assessment.² As a result, the commitment’s main deliverables will now be fully implemented in 2020, beyond the timeframe of the third action plan. Telemedical solutions for pregnant women with complications is in its initial implementation phase in all regions. Therefore, the overall completion is limited.

The decision to invest in one common infrastructure across all Danish regions and municipalities delayed the implementation of telemedicine to patients with COPD. The decision was based on the need for a more sustainable model that is able to incorporate additional patient groups in the future.³ The solution for women with complex pregnancies is on track, and will be implemented in 2020. While nation-wide implementation has not yet materialized during the current action plan period, the positive effects of telemedicine on patients in Denmark have been well-documented,⁴ and independent solutions are in place in certain regions.

As the commitment will not be fully implemented before 2020, the commitment has not led to any tangible changes so far. Rather, the commitment represents a gradual expansion of already existing solutions in the area of telemedicine.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² “Mid-term Self-Assessment Report on Denmark’s OGP Action Plan 2017-2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, Independent Reporting Mechanism.

³ Ea Busch-Petersen (Danish Regions), interview by IRM researcher, 7 November 2019.

⁴ “Afslutningsfolder for det telemedicinske storskalaforseg i Nordjylland”, TeleCare Nord, available [in Danish] at <https://bit.ly/2VWEcbE>.

8. MyLog

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“In the annual budget agreement between the government and the regional governments for 2018 it was agreed that data and information security-work should be of high priority and should be strengthened further to ensure confidentiality (and thereby security) of personal sensitive information and a high level of security in the digital infrastructure. This includes ensuring increased transparency of access to the citizens’ health data.

On that basis it was agreed that the regional governments in the future adjustments of the hospital information systems would be obligated to make sure that it is possible for the citizens to review digital log-information, even when data is processed/accessed through internal systems in hospitals. In addition, it was agreed to analyse how a user-friendly joint public solution could be made accessible for citizens via the webpage Sundhed.dk. One of the purposes of Sundhed.dk is to gather all health-related information in one place, where patients can access information about e.g. health record, health related treatments on hospitals, lab results, vaccinations and prescriptions. In addition to access to own health data, sundhed.dk contains information about health services, hospitals, health-apps, diseases, etc.

Danish Regions is responsible for the analysis, and the analysis itself is expected to be carried out in collaboration with the Danish Health Data Authority. Content, time and the organisation of the analysis will be completed by the end of 2017.”

Milestones:

8.1 Presentation and clarification of analysis

8.2 Execution of analysis

Start Date: September 2017

End Date: November 2018

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 19–21, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: No• Relevant: Access to information• Potential impact: Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Complete• Did it Open Government? Did not change

This commitment aimed to improve and enhance citizens’ overview of their healthcare journals via a shared registry solution called MyLog. This would give citizens increased access to their health files, promoting trust in the overall health system.¹

The commitment’s milestones covered the preparatory work for the eventual implementation that is to be undertaken in 2020. Analysis for the solution was carried out by the Danish Regions in collaboration with the Danish Health Data Authority and the Ministry of Health. The Ministry of Health stipulates, through ministerial orders, the legal framework for the obligation of the regions to render log displays accessible to citizens.²

Given that this commitment did not entail full implementation of the solution, but rather the preparatory work, there are no immediate results or changes in government practice. However, the eventual implementation could enhance transparency of health care institutions as well as citizens’ abilities to address mishandling of their electronical patient records through MyLog.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² Written feedback on mail, the Ministry of Health, 12 June 2020. and “End-of-term report on Denmark’s OGP Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, forthcoming.

9. National Strategy for a Stronger Civic Society

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“The commitment will be implemented based on input from a task force consisting of central players from civil society, local governments, the business community and trade unions. The recommendations of the task force, which were submitted to the Government on 14 September 2017, will form part of the work on the strategy for a stronger civil society. The task force’s mandate contained five tracks:

Track 1: The value of volunteering. This track aims to investigate the social value of volunteering in relation to the public initiatives in one or more projects, e.g. on the basis of a social issue and through partnerships with for example local governments and foundations. In addition, organisational and collaboration models can be developed for collaborate on solving welfare challenges, particularly targeting citizens on the fringe of society.

Track 2: Participation and community. This track will contain specific initiatives to underpin the Government’s objective of making more citizens outside the working community and with no education volunteer.

Track 3: Economy. This track can involve a study of how to ensure a more targeted use of funds in the sector, including removing barriers to the current economic support structure for voluntary social work and support acquiring knowledge and gathering evidence about the effects of volunteering.

Track 4: Infrastructure This track can include initiatives that aim to improve the infrastructure in the voluntary sector, including e.g. supporting volunteering locally and civil society’s representation in relation to national political representation and locally in the local governments.

Track 5: Research and knowledge It is proposed to earmark funds for strengthening the knowledge base about and inside civil society. Focus can be on civil society’s own needs for knowledge about its own initiatives by facilitating evaluation models that are easy to implement or other methods for showing the change brought about by volunteering.”

Milestones:

9.1 Recommendations from the task force have been submitted to the Danish Government

9.2 Civil society strategy published

9.3 Implementation

9.4 First initiative formed

Start Date: 1 July 2017

End Date: 31 December 2021

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 22–23, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Civic participation • Potential impact: Moderate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Substantial • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment sought to address a lack of citizen participation in local communities by implementing a national civil society strategy. In its civil society strategy, the government expected more citizens to volunteer and take responsibility for their communities. Local voluntary social work was also expected to be upgraded through sustainable local volunteering communities.¹

The government published a civil society strategy in 2017, which includes inputs and recommendations from the task force representing a broad segment of Danish civil society.² The implementation of the strategy is led by the Ministry of Children and Education and runs until 2021, hence this commitment's overall completion is considered substantial. The ministry confirms that at least one initiative from the strategy has been implemented according to the commitment's milestones.³

The volunteer community in Denmark is characterized by a high degree of stability due to long-standing traditions and steady support from the state.⁴ As such, the strategy has so far not led to an increase in the number of active volunteers in the country. Rather, the strategy contains a noteworthy focus on improving the infrastructure of volunteerism by relaxing bureaucratic obstacles. It also supports the capacity of volunteer organizations in advocacy and volunteer management. This is seen as a valuable contribution to the capacities of civil society organizations to engage with authorities.⁵ Examples of this component include restructuring the Volunteer Council⁶ to include more local and diverse representation, and providing capacity-building seminars to non-governmental organizations.

The commitment constituted a noticeable step towards more locally-anchored volunteerism in Denmark through a gradual restructuring of the sector. While the IRM researcher cannot assess the impact on Danish civil society, the strategy's focus on restructuring and supporting the volunteer sector has facilitated dialogue and collaboration between local communities and national authorities. However, being a contribution to an already well-functioning and independent civil society the 'Did it Open Government' rating is marginal.

¹ "Denmark Design Report 2017–2019", Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² "Strategi for et stærkere civilsamfund", Ministry of Children and Education, October 2017, available [in Danish] at http://www.stm.dk/multimedia/2017_strategi-for-et-staerkere-civilsamfund-pdf.pdf.

³ "End-of-term report on Denmark's OGP Action Plan 2017-2019", Danish Agency for Digitisation, forthcoming.

⁴ Mette Hjære (Danish Center for Voluntary Effort [CSFA]), interview by IRM researcher, 28 October 2019.

⁵ Nikolaj Beuschel (Ministry of Social Affairs and the Interior), interview by IRM researcher, 20 November 2019.

⁶ The Volunteer Council provides strategic inputs to the government on the volunteer sector on behalf of the Danish civil society.

10. Report a rule

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“The commitment will be carried out as part of a campaign from October 2017 to February 2018 where the websites of the ministries that manage citizen- and business-oriented rules will be equipped with digital mailboxes through which citizens, businesses, trade unions, etc. can submit proposals for debureaucratising of the public sector. The ministries will screen the proposals and assess whether they should lead to amendments of legislation, orders, rules and procedures, etc. Proposals can also form part of the Government’s cohesion reform. The overall objective of this commitment is to ensure the inclusion of citizens, businesses, trade unions, etc. in the Government’s effort to create a more efficient public sector.”

Milestones:

- 10.1 Campaign launch
- 10.2 First follow-up on campaign
- 10.3 Final follow-up on campaign

Start Date: October 2017

End Date: February 2018

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 24–25, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: No• Relevant: Civic participation• Potential impact: Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion: Complete• Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment aimed to include citizens, businesses, trade unions, and others in the government’s effort to create a more efficient public sector.¹ Specifically, the commitment called for establishing online mailboxes for those ministries that manage citizen- and business-oriented rules in order to allow all actors to submit ideas for rules.

The ministries successfully launched the campaign in 2017, after which the previous government received a total of 984 proposals. The then-government decided to move 300 proposals forward, feeding directly into its broader de-bureaucratizing effort.² Accepted proposals were subsequently handled and followed up by the respective ministries. It is unclear which criteria were deployed during selection of reported rules besides feasibility.

The campaign was well-received by the public, and saw the participation of citizens, municipalities, and stakeholder institutions. Proposals that qualified for amendments primarily revolved around simplifying administrative and cumbersome regulations, such as rules for elaborating student schemes and single action plans for vulnerable citizens and families. The campaign provided a direct and easily-accessible channel to raise awareness on bottlenecks within public administration.

While some proposals received from municipalities and citizens were about issues already known to the government, the ‘report a rule’ campaign added additional focus on changing unnecessary government regulations in various areas to the benefit of citizens.³ However, the commitment constituted a one-time, short-term campaign building on existing governmental priorities, and did not lead to a sustainable mechanism with which to address ineffectiveness within public administration.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf

² "Minister klar til at fjerne over 300 regler: Vi har for mange gak-gak regler i det offentlige", DR, 25 August 2018, available [in Danish] at <https://bit.ly/2xY6Scf>.

³ Martin Eskerod Nielsen (Danish Agency for Digitisation), interview by IRM researcher, 14 November 2019.

11. Open Government Partnership-network meetings/OGP network meetings

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“As part of the implementation of the action plan, a forum will be established consisting of stakeholders from civil society and possibly ministries and/or local governments. The forum will be entrusted with the task of contributing regularly with input to Denmark’s participation in OGP at a strategic level as well as in relation to the development and evaluation of the Open Government action plans.”

Milestones:

- 11.1 Identification of potential members
- 11.2 Dialogue with potential members
- 11.3 Establishment of forum
- 11.4 Start-up meeting

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, p. 25, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Civic participation • Potential impact: Minor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment planned to create a formal multi-stakeholder forum to serve as a platform for the government and civil society to discuss Denmark’s involvement in OGP. This commitment followed a previous IRM recommendation to open up OGP forums for all interested members.¹

The commitment’s milestones have been carried out. The Agency of Digitisation (AFD) organized the forum (the OGP Network Meeting), which met for the first time on 22 August 2018 in Copenhagen.² The forum remains situated within the AFD, but all who are interested can participate and provide inputs.

The OGP process in Denmark primarily focuses on digitization of the public administration. In contrast, civil society organizations in Denmark tend to be more directly engaged in high-policy issues such as anti-corruption. According to minutes from the latest forum held in September 2019, only two stakeholders participated: the AFD (from government) and Open Knowledge Denmark (from civil society).³ By contrast, in 2018, the forum saw the participation of Transparency International Denmark, Open Knowledge Denmark, the National Archives, the Ministry of Children and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the AFD.

Formalizing the OGP forum as an open and regular event has not yet increased participation from civil society. However, it has created an opportunity to bring on board additional stakeholders that may be central to promoting OGP in Denmark looking ahead. It should be noted that by introducing the multi-stakeholder forum for the first time in the current cycle, Denmark now meets all mandatory requirements for the OGP process.⁴

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

³ For a resumé of the meeting, see Denmark’s OGP website at: “OGP-network meetings”, Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, available [in Danish] at <https://digst.dk/strategier/internationalt-samarbejde/open-government/ogp-netvaerksmoeder/>.

⁴ “OGP Participation & Co-Creation Standards”, Open Government Partnership, 2017, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/OGP_Participation-Cocreation-Standards20170207.pdf.

12. Anti-corruption and transparency in Denmark’s country programme for Uganda

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“Denmark will through the Country Programme – in close coordination with other development partners – support key democratic state and non-state stakeholders and the partnerships between them, and thereby promote a more accountable, inclusive and stable society including engagements in:

- Democratic Governance Facility (DGF)
- Financial Management and Accountability Programme (FINMAP)
- Inspectorate of Government (IG)
- Anti-corruption control mechanisms in the country programme.”

Milestones:

12.1 Continuous updates on the commitment can be found at www.openaid.dk

12.2 Mid-term review

Start Date: 2018

End Date: 2022

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 26–28, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: No • Relevant: Unclear • Potential impact: None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Did it Open Government? Did not Change

This commitment was part of Denmark’s ongoing development policies in Uganda. Specifically, it planned to address corruption in Uganda by bringing together democratic state institutions and civil society to promote legal security, transparency, democracy, and respect for human rights.¹

The commitment included two milestones that cannot be verified, as they relate to overall implementation of the Danish Uganda country program. The first milestone concerns regular updates on www.openaid.dk, however no update on the project appears to have taken place since 2011.² The second milestone concerns a mid-term review, which is not to be undertaken until 2021.

As stated in the government’s mid-term self-assessment, activities in Uganda that are related to the commitment are limited, and the program is still in its design phase.³ Initial activities within the Financial Management and Accountability Programme (FINMAP), including the establishment of a budget website, have been undertaken.⁴ Furthermore, the Ugandan Inspectorate Government (IG) and the Danish Ombudsman have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the provision of technical support to fight corruption and sharing challenges in the area.⁵

As mentioned in the IRM Design Report, this commitment built on a history of Danish anti-corruption efforts in Uganda. Given the limited implementation, there have not been any immediate results or changes to the Danish government’s existing work in this area.⁶

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² “Project: Anti-Corruption Programme in Uganda”, Danida Openaid, accessed 3 November 2019, <https://openaid.um.dk/da/projects/DK-1-96401>.

³ “Mid-term Self-Assessment Report on Denmark’s OGP Action Plan 2017–2019”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, Independent Reporting Mechanism.

⁴ “Uganda Budget Information”, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, <https://www.budget.go.ug/>.

⁵ “Uganda, Denmark Partner to Fight Corruption”, Anti-Corruption Digest, 10 January 2018, <https://anticorruptiondigest.com/2018/01/10/uganda-denmark-partner-to-fight-corruption/#axzz660piZPsS>

⁶ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

13. The 18th International Anti-Corruption Conference

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“In 2018, Denmark will host the 18th International Anti-Corruption Conference, organised in close cooperation with Transparency International. As part of the conference a high-level segment will be organised with ministry-level members from around 20 donor countries and developing countries. The objective of the high-level segment is to strengthen common efforts and facilitate concrete anticorruption initiatives with operational follow-up mechanisms, including initiatives within the area of public-sector transparency.”

Milestones:

13.1 Specific initiatives to combat corruption from 15-20 countries.

Start Date: 25 September 2017

End Date: 22 October 2018

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 28–29, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Complete • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment sought to organize a high-level segment at the 18th International Anti-Corruption Conference (IACC), held in Copenhagen (October 2018), that would create a set of initiatives to combat corruption in various countries. A follow-up high-level segment is expected for the next IACC, to be held in the Republic of Korea in 2020, which will discuss the implementation of the initiatives from 2018. Civil society was expected to play a key role in the oversight of their implementation, but the commitment did not describe in detail how this oversight would take place.¹

The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Transparency International collaborated to implement the IACC conference over course of three days in October 2018. Per the commitment’s only milestone, the conference culminated in a common declaration from the high-level segment, with individual action plans from 19 countries and 12 international organizations.² Therefore, the commitment has been fully completed according to its description in the action plan.

Work is ongoing to ensure proper follow-up to the individual action plans that resulted from it. This follow-up monitoring will be conducted through a tracking mechanism for national and multi-lateral commitments made during the IACC. At the time of writing this report, Transparency International is developing the tracking mechanism, and it is set to be finalized before the next IACC conference in Seoul in 2020.³

This commitment revolved around a recurrent global event—the IACC—that addresses anti-corruption both nationally and internationally. While not part of the commitment’s milestones, the subsequent tracking mechanism constitutes a potential for civil society to hold Danish duty-bearers accountable against the commitments. However, the specifics of such a mechanism are still unclear.

¹ “Denmark Design Report 2017–2019”, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² For the Danish Action Plan see: “Danish National Statement: Presented at the 18th International Anti-Corruption Conference (IACC)”, IACC, 22 October 2018, accessed 15 November 2019, https://iaccseries.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Denmark_National_Statement_2018.pdf.

³ Marina-Buch Cristensen, interview with IRM researcher, 19 November 2019.

14. IATI (International Aid Transparency Initiative)

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

“The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will increase transparency by increasing public possibilities of ‘tracing’ how Danish development cooperation funds are used: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will upgrade its own IATI reporting and align future procedures to ensure digital cohesion between the reporting from the ministry and the reporting from grant recipients. As this involves Open Data, the information will be directly available in machine readable format without requiring any action from a central source. In future, organisations receiving grants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will be required to report their activities in accordance with the IATI standard (format) and carry on the requirement to their partners.”

Milestones:

14.1 All major Danish civil society organisations receiving grants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will start reporting in the IATI standard format

14.2 All other Danish civil society organisations receiving grants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will start reporting in the IATI standard format

14.3 International organisations receiving grants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will start reporting in the IATI standard format

14.4 The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark will start reporting multiple country codes in DAC-CRS format based on IATI reporting from Danish civil society organisations

Start Date: 2017

End Date: 2019

Editorial note: For the full text of this commitment, see “The Danish OGP National Action Plan 2017–2019,” Danish Agency for Digitisation, pp. 30–31, <https://en.digst.dk/policy-and-strategy/open-government/open-government-partnership-ogp-action-plan/>.

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Relevant: Access to information • Potential impact: Minor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: Limited • Did it Open Government? Marginal

This commitment aimed to make it easier for the public to track and understand the results of Danish development aid. To do so, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) planned to upgrade Denmark’s reporting under the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), and present a more precise statistical image of Denmark’s role in international development co-operation.¹

A vast majority of Danish non-governmental organizations receiving grants from the MFA have now begun documenting basic data (e.g., confirming receipt of funds from MFA) in the IATI format. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) has not yet decided on multiple-country codes, and thus not been operationalized by the MFA.²

The MFA continues to expand the use of the IATI format for all organizations receiving Danish grants for development co-operation. However, while the number of organizations using the format has increased during the third action plan cycle, the quality of reporting varies significantly between organizations. To avoid such inconsistencies, MFA pursued a consensus-based approach, allowing partners to realize their specific business-case when deciding to incorporate the format properly. The goal was to demonstrate that there is a mutual gain for both donors and recipients in the use of open data in development partnerships.³

Limitations to the application of IATI reporting implementation was caused by a change of focus towards better integration of the format among grant recipients. However, an increased amount of

information on recipients' use of grants is now publicly available as a result of the commitment, and thus it has led to a marginal improvement to access to information.

¹ "Denmark Design Report 2017–2019", Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM),

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

² "End-of-term report on Denmark's OGP Action Plan 2017-2019", Danish Agency for Digitisation, forthcoming.

³ Peter Ellehøj and Ole Jacob Hjøllund (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), interview by IRM researcher, 11 November 2019.

III. Multi-stakeholder Process

During the implementation of its third action plan, stakeholders were able to participate in public hearings leading up to the mid-term self-assessment report, in which progress on the action plan was discussed. The implementation period also saw for the first time the establishment of a formal OGP multi-stakeholder forum. Hence, Denmark now meets all mandatory requirements for the OGP process.

3.1 Multi-stakeholder process throughout action plan implementation

In 2017, OGP adopted the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards intended to support participation and co-creation by civil society at all stages of the OGP cycle. All OGP-participating countries are expected to meet these standards. The standards aim to raise ambition and quality of participation during development, implementation, and review of OGP action plans.

OGP’s Articles of Governance also establish participation and co-creation requirements a country or entity must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to OGP process. Denmark **did not act** contrary to OGP process.¹

Please see Annex I for an overview of Denmark’s performance implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan implementation.

Table [3.2]: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) “Spectrum of Participation” to apply to OGP.² This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for “collaborate.”

Level of public influence		During development of action plan	During implementation of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.		
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda.		
Involve	The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered.	✓	
Consult	The public could give inputs.		✓
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.		
No Consultation	No consultation		

Civil society engagement during implementation of the third action plan was facilitated through the formalization of a multi-stakeholder forum (the OGP Network) in August 2018. Following this meeting, the Agency for Digitisation (AFD) published meeting minutes online.³ Only a few non-governmental organizations were directly involved in monitoring implementation, and participation from civil society in public hearings leading up to the mid-term self-assessment report was scarce. Participants in the OGP Network have agreed to limit the forum to discussing OGP deliverables and deadlines.⁴

¹ Acting Contrary to Process is defined as: Country did not meet (1) “involve” during the development or “inform” during implementation of the national action plan (NAP), and (2) government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance.

² “IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum,” IAP2, 2014, http://c.ycdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf.

³ “Notat”, Danish Agency for Digitisation, 23 August 2018, <https://digst.dk/media/17855/34-referat-fra-ogpnetvaerksmoede-d-22-august.pdf>.

⁴ “OGP-network meetings”, Digitaliseringsstyrelsen, <https://digst.dk/strategier/internationalt-samarbejde/open-government/ogp-netvaerksmoeder/>.

VI. Methodology and Sources

The IRM reports are written by national researchers in each OGP-participating country. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual¹ and in Denmark's Design Report (2018).²

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 making comments in the IRM Online Library in Denmark at: <https://digst.dk/strategier/internationalt-samarbejde/open-government/dokumentbanken/>.

¹ "IRM Procedures Manual, V.3", OGP, 16 September 2017, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>.

² "Denmark Design Report 2017–2019", Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Denmark_Design-Report_2017-2019_EN.pdf.

Annex I. Overview of Denmark’s performance throughout action plan implementation

Key:

Green= Meets standard

Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)

Red= No evidence of action

Multi-stakeholder Forum	During Development	During Implementation
1a. Forum established: There is a forum to oversee the OGP process.	Green	Green
1b. Regularity: The forum meets at least every quarter, in person or remotely.	Yellow	Yellow
1c. Collaborative mandate development: Members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership, and governance structure.	Yellow	Yellow
1d. Mandate public: Information on the forum’s remit, membership, and governance structure is available on the OGP website/page.	Green	Green
2a. Multi-stakeholder: The forum includes both governmental and non-government representatives.	Green	Green
2b. Parity: The forum includes an even balance of governmental and non-governmental representatives.	Yellow	Yellow
2c. Transparent selection: Non-governmental members of the forum are selected through a fair and transparent process.	Green	Green
2d. High-level government representation: The forum includes high-level representatives with decision making authority from government.	Red	Red
3d. Openness: The forum accepts inputs and representation on the action plan process from any civil society or other stakeholders outside the forum.	Green	Green
3e. Remote participation: There are opportunities for remote participation in at least some meetings and events.	Green	Green
3f. Minutes: The OGP forum pro-actively communicates and reports back on its decisions, activities and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders.	Green	Green

Key:

Green= Meets standard

Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)

Red= No evidence of action

Action Plan Implementation	
4a. Process transparency: There is a national OGP website (or OGP webpage on a government website) where information on all aspects of the national OGP process is pro-actively published.	Green
4b. Documentation in advance: The forum shares information about OGP to stakeholders in advance to guarantee they are informed and prepared to participate in all stages of the process.	Green
4c. Awareness-raising: The forum conducts outreach and awareness-raising activities with relevant stakeholders to inform them of the OGP process.	Yellow
4d. Communication channels: The government facilitates direct communication with stakeholders to respond to action plan process questions, particularly during times of intense OGP activity.	Yellow
4e. Reasoned response: The multi-stakeholder forum publishes its reasoning behind decisions and responds to major categories of public comment.	Green
5a. Repository: Government collects and publishes a document repository on the national OGP website/webpage, which provides a historical record and access to all documents related to the national OGP process, including (but not limited to) consultation documents, national action plans, government self-assessments, IRM reports, and supporting documentation of commitment implementation (e.g., links to databases, evidence of meetings, publications).	Green

Editorial note: If a country “meets” the six standards in bold, the IRM will recognize the country’s process as a Starred Process.

Annex II. IRM Indicators

The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.¹ A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

- **Verifiability:**
 - Not specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, do the objectives stated and actions proposed lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
 - Specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, are the objectives stated and actions proposed sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
- **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
 - Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
 - Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions or policies?
 - Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve public facing opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
 - Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?
- **Potential impact:** This variable assesses the *potential impact* of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
 - Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
 - Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
 - Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.
- **Completion:** This variable assesses the commitment's implementation and progress. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *IRM Implementation Report*.
- **Did It Open Government?:** This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice, in areas relevant to OGP values, has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the IRM Implementation Report.

Results oriented commitments?

A potentially starred commitment has more potential to be ambitious and to be implemented. A good commitment design is one that clearly describes the:

1. **Problem:** What is the economic, social, political, or environmental problem? Rather than describing an administrative issue or tool (e.g., 'Misallocation of welfare funds' is more helpful than 'lacking a website.').
2. **Status quo:** What is the status quo of the policy issue at the beginning of an action plan (e.g., "26 percent of judicial corruption complaints are not processed currently.")?
3. **Change:** Rather than stating intermediary outputs, what is the targeted behavior change that is expected from the commitment's implementation (e.g., "Doubling

response rates to information requests” is a stronger goal than “publishing a protocol for response.”)?

Starred commitments

One measure, the “starred commitment” (★), deserves further explanation due to its particular interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries/entities. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- The commitment’s design should be **Verifiable, Relevant** to OGP values, and have **Transformative** potential impact. As assessed in the Design Report.
- The commitment’s implementation must be assessed by IRM Implementation Report as **Substantial** or **Complete**.

This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the IRM Implementation Report.

¹ “IRM Procedures Manual V. 3,” OGP, 16 September 2017, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>.