

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Action Plan Review:
Norway 2023-2027

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Section I: Overview of the 2023-2027 Action Plan	2
Section II: Promising Commitments in Norway 2023-2027	4
Section III: Methodology and IRM Indicators	10
Annex 1: Commitment by Commitment Data	13
Annex 2: Action Plan Co-Creation	14

Section I: Overview of the 2023-2027 Action Plan

Norway's fifth action plan includes commitments addressing public procurement, digital inclusion and anti-corruption. The action plan presents an opportunity to implement mechanisms for broader participation of civil society groups and other interested groups, beyond those stakeholders already participating in the process. The ambition of commitments can be enhanced by including actions that represent policy changes rather than intermediate outcomes of a process. Norway can take advantage of the action plan's midterm refresh to account for emerging lessons from the first two years of implementation and adapt the action plan commitments accordingly.

Norway's fifth action plan is the country's first four-year action plan. It includes seven commitments in the areas of public procurement, government data management and anti-corruption. It also introduces openness in the justice sector and digital inclusion as emerging policy areas.

Regarding Commitment 1 on procurement, highlighted as promising, implementation of a similar commitment on digitizing the public procurement process in the previous action plan cycle reached limited completion. This time, the commitment focuses on promoting the publication of public procurement data and statistics, including green and environmentally friendly public procurement data. This commitment could improve the quality and availability of public procurement data and remove barriers to public procurement transparency.

The initiatives on anti-corruption and openness in the justice sector propose activities that do not represent a change in public practices, but rather initial analyses from which there is no clarity on further actions. The ambition of this action plan is similar to that of the fourth action plan, where only one commitment was rated as having transformative potential impact.

Compared to the 2019-2022 action plan co-creation process, it is a positive development that more meetings took place in the OGP Council to discuss the action plan and more opportunities for stakeholders to submit proposals were made available. Following a consultation where the government proposed seven priority areas, five priority areas that reflect both government and civil society priorities were included in the final action plan.¹ Based on the information provided to the IRM, the civil society proposal that was included in the final action plan is Commitment 7, Openness in the Justice Sector. Both a civil society representative and the OGP Point of Contact² agree that one of the main challenges remains the participation of a diverse range of civil society organizations, beyond those already

AT A GLANCE

Participating since: 2011
Number of commitments: 7

Overview of commitments:
Commitments with an open government lens: 7 (100%)
Commitments with substantial potential for results: 1 (14%)
Promising commitments: 1 (14%)

Policy areas:
Carried over from previous action plans:

- Public procurement
- Government data management
- Anti-corruption

Emerging in this action plan:

- Openness in justice
- Digital inclusion

Compliance with OGP minimum requirements for co-creation:
Yes

participating in the OGP process. This can be at least partly attributed to civil society organizations having multiple alternatives to engage with the government in the Norwegian context outside of the OGP process.³ A key challenge to the OGP process is to better communicate the scope and benefits it could bring to different areas of public policy to a diverse range of civil society organizations, as well as other stakeholders that could be interested, such as industry groups or private sector organizations. To address this issue, the DFD could conduct outreach to bring some of the alternative engagement avenues that CSOs are using to engage with the government under the OGP umbrella.

The co-creation of this plan included meetings between civil society and government representatives, with greater participation of press organizations under the Norwegian Press Association than in previous action plan cycles⁴. However, one of the civil society representatives⁵ considered it crucial to ensure that organizations have timely and clear information on their expected role in the process, to guarantee more effective participation.

Four-year action plans include a midterm refresh at the two-year mark, where countries could review the progress of commitment implementation up to date and to amend the action plan where needed. Countries can also include new commitments to the action plan. Norway is encouraged to use this opportunity to consolidate emerging lessons from the first two years of implementation as well as to accommodate unforeseen circumstances that might arise during implementation. Norway could also consider including the lobbying transparency commitment that was submitted after the end of the co-creation process by the Ministry of National IT Policy and Public Governance at the midterm refresh point, as it could prove promising for advancing sectoral transparency in the country.

¹ "Norway Action Plan 2024-2027", Open Government Partnership, 20 December 2023. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf

² Tom Arne Nygaard (previous Norway Point of Contact), correspondence with the IRM researcher, 13.10.2022; Tor Dolvik (Transparency International Norway & member of the Multi-Stakeholder Forum), correspondence with the IRM researcher, 4 June 2024.

³ Tom Arne Nygaard, correspondence.

⁴ Tom Arne Nygaard, correspondence.

⁵ Tor Dolvik, correspondence.

Section II: Promising Commitments in Norway 2023-2027

The following review looks at the one commitment that the IRM identified as having the potential to realize the most promising results. Promising commitments address a policy area that is important to stakeholders or the national context. They must be verifiable, have a relevant open government lens, and have modest or substantial potential for results. This review also provides an analysis of challenges, opportunities, and recommendations to contribute to the learning and implementation process of this action plan.

Table 1. Promising commitments

Promising Commitments
1. Public Procurement Data: This commitment aims to improve the availability and quality of quantitative public procurement data.

Commitment # 1: Public procurement data

Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries (NFD), The Norwegian Agency for Public and Financial Management (DFØ), Department of National IT Policy and Public Governance (DFD), Transparency International Norway

For a complete description of the commitment, see Commitment #1 in:

<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/norway-action-plan-2023-2027-december/>

Context and objectives:

This commitment responds to the need for better procurement data in Norway.¹ The public procurement process has been a longstanding government and civil society priority.² Norway's 2019-2022 action plan included a commitment on digitizing the public procurement process. That commitment achieved limited completion due to issues of data availability and legislative barriers related to data protection.³ Some progress has been made since that commitment, namely in standardizing the data transfer formats between different steps of the procurement process on the Doffin platform, Norway's central public procurement database.⁴

This commitment aims to make more data on public procurement available and to create a stable framework for managing procurement data centrally at the DFØ. It focuses on publishing data on public announcements on Doffin, usage statistics from the data-sharing service eBevis, statistics from accounting data and supplier information for public agencies, data and statistics on climate and environmentally friendly public procurement, and results and data from the biannual DFØ procurement survey.⁵ All milestones are expected to be completed by the end of 2024. The commitment is relevant to the OGP value of transparency, as it will increase the types of available public procurement data.

Potential for results: Substantial

The commitment is important in Norway, especially since a public procurement committee has been appointed to review regulations and propose changes for review in parliament.⁶ This commitment could make more data on public procurement in Norway available. Additionally, the collection of green and environmentally friendly procurement data is a novelty for Norway.

Currently, the use of e-procurement is mandatory for all contracting authorities or entities involved in public contracts whose value exceeds NOK 1.4 million⁷ (€117,000). Purchases over this threshold are also announced on Doffin.⁸ While procurement plans, tender notices, bidding documents and award notices are all published on Doffin, no structured data, i.e. data that is highly organized and easily decipherable by machine learning algorithms,⁹ is published on the above categories. Therefore, the publication of structured data could lead to more clarity in the procurement process by providing an overview of trends in the sector.

However, it is unclear if some categories of data and statistics in the commitment would constitute high value public procurement data for end users. Furthermore, while the inclusion of statistics is a positive step, if structured data is published, users could also independently produce statistics based on this data.¹⁰ If the DFØ takes the needs and interests of end users into consideration, this commitment has substantial potential for results. Overcoming those technical and legal issues in publishing public procurement data could allow interested groups to have information in open format for monitoring and accountability and to identify trends and areas of opportunity in the sector, ultimately ensuring public integrity in the public procurement system. Access to this information could support media investigations on public sector procurement. In addition, access to statistical data on green procurement would allow government offices and the public to better understand the environmental impact of procurement and continue advancing in its implementation. The Open Contracting Partnership (OCP) highlights the importance of publishing green and environmentally friendly procurement data in meeting the European Commission Green New Deal's policy objectives, and its potential to demonstrate the value of publishing such data to other countries in the Nordic region.¹¹ The new public procurement regulations that were adopted in January 2024 mandate that all contracting authorities must weigh climate and environmental considerations as award criteria with a minimum of 30% of the total criteria assessed.¹² DFØ data show that in 2024 about 75% of public procurement contracts have an environmental weighing of 30% or more or include environmental criteria, compared to around 50% in 2023.¹³ While the DFØ has started collecting this data, a civil society stakeholder expressed uncertainty about what 'environmentally friendly procurement' means in practice, as well as the establishment of the technical solution to publish this kind of data.¹⁴

Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations during implementation

It will be important for the DFØ to engage all involved ministries and in the publication of public procurement data. Norway is drafting a new public procurement law¹⁵. The proposal would make it easier for public agencies to not use the standardized formats and Doffin to announce procurements. The DFØ is engaging with the process to change that development. If this commitment is successful, the DFØ could move on to publishing more categories of data for the remainder of the action plan as well as after its end.

This commitment could face similar challenges to the previous commitment on digitizing the public procurement process.¹⁶ Firstly, data protection laws could prohibit publicizing certain categories of public procurement data, a challenge that the commitment does not directly address.¹⁷ A civil society stakeholder suggested that the government could start by publishing non-sensitive data in the short term.¹⁸ Also, while the DFØ collects public procurement data, neither the DFØ nor the Ministry of Finance own the data. The DFØ must reach out to each public agency individually when collecting public procurement data, a time-consuming practice. Furthermore, while public agencies must report who is awarded public procurement contracts,

they do not always do so, and some parts of the process are undertaken by private suppliers, not the DFØ.¹⁹

For the midterm refresh of the action plan, the IRM recommends the following:

- **Review legislative barriers to data publication and whether there are ways to adapt the commitment to existing regulations**, ensuring the publication of public procurement data while protecting personal data. For example, the DFØ could review data protection applications to legal persons as well as legal bans for data ownership by different authorities. Where data redactions need to be made, OCP recommends that clear public justifications should be provided.²⁰
- **Create spaces on Doffin for users to suggest high value data categories and flag potential inaccuracies in the available data**, such as education, health or public finances. Datasets are deemed high value if they contain data for a key set of fields based on local users' needs.²¹ The DFØ could also involve the private sector, like chambers of commerce and business associations. For example, Ukraine's DoZorro²² and Italy's OpenCoesione²³ platforms allow user feedback on procurement data.
- **Centralize public procurement data collection and streamline data sharing to the DFØ from public agencies.**
- **Draw from the newly released data to inform the public on key issues**, through accessible and widely disseminated reports on key facts. This awareness campaign could also include encouraging reuse of data by journalists, researchers, students and the public through a procurement data application contest or an investigative journalism award, using data on Doffin.
- The government could **enhance public procurement transparency at the local level**. This would allow interested stakeholders to review public procurement data at the local level. For example, Scotland is implementing a procurement management information platform to improve open fiscal data at the local level, including in public procurement.²⁴

Other commitments

Other commitments that the IRM did not identify as promising are discussed below. This review provides recommendations to contribute to the learning and implementation of these commitments. As Norway is implementing a four-year action plan, the country will have to schedule a mandatory refresh at the two-year mark, reviewing progress up to that point and potentially amending the action plan for the remaining two years of implementation. Norway could take stock of areas for improvement for the remaining two years of implementation.

Commitment 2 aims to ensure digital inclusion by applying universal design regulations for public sector websites and apps, focusing on people with visual, hearing or mobility impairments or who have a primary language other than Norwegian. The commitment introduces the novel element of annually controlling the extent to which public bodies comply with the regulations, reporting the results to the EU and making them publicly available.²⁵ A civil society representative stressed the importance of ensuring that these regulations are followed in the education sector.²⁶ However, as written, the commitment text lacks milestones, making the timeline of the planned activities unclear. Furthermore, Uu-tilsynet (Authority for Universal Design of ICT) has already implemented three of the six activities in the commitment. It is therefore difficult to assess how this commitment would expand this work. During implementation, Norway could add milestones to this commitment and allocate adequate

resources to the Uu-tilsynet to scale up its public and private sector controls. Finally, Uu-tilsynet is encouraged to address what universal design would entail for different groups, i.e. ensuring that people with hearing impairments are able to communicate in writing and have access to closed captions in videos and audio clips.

For Commitment 3, the Ministry of Digitization and Public Governance (DFD) aims to develop a common template for public sector websites on presenting how they process personal data. The goal is to make information about the processing of personal data more understandable for the public. It is unclear if the DFD intends to mandate that all public sector entities use the template. At the midterm refresh, the DFD could take stock of the uptake of the template and discuss how to get more public institutions to adopt it. The DFD could also utilize the Language Council of Norway's Plain Language Guide for civil servants when developing the template²⁷.

Commitment 4 aims to organize free training programs for people to develop their digital skills. Additionally, it aims to regularly survey digital skills levels, develop local guidance services and make businesses more responsible for digital inclusion. The trainings are part of a grant program that runs until 2025, led by the DFD and carried out with the civil society organization (CSO) "Seniornett," the Norwegian Directorate for Higher Education and Skills (HK-dir) and the Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS). An official of the Norwegian Digital Agency (DigDir) noted that the success metric of the commitment of reducing the number of citizens over 16 with weak basic digital skills from 14 per cent in 2021 to 10 per cent in 2025, might not be realistic.²⁸ The government has created a multi-stakeholder forum for digital inclusion which meets twice a year to discuss challenges.²⁹ At the two-year mark of the action plan, Norway could include the meetings of the forum as an activity in the commitment, and incorporate its feedback into digital inclusion policy. Norway could also include the forum's entire work plan to ensure that the commitment encompasses all relevant avenues of stakeholder discussion on the issue of digital inclusion. Also, as the training program is expected to end in December 2025, Norway could reassess the success metric at the two-year mark at that time and determine if the commitment could be adjusted for the last two years of the implementation period.

Commitment 5 aims to evaluate whether the eInnsyn publishing service supports the right of access in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and whether it supports full-text publishing. Additionally, it aims to assess the sustainability of eInnsyn's funding model, as well as potential efficiency gains for administrative processes related to the handling of access requests. The commitment will result in a report from the evaluation but it is unclear what additional steps that will be taken to address issues that may be raised in the report. During implementation, the IRM recommends publishing the evaluation report and addressing potential issues raised in the report, incorporating their solutions in the functioning of eInnsynn.

Commitment 6 aims to produce a white paper on economic crime, including corruption, and create a website with information about public authorities' anti-corruption efforts. The commitment was proposed by civil society, citing a lack of progress on domestic anti-corruption efforts.³⁰ The Ministry of Justice and Public Safety published the white paper in March 2024³¹. In response to the white paper, civil society highlighted the need for a national anti-corruption strategy, and to separate corruption from other forms of financial crime in policy making.³² During implementation, Norway could develop a roadmap for this process based on the paper, taking into consideration civil society input.

Commitment 7 aims to improve the rules around access by the press to police criminal case documents. The Point of Contact noted that organizations in the Norwegian Press Association are interested in accessing these documents and that their contributions were influential in the inclusion of the commitment in the action plan.³³ The commitment lacks milestones, making it difficult to assess how it will facilitate access to criminal case documents. During implementation, the Ministry of Justice and Public Security could clarify the proposed solution, as well as milestones to ensure the commitment will reach its goal. Furthermore, the ministry could hold regular meetings with interested press outlets and civil society organizations to share the progress of implementation.

¹ Maria Egeland Thorsnes, Norway OGP Point of Contact, correspondence with IRM staff, 30.07.2024.

² Birgit Enger Nordstrand, Director of Governance and Digitalization, Procurement at DFØ, interview with IRM staff, 03.09.2024.

³ Results Report: Norway 2019-2022, Open Government Partnership, 15 May 2023, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/norway-results-report-2019-2022/>

⁴ Tor Dolvik, Member of the OGP Council & Special Adviser at Transparency International Norway, correspondence with IRM staff, 05.09.2024 and Nordstrand, interview.

⁵ The DFØ conducts a biannual public procurement survey of all state and municipal enterprises and are used to improve public procurement processes. The 2024 survey results can be found at <https://anskaffelser.no/innkjopsledelse/anskaffelsesundersokelsen>.

⁶ Høring NOU 2024: 9 Ny lov om offentlige anskaffelser [Consultation NOU 2024: 9 New Public Procurement Act], Available at: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/horing-nou-20249-ny-lov-om-offentlige-anskaffelser/id3039354/?expand=horingsbrev>.

⁷ Alif Amund Gulsvik, Stian Hultin Oddbjørnsen and Ronny Rosenvold, CMS Expert Guide to Public Procurement – Norway, 26.08.2022, Available at: <https://cms.law/en/int/expert-guides/cms-expert-guide-to-public-procurement/norway> and Dolvik, correspondence with IRM staff.

⁸ International Trade Administration, Norway – Country Commercial Guide: Selling to the Public Sector, 20.01.2024, Available at: <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/norway-selling-public-sector>.

⁹ IBM, “Structured vs unstructured data”, 29 June 2021, <https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/structured-vs-unstructured-data>.

¹⁰ Karolis Granickas, Head of Europe at Open Contracting Partnership, interview with IRM staff, 23.07.2024.

¹¹ Granickas, interview.

¹² Anette Ensrud Kraakevik, Patrick Oware, Important changes to the procurement regulations – tightening requirements to consider climate and environmental concerns, 07.08.2023, Wikborg Rein, <https://www.wr.no/en/news/important-changes-to-the-procurement-regulations-tightening-requirements-to-consider-climate-and-environmental-concerns>.

¹³ Jonas Karstensen, Senior advisor at DFØ, email correspondence with IRM staff, 12.09.2024; Statistikk om klima- og miljøhensyn i offentlige anskaffelser [Statistics on climate and environmental considerations in public procurement], DFØ, <https://anskaffelser.no/berekraftige-anskaffingar/klima-og-miljo/statistikk-om-klima-og-miljohensyn-i-offentlige-anskaffelser>.

¹⁴ Dolvik, correspondence

¹⁵ Morten Gulhagen-Revling, Line Voldstad, Aksel Joachim Hageler, Oda Linneberg Uggen, Thea Åkermoen, David Berset, Public Procurement in Norway, DLA Piper, 16.05.2024, Available at: <https://norway.dlapiper.com/en/news/public-procurement-norway-proposed-changes>

¹⁶ Results Report: Norway 2019-2022, Open Government Partnership, 15 May 2023, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/norway-results-report-2019-2022/>

¹⁷ Tor Dolvik (Member of the OGP Council & Special Adviser at Transparency International Norway), correspondence with IRM researcher, 4 June 2024.

¹⁸ Dolvik, correspondence

¹⁹ Nordstrand, interview

²⁰ Open Contracting Partnership, How can we legislate for open contracting?, 2021, <https://www.open-contracting.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/OCP2021-OCLegislative-Guide.pdf>

²¹ Andrew Mandelbaum, “Blog: From transparency to data use: rising to open contracting’s next challenge”, 23 November 2017, Hivos, <https://hivos.org/blog-from-transparency-to-data-use-rising-to-open-contractings-next-challenge/>.

²² Ukraine, Open Public Procurement, 2016-2018 Ukraine OGP Action Plan. Available at: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/ukraine/commitments/UA0064/>

²³ Italy, Information System on the Status of Actions Falling Under the Unitary Regional Planning, 2012-2013 Italy OGP Action Plan. Available at: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/italy/commitments/IT0003/>.

²⁴ Scotland, United Kingdom, Fiscal Openness and Transparency – improving the accessibility and usability of our data and information about the public finances, 2021-2025 Scotland, United Kingdom Action Plan. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/scotland-united-kingdom/commitments/gbsc0001/?_gl=1*19s4n4*_ga*MTEyNTk4MzEyNC4xNzE1NTk1ODc2*_ga_T47DS22V65*MTcyMDA5OTI0Ni4xNDYuMS4xNzlwMTAxMzc1LjI2LjAuMA.

²⁵ “Norway Action Plan 2024-2027”, Open Government Partnership, 20 December 2023. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf.

²⁶ Øydis Lebiko (Political advisor at Norwegian Association for the Hearing Impaired), correspondence with IRM staff, 1 October 2024.

²⁷ Klarspråk (Plain Language), Språkrådet (Language Council of Norway). Available at: <https://sprakradet.no/klarsprak/>

²⁸ Lindbol, interview.

²⁹ Lindbol, interview and Handlingsplan for auka inkludering i eit digital samfunn [Action Plan for increasing inclusion in a digital society], Available at: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/handlingsplan-for-auka-inkludering-i-eit-digitalt-samfunn/id2984233/>

³⁰ Tor Dolvik, Special Advisor at Transparency International Norway, correspondence with IRM staff, 05.09.2024.

³¹ Meld. St. 15 (2023-2024) Felles verdier – felles ansvar – Styrket innsats for forebygging og bekjempelse av økonomisk kriminalitet [Report N. 15 (2023-2024) Shared values – shared responsibility – Strengthened efforts to prevent and combat financial crime], Available at: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-15-20232024/id3031227/>

³² Transparency International Norway, Økende geopolitisk usikkerhet krever en nasjonal antikorrupsjonsstrategi [Increasing geopolitical uncertainty requires a national anti-corruption strategy], 26.04.2024, Available at: <https://www.transparency.no/blog/kende-geopolitisk-usikkerhet-krever-en-nasjonal-antikorrupsjonsstrategi>

³³ Egeland Thorsnes, correspondence.

Section III: Methodology and IRM Indicators

The purpose of this review is not an evaluation. It is intended as a quick, independent, technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process. The IRM highlights commitments that have the highest potential for results, a high priority for country stakeholders, a priority in the national open government context, or a combination of these factors.

The three IRM products provided during a national action plan cycle include:

- **Co-Creation Brief:** A concise brief that highlights lessons from previous IRM reports to support a country's OGP process, action plan design, and overall learning.
- **Action Plan Review:** A technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process.
- **Results Report:** An overall implementation assessment that focuses on policy-level results and how changes happen. It also checks compliance with OGP rules and informs accountability and longer-term learning.

In the Action Plan Review, the IRM follows a filtering and clustering process to identify promising reforms or commitments:

Step 1: Determine what is reviewable based on the verifiability of the commitment as written in the action plan.

Step 2: Determine if the commitment has an open government lens. Is it relevant to OGP values?

Step 3: Review commitments that are verifiable and have an open government lens to identify if certain commitments need to be clustered. Commitments that have a common policy objective or contribute to the same reform or policy issue should be clustered. The potential for results of clustered commitments should be reviewed as a whole. IRM staff follow these steps to cluster commitments:

- a. Determine overarching themes. If the action plan is not already grouped by themes, IRM staff may use OGP's thematic tagging as reference.
- b. Review commitment objectives to identify commitments that address the same policy issue or contribute to the same broader policy or government reform.
- c. Organize commitments into clusters as needed. Commitments may already be organized in the action plan under specific policy or government reforms.

Step 4: Assess the potential for results of the clustered or standalone commitment.

Filtering is an internal process. Data for individual commitments is available in Annex 1. In addition, during the internal review process of this product, the IRM verifies the accuracy of findings and collects further input through peer review, OGP Support Unit feedback as needed, interviews and validation with country stakeholders, an external expert review, and oversight by IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).

As described earlier, IRM relies on **three key indicators** for this review:

I. Verifiability

- **Yes, specific enough to review:** As written in the action plan, the stated objectives and proposed actions are sufficiently clear and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation.
- **No, not specific enough to review:** As written in the action plan, the stated objectives and proposed actions lack clarity and do not include explicitly verifiable activities to assess implementation.
- Commitments that are not verifiable will be considered not reviewable, and further assessment will not be carried out.

II. Open government lens

This indicator determines if the commitment relates to the open government values of transparency, civic participation, or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration and the OGP Articles of Governance by responding to the following guiding questions. Based on a close reading of the commitment text, the IRM first determines whether the commitment has an open government lens:

- **Yes/No:** Does the commitment set out to make a policy area, institution, or decision-making process more transparent, participatory, or accountable to the public?

The IRM uses the OGP values as defined in the Articles of Governance. In addition, the following questions for each OGP value may be used as a reference to identify the specific open government lens in commitment analysis:

- **Transparency:** Will the government disclose more information, improve the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improve the transparency of government decision-making processes or institutions?
- **Civic Participation:** Will the government create or improve opportunities, processes, or mechanisms for the public to inform or influence decisions? Will the government create, enable, or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities or underrepresented groups? Will the government enable a legal environment to guarantee freedoms of assembly, association, and peaceful protest?
- **Public Accountability:** Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions? Will the government enable legal, policy, or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of public officials?

III. Potential for results

The IRM adjusted this indicator—formerly known as the “potential impact” indicator—to take into account the feedback from the IRM Refresh consultation process with the OGP community. With the new results-oriented strategic focus of IRM products, the IRM modified this indicator to lay out the expected results and potential that would be verified in the IRM Results Report after implementation. Given the purpose of this Action Plan Review, the assessment of potential for results is only an early indication of the possibility the commitment has to yield meaningful results based on its articulation in the action plan in contrast with the state of play in the respective policy area.

The scale of the indicator is defined as:

- **Unclear:** The commitment is aimed at continuing ongoing practices in line with existing legislation, requirements, or policies without indication of the added value or enhanced open government approach in contrast with existing practice.
- **Modest:** A positive but standalone initiative or change to processes, practices, or policies. The commitment does not generate binding or institutionalized changes across government or institutions that govern a policy area. Examples are tools (e.g., websites) or data release, training, or pilot projects.
- **Substantial:** A possible game changer for practices, policies, or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector, or the relationship between citizens and state. The commitment generates binding and institutionalized changes across government.

This review was prepared by IRM staff and was externally expert reviewed by Brendan Halloran. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products, and review process are overseen by IRM's IEP. For more information, see the IRM Overview section of the OGP website.³⁹

³⁹ IRM Overview: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>

Annex 1: Commitment by Commitment Data¹²

Commitment 1: Public procurement data
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Substantial
Commitment 2: Enforce regulations for universal design of ICT solutions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Modest
Commitment 3: Simplified privacy statements on public websites
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Modest
Commitment 4: Digital Inclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Modest
Commitment 5: Evaluation of eInnsyn
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 6: Develop a more strategic approach to anti-corruption work
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Modest
Commitment 7: Openness in the justice sector
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: Yes• Does it have an open government lens? Yes• Potential for results: Unclear

¹ **Editorial notes:**

1. For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitments.
2. Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see Norway's action plan: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf

Annex 2: Action Plan Co-Creation

OGP member countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards that came into force on 1 January 2022.¹ The IRM assesses all countries that submitted action plans from 2022 onward under the updated standards. Table 2 outlines the extent to which the countries’ participation and co-creation practices meet the minimum requirements that apply during development of the action plan.

OGP instituted a 24-month grace period to ensure a fair and transparent transition to the updated standards. Action plans co-created and submitted by 31 December 2023 fall within the grace period. The IRM will assess countries’ alignment with the standards and their minimum requirements.² However, countries will only be found to be acting contrary to process if they do not meet the minimum requirements for action plans co-created in 2024 and onwards.

Please note that, according to the OGP National Handbook, countries implementing four-year action plans must undertake a refresh process at the two-year mark. Countries are expected to meet minimum requirements 3.1 and 4.1 during the refresh process.³ IRM assessment of the refresh process will be included in the Results Report.

Table 2. Compliance with minimum requirements

Minimum requirement	Met during co-creation?	Met during implementation?
1.1 Space for dialogue: The multi-stakeholder space for dialogue, the Stakeholders’ Forum, met four times during the co-creation process: 23 June 2022, 20 September 2022 and 13 and 16 January 2023. ⁴ The MSF continued to be consulted on the action plan after the January 16 meeting. ⁵ Information on the OGP Council meetings is made available. ⁶ The OGP Council’s mandate and membership are available online. ⁷	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
2.1 OGP website: The Ministry of Digitalisation and Public Governance (DFD) maintains a dedicated OGP website with information on the OGP process in Norway. ⁸ The website was updated in 2024, after the adoption of the action plan.	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
2.2 Repository: There is a repository online with information on the co-creation process, as well as information on the status of commitments in the 2023-2027 action plan. It was updated at least twice a year during the co-creation process.	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
3.1 Advanced notice: The public consultation notice was published on 1 July 2022 with a deadline for input on 25 August 2022. ⁹	Yes	To be assessed in the Results Report
3.2 Outreach: The DFD conducted outreach to CSO members of the MSF, as well as other CSOs that have expressed interest in the OGP process in the past via email. Additionally, the DFD conducted a public consultation on reggeringen.no , where the public could provide comments on the action plan.	Yes	Not applicable
3.3 Feedback mechanism: The government collected input through an online consultation that was open in June 2023 on the Norwegian OGP website. ¹⁰	Yes	Not applicable

<p>4.1 Reasoned response: Stakeholder input from the online consultation is available on the OGP website.¹¹The government provided feedback on why or why not CSO proposals could be further discussed at the meetings between CSOs and the ministries in the fall of 2022 and January 2023.¹²</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>To be assessed in the Results Report</p>
<p>5.1 Open implementation: The IRM will assess whether meetings were held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation results and enable civil society to provide comments in the Results Report.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p><i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i></p>

The OGP process in Norway could be strengthened through the following measures:

- Formalize the terms of participation in the multi-stakeholder forum, so that government and civil society representatives have clear expectations of their roles. As a civil society representative pointed out, this could also facilitate the engagement of new civil society organizations (CSOs) that are possibly interested in the thematic priorities but are unfamiliar with OGP proceedings.¹³ Also, the KDD could update the entire mandate of the OGP Council on the new OGP website, including the terms of reference and membership.
- Ensure that the online repository is updated regularly (at least twice a year) with evidence on the implementation status of commitments.
- Document dialogue between government and CSOs as part of the process, so that stakeholders have information on how their contributions are included in decision making.
- The DFD could expand its outreach to civil society and other interested stakeholders. For example, the government could include promotion of the OGP process during Arendalsuka¹⁴ and through social media, like LinkedIn.

¹ 2021 OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>

² IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-guidelines-for-the-assessment-of-minimum-requirements/>

³ OGP National Handbook 2022, Section 2.3: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/ogp-national-handbook-rules-and-guidance-for-participants-2022/>

⁴ “Norway Action Plan 2024-2027”, Open Government Partnership, 20 December 2023. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf

⁵ “Norway Action Plan 2024-2027”, Open Government Partnership, 20 December 2023. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf

⁶ Maria Egeland Thorsnes, Norway Point of Contact, correspondence with IRM staff, 30.07.2024.

⁷ OGP-rådet [OGP Council]. Available at: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dep/dfd/org/styrer-rad-og-utvalg-under-digitaliserings-og-forvaltningsdepartementet/ogp-radet/id2577472/>

⁸ OGP Website, Norway: <https://open.regjeringa.no/>

⁹ “Norway Action Plan 2024-2027”, Open Government Partnership, 20 December 2023. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf

¹⁰ “Norway Action Plan 2024-2027”, Open Government Partnership, 20 December 2023. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Norway_Action-Plan_2023-2027_December_EN_Revised.pdf

¹¹ Høring - Open Government Partnership (OGP) – innspill til handlingsplan 5 [Consultation – Open Government Partnership (OGP) – input to action plan 5, 04.07.2022. Available at: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/open-government-partnership-ogp-innspill-til-handlingsplan-5/id2920957/?showSvar=true&consterm=&page=1&isFilterOpen=true>

¹² Tor Dolvik, Member of the OGP Council & Special Adviser at Transparency International Norway, correspondence with IRM staff, 15.10.2024.

¹³ Tor Dolvik (Transparency International Norway & member of the Multi-Stakeholder Forum), correspondence with the IRM researcher, 4 June 2024.

¹⁴ Arendsuka [Arendal Week] is an independent annual national festival where politics, civil society and business stakeholders meet and debate regarding policy formulation for the present and future. Its stated goal is to strengthen democracy in Norway.