OPEN GOVERNMENT MANIFESTO

Introduction

Fighting corruption. Ensuring public money is well spent. Improving public services. Developing better policy and laws. Knowing who is influencing decisions. Making the voices of citizens heard.

Open government is the simple but powerful idea that governments and institutions work better for citizens when they are transparent, engaging and accountable.

> **Transparency** – opening up of government data and information on areas such as public spending, government contracts, lobbying activity, the development and impact of policy, and public service performance.
>
> **Participation** – support for a strong and independent civil society, the involvement of citizens and other stakeholders in decision making processes, and protection for whistleblowers and others who highlight waste, negligence or corruption in government.
>
> **Accountability** – rules, laws and mechanisms that ensure government listens, learns, responds and changes when it needs to.

Good open government reforms can transform the way government and public services work, ensuring that they are properly responsive to citizens, while improving their efficiency and effectiveness, and preventing abuses of state power.

Based on a ten month project to source the best open government ideas from citizens and civil society across the UK, the **Open Government Manifesto** puts forward key proposals for commitments for the UK's new Open Government Partnership National Action Plan.

Open Government Partnership

The Open Government Partnership[1] is an international initiative that provides a platform for reformers inside and outside governments around the world to develop reforms that "promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption and harness new technologies to strengthen governance". Since its foundation in September 2011, over 2,000 commitments have been made by 65 participating countries, covering a third of the world's population.

Countries must meet a set of basic eligibility criteria and agree to an Open Government Declaration to join. Once a member, governments must develop a National Action Plan with civil society in their country on a biennial basis. The government must regularly report on its progress and work with civil society to achieve the agreed reforms. Progress is evaluated at regular intervals by an independent researcher appointed by the OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism. The OGP emphasises partnership between government and civil society at all levels. Its steering committee is formed of equal government and civil society representatives, with co-chairs drawn from each.

As a member of the Open Government Partnership, every two years the UK government in collaboration with civil society must develop an open government national action plan, setting out specific, measurable and time bound commitments. So far, the UK has developed and implemented two action plans (2011-13 & 2013-15), and is due to publish its third in early 2016.

Open Government Manifesto

For the past 10 months, the Open Government Network has been asking UK civil society what open government reforms governments in the UK should make, how they should be implemented, and what effect they will have on on citizens and society in the UK and beyond.

The Open Government Manifesto is a crowdsourced collection of open government reforms and initiatives that civil society in the UK want governments to adopt in the UK's new OGP National Action Plan.

Through face-to-face events and online engagement, 79 ideas were collected between December 2014 and June 2016, which have since been developed and refined into the set of 28 proposed commitments found in this Open Government Manifesto.

---

[1] www.opengovpartnership.org/

Summaries of the commitments can be found at:
www.opengovernment.org.uk/engage/open-government-manifesto/

Contents

Open Local Government

Open Parliaments & Courts

Privacy

Anti-corruption

1. Implement & update the anti-corruption plan

HMG should commit to implementing the current Anti-Corruption Plan, and updating and developing the Anti-Corruption Action Plan.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

In late 2014, the UK Government, for the first time in history, set out a plan for how it will fight corruption – making sure that all the different government activities are coordinated. This was good news as it is vital that the Government recognises the problem and tackles it in a strategic and focussed way. However, it is important that this momentum isn't lost. A commitment to the Plan – and to put out further versions (including commitments on areas that were patchy in the original plan) – would help ensure that corruption stays high on the Government agenda.

Main Objective

- HMG commit to implementing the current Anti-Corruption Plan.
- HMG commit to updating and developing the Anti-Corruption Action Plan.

Relevance

Corruption is one of the biggest global issues of our time. The Anti-Corruption Plan sets out how the Government will fight corruption in the public and private sectors in the UK and overseas, and how it will ensure the coordination needed between departments in order to effectively tackle the problem.

Everyone deserves a fair chance: individuals in positions of power should not be able to abuse their position for private gain. No-one's life should be destroyed because they are too poor to pay a bribe, and the interests of democracy should not be hijacked by corrupt individuals.

Transparency is a proven means of deterring and detecting corruption and making institutions accountable, as well as helping improve the balance of power between public institutions and the citizens they are designed to serve. An open government is an essential element in combating corruption.

When corruption takes hold, institutions and systems can quickly deteriorate. Prevention is better than cure. Strong institutions that are transparent and accountable are bulwarks against corruption.

Ambition

A commitment to the Plan – and to develop further versions using the open government participatory approach (including commitments on areas that were patchy in the original plan) – would help ensure that corruption stays high on the Government agenda.

Milestones

1	December 2015 - One year after publication, the UK's Anti-Corruption Champion reports on progress of implementation of the 66 commitments in the UK Anti-Corruption Plan
2	June 2016 - The UK Government updates civil society groups on implementation of the commitments in the 2014 Anti-Corruption Plan
3	November 2016/January 2017 - The UK Government publishes an updated Anti-Corruption Plan

---

2. Strengthen natural resource transparency

HMG should require UK-listed extractive companies to provide open data; work for EU-wide extractives commodity and other payments disclosure; extend disclosure to AIM; and influence the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies to require disclosure.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

UK leadership has contributed to significant progress in making the world's extractive (oil, gas and mining) industries more financially transparent and accountable, but reporting gaps and weaknesses remain in the UK, EU and international disclosure regimes.

Main Objective

To broaden and strengthen natural resource transparency worldwide by requiring more companies active in oil, gas and minerals extraction and trading to publicly disclose in open data format a wider spectrum of payments to governments on a country and project-level basis in more home jurisdictions and capital markets.

Relevance

This commitment will extend open data reporting of payments to governments by international oil, gas and mining companies and facilitate public access to data; extend disclosure to include payments to governments arising from the highly profitable, opaque

and corruption-prone international commodity trade in natural resources (the UK is responsible for 25% of the global commodity trade in oil; and in Switzerland, the world's largest commodity trading hub, a preliminary draft law on extractives transparency aligned with the payments to governments requirements of the EU Accounting and Transparency Directives includes the ability for the Swiss Federal Council to extend the scope of the legislation quickly to include payments to governments for commodity trading but only as part of an internationally agreed process. Clearly UK action could have a significant impact on Swiss moves to improve commodity trading transparency), along with other categories of payments; increase UK AIM-listed extractive companies', as well as host governments', accountability; complement the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI); and encourage the UK Overseas.

Ambition

All oil, gas and mining companies publicly listed on the London Stock Exchange, and on AIM (the Alternative Investment Market), will provide payment-to-governments reports as open data, enabling citizens and civil society to easily access, manipulate and analyse the data and better hold companies and governments to account for natural resources and extractive revenues. Inclusion in reports of EU extractive and trading companies' data on payments to governments for the sale of oil, gas and minerals will pave the way to extending the global standard to cover a major area of corruption risk and match the EITI, and inclusion of payments relating to transportation and export activities, for social expenditures and to state security forces for security services will address further important areas at risk of corruption and mismanagement in the sector and complement existing international standards. Securing similar disclosure rules for oil, gas and mining companies incorporated or publicly listed in the UK Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies will ensure that these jurisdictions and markets reinforce rather than undermine international transparency standards and advance good governance and accountability in the global natural resources sector.

The medium- to long-term impact on citizens of these measures will be to increase public knowledge and understanding of a broader range of payments to governments by extractive and oil, gas and mineral trading companies based not only in the UK but further afield, enabling citizens and civil society to hold companies and governments more to account for revenues generated from developing countries' finite natural resources. In particular a new global transparency standard for extractives commodity trading will impact positively on citizens of sub-Saharan Africa's leading oil producers, including countries where the "resource curse" is strong such as Angola, Congo-Brazzaville, Gabon and Nigeria, which are highly dependent on commodity trading.

Milestones

1	2017 - All UK-listed (LSE Main Market) extractive companies start to publish data under the EU Directives in an open and accessible format
2	2017 - The UK's statutory review of the Reports on Payments to Governments Regulations 2014 recommends extending disclosure requirements to payments to governments (including to national oil companies) for the sale of oil, gas and minerals, and other categories of payments to governments (relating to transportation and export activities, for social expenditures and to state security forces for security services), and to the Alternative Investment Market (AIM) market, and to commodity payments to governments (including to national oil companies) and other categories of payments to governments (relating to transportation and export activities, for social expenditures and to state security forces for security services), and to engagement with the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies with a view to their implementing similar disclosure rules
3	2018 - The UK presents to the EU Commission's review of the 2013 Accounting Directive's extractive transparency regime its recommendations to extend disclosure requirements to commodity payments to governments (including to national oil companies), to payments to governments relating to transportation and export activities and for social expenditures, and to state security forces for security services
4	2018 - The Alternative Investment Market (AIM) implements extractive industry disclosure requirements consistent with the Main Market rules
5	2018 - The UK engages with the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies with a view to their implementing similar disclosure rules

3. Extend beneficial ownership disclosure

Ensure that all companies that own property or participate in delivering government obligations to provide public, goods, services and infrastructure will disclose who controls and benefits from their business decisions as open data.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Corruption thrives under conditions of secrecy, which the Government has already acknowledged in its approach to beneficial ownership. However, more can be done by HMG to extend this beyond the UK, using mechanisms within the UK Government's control.

One obvious way would be to require beneficial ownership disclosure from all companies that participate in the delivery of public goods, services and infrastructure in the UK or overseas.

Also, much high-value property is owned by company vehicles, not named individuals. This is a proven means of hiding corrupt assets. From 2016, UK-registered companies that own property will no longer be able to hide their beneficial owners. This means there will no longer be a level playing field with foreign-owned companies, which can own property without declaring who the owner is. Therefore, corrupt money will continue to flow undetected into UK property.

Main Objective

HMG should extend requirements to disclose beneficial ownership as open data in the following areas:

- All companies that participate in the delivery of public goods, services and infrastructure in the UK or overseas.
- Companies that bid for UK public contracts, including any sub-contractors or suppliers relevant to the contract.
- HMG should publish the ultimate beneficial ownership information of UK properties owned by overseas companies, on the same basis as Companies House is set to do for UK companies under current legislation.
- The UK needs to bring to bear whatever power and influence it has to ensure implementation of a public beneficial ownership regime in the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.

Relevance

The public disclosure of beneficial ownership information will enable citizens to know who owns the companies that deliver government services, bid for public contracts, and own UK property.

The B20 has highlighted how the lack of transparency and corruption can deter investment and make it more expensive to deliver infrastructure. Making company structures more transparent is one step towards supporting good businesses and encouraging their participation in meeting the estimated $1 trillion per year infrastructure gap..

It is important to turn transparency into a benefit for companies themselves, and not just other stakeholders. This can be achieved by creating a transparency dividend, such that more transparent companies will be the preferred partners in deals and have greater eligibility for bidding processes.

Ambition

When corrupt individuals and other criminals obtain illicit funds, they seek out ways to disguise the illegal origin of the money and to store the value somewhere secure. This means that all manner of investments can be used to launder the proceeds of corruption. Through this laundering process, illegally acquired wealth, such as bribes, kick-backs, illicit political contributions, embezzled funds and fake loans – as well as the proceeds of trafficking, frauds and tax evasion – are given an appearance of legitimacy. The assets can then be enjoyed by the corrupt or further moved on for other legal or illegal purposes. The UK is an attractive location to launder, hide or enjoy the proceeds of corruption from around the world. The individuals who perpetrate these crimes are often engaged in grand corruption – corruption that pervades the highest levels of a national government and leads to a broad erosion of confidence in good governance, the rule of law and economic stability and enables the theft of very large amounts of wealth.

Extending beneficial ownership requirements to property owners and companies registered in the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies will make it harder to hide illicit wealth in the UK.

Extending disclosure requirements to companies bidding for and delivering government contracts will enable government officials and civil society to know who are the true owners of the companies that are receiving and spending public money. Greater openness will help to develop understanding about how to successfully engage private companies in the delivery of government obligations and to build public trust in government.

Milestones

1	September - November 2015: UK Government consults on extending beneficial ownership to foreign companies buying UK property and bidding for UK Government contracts
2	January 2016 - UK Government announces findings / decisions following consultation period.
3	November 2015 - Overseas Territories Joint Ministerial Council meeting

4. Increase lobbying transparency

HMG should reform the statutory register of lobbyists so that it provides meaningful information about the scale and nature of lobbying in the UK.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Lobbying is a healthy part of democracy and can lead to better decisions and more effective policies. However, it can be done in a way that distorts the democratic process. In turn, this can adversely affect citizens' trust in their representatives and the government.

According to Transparency International's latest Global Corruption Barometer (2013), 59 per cent of respondents believed that the UK government is 'entirely' or 'to a large extent' run by a few big entities acting in their own best interests; 67 per cent thought that political parties in the UK are 'corrupt' or 'extremely corrupt'; and 55 per cent thought that the UK parliament is 'corrupt' or 'extremely corrupt'.

Despite recent reforms, there is still very little transparency about the scale and nature of lobbying activities in the UK and little disincentive to prevent corrupting behaviour by lobbyists. The statutory register only covers a fraction of those engaged in lobbying activities, it provides no information on the activities of lobbyists, or the amount of money being spent to promote certain policies or views and it only covers those engaging with senior government figures, such as Ministers and Permanent Secretaries - it does not cover influencing aimed at mid-level civil servants, or parliamentarians.

In its White Paper on lobbying, the government claimed that there was no need to widen the scope of the statutory register because details of interactions between government and in-house lobbyists was already made available through data containing information on meetings between Ministers, Permanent Secretaries and Special Advisers and external organisations. However, this data has significant issues which means that it does not compensate for a comprehensive statutory register of lobbyists. Its issues include:

- Scope: they only cover meetings between lobbyists and senior government figures, when a lot of influencing work is aimed at mid-level civil servants and parliamentarians. They also do not provide information about how much is being spent by lobbyists on their influencing activities.
- Accessibility: the latest versions of this data cover April to June 2014 and only half of departments publish it as machine-readable open data.
- Meaningfulness: there is insufficient information in most of the data to give members of the public an idea of what was discussed in the meetings.
- Accuracy: questions have been raised about how complete these records are. For example, there have been a number of incidents where Ministers have not reported meetings with lobbyists.
- Intelligibility: the lack of structure in the data means it is hard for the public to easily analyse how many people are trying to influence government and who they are.

Main Objective

To expand the scope and requirements of the statutory register of lobbyists to provide greater transparency about who is trying to influence public policy and decisions within the current Parliament. The new register should include:

- in-house as well as consultant lobbyists
- lobbyists who are trying to influence UK Government Ministers, Permanent Secretaries, Special Advisers, mid-level Civil Servants and UK Parliamentarians
- details of their registered address and company recognition number (if applicable)
- quarterly updates detailing their activities during that period, including:
  - an honest and reasonable assessment of how much they spent on lobbying activities
  - details of any staff they had seconded to a government department
  - details of who lobbyists are trying to influence i.e. which government department of official
  - details of the names of lobbyists who have lobbied on their behalf of within the previous quarter
  - details of any public office held previously (during the past five years) by any employees who are engaged in lobbying
  - details of what they are trying to influence i.e. the policy, legislation, contract, licence etc.

Relevance

Providing transparency about who is trying to influence public policy and decisions would make our democratic system more open and accountable to citizens.

Ambition

Providing more information about who is trying to influence public policy and decision-making would increase the openness of our political system. In turn this would help citizens hold their representatives and public officials to account for the decisions they make.

Milestones

1	January 2016 - Begin work on White Paper
2	April 2016 - Publish White Paper and open consultation on draft proposals
3	August 2016 - Close consultation
4	October 2016 - Government publishes its response to the consultation

5	November 2016 - First reading in the House of Commons
6	Passage of Bill - informal engagement between the lobbying Registrar and those potentially affected by the legislation about the practical consequences of the changes
6	November 2017 - Royal Assent
7	June 2017 - end of transitional provisions and commencement of new rules

Citizen Participation

5. Improve consultation practice

Develop process and tools for more effective consultation practices.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

The principle that those affected by decisions should be given the opportunity to shape those decisions is central to open government. Outside periodically voting for elected representatives, citizens (in the broadest sense of term to mean all inhabitants of a country or local region) must be offered opportunities to provide their input into key policy decisions that affect them.

Consultation provides not only an opportunity to gather opinion and values, but also an opportunity to tap into the expertise of the public; crowdsourcing insights that government would not otherwise have access to. However, this process is often experienced, both by government and by citizens, as a tick-box exercise: more concerned with compliance than with conversation and dialogue.

Consultation principles and requirements on government to consult have been progressively weakened, with recommended and mandatory timelines removed. Many national and local government agencies have lost specialist staff capacity to deal with consultation, and early experiments by government with the use of social media for greater consultation and dialogue have not been followed up systematically. Furthermore, many consultations taking place in ways that limit the effective ability of citizens to engage, and too frequently the process of consultation is not transparent, and those who do respond are often left with little understanding about how their ideas have been considered and heard, or why their views may not be taken on board.

Research into civic engagement shows repeatedly that the consultation process itself is damaged and the public becomes apathetic if the time they invest in consultation is perceived to be wasted. If policy-makers do not respond to the findings of consultation, credibility, engagement and trust are severely impaired. Ministers, as elected representatives of members of the public, have ultimate authority in policy-making; their role in ensuring that consultation is carried out at the right time, heard, and responded to is paramount.

With Government self-monitoring consultation performance, there is little transparency about consultation performance, and little ability for citizens to raise concerns that decision making has not been sufficiently informed by the public voice.

Main Objectives

Government should work to create a stronger culture of responsive, accessible, and transparent consultation.

Building on the template of the Government Service Design Manual, which offers accessible guidance for civil servants in agile management of digital services, government should develop a Consultation Design Manual and toolkit, remixing existing resources to provide improved support for officials carrying out consultations, and should also include guidance on how findings of consultations should be processed to Ministers for consideration.

Work needs to be done to better understand what an effective response to consultation should look like and to develop the processes to enact this. While it is understood that government has to act on all most or even any of the findings of a consultation. However, those who have given their time and ideas in a consultation have the right to know that these ideas were considered, how. Furthermore, where popular or majority ideas were not incorporated into a policy, a response should explain the reasons for this.

Greater transparency should be provided about consultations, with a regular review published with information on consultations listed on GOV.UK, including details of their opening dates, duration, number of responses (alongside some data about demographics of respondents), and the number of days taken for a government response to be published.

Public sector consultation standards should not be monitored by government itself, and instead an external organisation, such at the National Audit Office, should be given responsibility for public sector consultation standards, and for ensuring compliance, with a clear complaints route to an Ombudsman. Introduce a system by which further checks and balances such as proper scrutiny of published summaries of data, feedback communications and submissions to decision-makers are added.

Civil society also has a responsibility here: to provide greater oversight of consultation as a whole, evaluating government progress, and providing constructive critical feedback on areas to improve.

Relevance

The right for citizens to participate in the decisions that affect their lives is a central element of open government and one of the key eligibility criteria for the OGP. Effective consultation processes that allow citizens to participate fully, including being heard, and the tools to enable civil servants to do this, are crucial.

This commitment seeks to develop better consultation process and tools, and to create opportunities to re-establish trust in the process of policy-making informed by consultation, requiring policy-makers to communicate their response in a way that demonstrates genuine consideration of public voices, and developing a process by which Government are not self-monitoring their own processes.

Transparent evidence, in the form of a published response to each consultation that details how the government have used the information from the public strengthens openness and accountability: how public voices have influenced policy and explaining where they have not strengthens accountability and openness.

An external body, in the form of the National Audit Office, should have responsibility for public sector consultation standards and ensuring compliance, with a clear complaints route provided. This would mark an end to unenforced standards, fewer judicial reviews, result in a greater confidence in consultative processes, as well as increasing government accountability.

Ambition

In an increasingly complex world, citizens' input is a critical resource for policy-making, as good decision-making requires the knowledge, experiences, views and values of the public.

The process of consultation is typically opaque, with little built in requirement for engagement of a wide range of individuals. Institutionalising a minimum level of citizen engagement in the policy process is important for ensuring that the views of citizens and other stakeholders are present when decisions are made, and that decisions are better informed as a result.

With a lack of transparency about how decisions are reached from the input curated through consultation, too frequently citizens are left feeling disengaged and lacking in trust in the decisions. Creating a requirement for government to respond about how public voices have or have not been taken on board in the decision making process creates feedback loops and prevents this breakdown in trust.

Finally, there is need for greater accountability. Government should not self-monitor their own consultation standards, and instead this should be provided.

An external body, in the form of the National Audit Office, should have responsibility for public sector consultation standards and ensuring compliance, with a clear complaints route provided. This would mark an end to unenforced standards, fewer judicial reviews, result in a greater confidence in consultative processes, as well as increasing government accountability.

Milestones

1	Civil society and government co-produce a manual and toolkit to improve consultation processes using both online and offline means. This should include guidance on how findings of consultation should be processed to Ministers for consideration.
2	Develop mandate for manual and toolkit to be used across the civil service
3	Civil society and government co-produce guidance for how policy-makers (defined as those with elected responsibility) should effect a response to consultation and the parametres of what that response should look like
4	Explore existing mandates for Ministerial Responsibility that could be strengthened to incorporate a requirement for response to consultation
5	Quarterly publication of statistics on consultations undertaken by central government (including details of their opening dates, duration, number of responses and some details about demographics of respondents)
6	Provide National Audit Office with remit to monitor public sector consultation and ensure compliance.
7	Set up an Ombudsman with oversight for public consultation

6. Open policy making pilot projects

Explore and practice open policy-making and share learning

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Policy makers need to develop and trial a range of different approaches to open policy making and citizen engagement to understand what works best and when.

As citizen engagement is a continuously developing field, with new evidence of benefits and limitations of different techniques in different settings emerging on an ongoing basis, continued exploration needs to take place to understand the tools and opportunities available for national and local governments to hear from a wider range of citizens.

Following this up with evaluation and sharing this learning across Whitehall, local governments, and devolved regions can ensure the maximum benefit for this work, and enable greater uptake and understanding of open policy making across the UK.

Main Objective

The UK Government will explore opportunities for open policy making by trialling 10 different open-policy and participation projects for capturing citizen involvement and feedback into policy formation in different departments, focussing on different stages of policy development, such as at the very early stages of policy formation on a particular issue, during a formal consultation, and following publication of a draft Bill. This builds upon commitments made in the UK's 2nd Open Government Partnership (OGP) National Action Plan to open up policy-making:

"The UK government will demonstrate the potential of open policy making by running at least five 'test and demonstrate projects' across different policy areas. These will inform how open policy making can be deployed across the civil service"

Consideration must be given to geographic diversity, and engagement with diverse audiences, and one of these pilot projects should include a participation project specifically focussed on engaging and ensuring the genuine participation of children.

These trials should be co-created in discussion with civil society organisations and built with an expectation of informing participants how their views have been heard, other competing insights, actions taken as a result (even if there is little), with feedback provided in language that participants can understand.

Subsequent to the completion of the 10 projects, a report should be created to share learning across Whitehall, comparing the different methodologies, value given, lessons learned, and how Government can learn from (and embed these ideas where appropriate) in future policy making. This evaluative report should also include recording the number of individuals engaged, the mechanisms by which they were engaged and how feedback was provided to those who engaged.

To better share learning outside of just Whitehall, and to raise the awareness of open policy making among local governments, devolved regions, and citizens, other dissemination activities should also take place - including 4 events taking place across the UK focussed specifically at engaging local government and devolved regions. Other dissemination activities could include blog posts or creation of a video.

Regular progress updates (every 6 months) of the progress made on this commitment should be provided to Parliament

Relevance

Open policy making is one means of civic participation. Citizen engagement, as part of that process, is a continuously developing field, with new evidence of benefits and limitations of different techniques in different settings emerging on an ongoing basis. There is no single "correct" model that should be adopted in any given scenario, but instead a range of possible approaches, the design of which can be tweaked to result in different outcomes.

It is therefore important that governments and civil society continue to explore the efficacy of different approaches to citizen engagement in different scenarios, but do so in an agile way that enables continued development of approaches, and encourages the sharing of best practice across both Whitehall and local government.

Ambition

This is an expansion upon a previous OGP commitment to open policy making with an increased number of projects, but also with very specific focus upon increasing inclusion, developing feedback mechanisms, and ensuring involvement at a variety of stages of policy formation.

There are also built in requirements to share learning across Whitehall and into local governments and devolved regions, helping to disseminate knowledge of open policy making and best practice among policy-makers and civil servants across the country.

Milestones

1	Government and civil society codesign 10 different open policy making projects based across a number of government departments focussing on different stages of policy development. At least one of these should focus on children's participation.
2	Initiation of 10 open policy making projects

3	Completion of 10 open policy making projects
3	Evaluative report published, including statistics on the number of individuals engaged, the mechanisms by which they were engaged and how feedback was provided to those who engaged.
4	4 events run sharing learning with devolved regions and local government
5	Identification of other effective dissemination mechanisms for sharing learning
6	Dissemination of learning taken place
7	Progress reports on commitment provided every 6 months

Open Budgets

7. Lead on transparency, public participation and accountability in the budget process

Increase transparency, public participation and accountability in the budget process at all levels domestically and internationally.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Greater transparency and increased active public participation in the budget process at all levels to ensure more accountable, responsive governance and effective use of public funds in the UK and abroad. The UK government should be a leading performer on the Open Budget Survey.

Transformation and innovation in developing reformed public services is essential in the current fiscal climate, but we know that formal politics and our traditional democratic processes struggle to attract participation and engagement from the wider demographic of the UK. This proposal suggests a 'test and learn' approach to designing greater participation in the influencing stages of budget setting and spending, and opening up budgets to greater transparency and public participation.

Main Objective

There are two objectives for this commitment:

1. To increase transparency, public participation and accountability in the budget process at all levels by promoting the implementation of the [GIFT High-Level Principles](#) domestically and internationally and improving fiscal performance as per the transparency, participation and oversight indicators of the [Open Budget Survey](#). Steps include increasing comprehensive of budget documents, legislative public hearings during the budget cycle where citizens can testify and provision of feedback by the executive and supreme audit institution on how public inputs are taken into account.
2. To implement the principles of participatory budgeting into a process that empowers the public to spend a percentage (0.25-1%) of public funds. A Citizen's Jury will design the process and make recommendations in response to their question: What would it take to devolve 0.25- 1% of a public budget to a citizen participation process? Our objective would be to apply those recommendations in a 'test and learn' environment.

Relevance

On 28th March 2015 The United Nations passed a resolution that stated it is the "...responsibility of States to ensure that relevant national laws and policies are translated into transparent, participatory and accountable budgets and spending" The resolution follows UN Resolution 67/218 endorsing the [Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency High-Level Principles](#) and calls upon States to make budgeting processes open, transparent, accessible and participatory.

The UK is in a strong position to deliver on this commitment domestically and internationally as per the transparency, participation and oversight indicators and practices of the [Open Budget Survey](#) and GIFT High-Level Principles. There is extensive evidence of how national and local governments have delivered on greater transparency, public participation and accountability in the budget process at all levels in a mainstreamed manner.

The UK should draw on tried and tested use of Participatory Budgeting in policing, health, local government and voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) organisations, and extending that practice into the mainstream budgeting process of both national and local budgeting.   This commitment has civic participation at its core and applies best practice principles of PB to ensure that civic participation becomes a strong and meaningful feature of open government when influencing public spending decisions.

The commitment can be measured by using the Open Budget Survey. The Open Budget Survey 2015, released on 9ᵗʰ September, provides specific recommendations for the UK and 101 other countries. [Recommendations for the UK](#) include increasing the comprehensiveness of the Executive Budget's Proposal and Enacted Budget; establishing credible, effective participation mechanisms such as public hearings, surveys and focus groups during the budget process; holding legislative hearings on the budgets of ministries, departments and agencies; providing feedback on how public inputs have been used.

Ambition

By adopting a 'test and learn' approach to greater participation in budgeting processes, the learning from this commitment will inform how the UK could extend and develop their approach to mainstreaming citizen participation in public spending.

By developing and scaling up existing practices, the government can deliver greater assurances to the UK taxpayer that their funds are well spent, and greater dividends to governments and recipients of UK aid.

Implementation of the GIFT High Level Principles, the Participatory Budgeting principles, the learning from over 300 participatory budgeting processes in the UK, and the practices

outlined in the Open Budget Survey can improve governance, trust and services that respond to citizens' needs.

Milestones

1	The UK champions fiscal and budget transparency, participation and accountability, including the implementation of the GIFT High-Level Principles, in international fora, such as the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group (e.g. Cabinet Office), GIFT and the OGP Fiscal Openness Working Group (e.g. HM Treasury, DFID) and the Sustainable Development Agenda with UK aid recipient partners (e.g. DFID, FCO)
2	Within 3 months, the Citizens Jury will be randomly selected and briefed on their role. They will have agreed the range of 'expert witnesses' required to make their recommendations with the Cabinet Office and OGN.
3	Within 6 months, the Citizens Jury receives all evidence and makes its recommendations on what it would take to devolve 0.25-1% of a public budget to a citizen participation process.
4	Within 9 months, the Government and OGN agree what percentage of which public budgets will be used to test the approach. We propose that the decision about which departments and organisations are involved should rest with the government of the day, but that they should seek to encourage those agencies at a central and local level to participate so that the learning is maximised across different levels of government for future consideration.
5	Within 12 months, the participatory budgeting process will be agreed with the identified departments and briefings/ support on the process provided
6	Within 2 years, the process of participatory budgeting process will have been conducted as per agreement at milestone 3 date.
7	The UK improves budget performance as per the transparency, participation and oversight indicators of the [Open Budget Survey](#) (measured by the Open Budget Survey 2017)

---

8. Increase the transparency and accountability of tax incentives/reliefs

Ensure all UK tax incentives/reliefs are annually costed and subject to periodic review to ensure they serve their purpose and provide value for money.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Currently the UK undertakes a cost benefit analysis of tax incentives and reliefs prior to adoption, but does not systematically undertake continuous monitoring once passed into law.

This is a problem as there is general agreement among economists that tax incentives have the potential to be harmful, and as such should be treated with caution and subject to close monitoring, yet this is not happening. This is a global problem, in developing countries it is estimated that harmful tax incentives are costing developing countries around $130bn a year (Action Aid). There are also various EU inquiries into harmful tax competition currently being undertaken.

In the UK the Public Accounts Committee found that HMRC is deficient in its reporting of tax reliefs, of tracking performance against stated objectives, and also including the cost of tax reliefs into policy spending (http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmpubacc/892/892.pdf). This commitment is consistent with the recommendations in the PAC report, as well as recommendations made by the OECD, UN, IMF and WB to the 2011 G20 (see http://www.oecd.org/ctp/48993634.pdf pg 23-24). Some other countries are more advanced than the UK in this regard - e.g. India does seek to attach an annual costing of reliefs to its budget http://www.indiabudget.nic.in/ub2015-16/statrevfor/annex12.pdf)

Main Objective

To extend the existing transparency of UK tax incentives and reliefs to enable greater monitoring and periodic assessment, ensuring parliamentary and public awareness and trust in the UK regime, and ensure value for money.

UK leadership in this area would also ensure the UK meets the recommendation of the UN/IMF/OECD and WB to the G20 in 2011 for G20 countries to show leadership in transparency and accountability of tax incentives, to drive the spread of best practice globally, especially to developing countries.

Relevance

This commitment would provide access to new information on how how the UK's tax incentives and reliefs operate, information that is necessary to understand the impact and utility of the measures that have been implemented, and to assess the likelihood of success of new measures. Thus public accountability would be increased by providing the tools and information to hold the government accountable. It will also help increase understanding of how the UK tax system works, and so enable greater civic participation in discussions on the development of the UK tax system.

So long as the methodology used is shared and made open it should provide opportunities for greater use of technology and innovation in improving the monitoring and assessment of tax incentives globally.

Ambition

This improved transparency would ensure the government is both more open, through the provision of more information, and improved as tax incentives and reliefs would have to be regularly assessed and justified, ensuring that poor incentives are removed from legislation.

Milestones

1	Independent body (e.g. NAO or OBR) mandated to develop methodology for costing and assessing tax incentives, with first comprehensive report costing all UK tax reliefs produced by end of plan
2	UK Government to develop schedule for rolling assessment of all UK tax reliefs, with first assessments to be conducted and submitted to parliament for debate by end of plan

Open Contracting

9. Fully adopt the Open Contracting Principles and data standards

Fully implement the Open Contracting Partnership's Global Principles and Data Standard across government.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

The 2013 UK OGP National Action Plan incorporated a commitment on Open Contracting (12). The UK committed to "endorse, implement and champion" the Open Contracting Principles and to explore adoption of the Open Contracting Data Standard for publishing data through Contracts Finder. Contracts Finder currently captures core metadata on public sector procurement and awards over £10,000 in central government, and £25,000 in the wider public sector.

Government also committed to: "look to introduce standard transparency clauses into central government contracts in consultation with civil society organisations and the business community" and to "take steps to ensure transparency about outsourced services is provided in response to freedom of information requests, by encouraging the use and enforcement of contractual provisions to maintain the levels of transparency provided by the Freedom of Information Act 2000" with revised guidance due to be provided in 2014.

Initial work on supporting the Open Contracting Data Standard in Contracts Finder has been undertaken, but is not yet deployed. Planning, tender and award stages of the contracting process are captured, but final contracts and contract amendments are not currently tracked in the platform. The disclosure of the full text of contracts, both for Major Projects and for general processes tracked on Contracts Finder remains an area of limited progress.

Overall, the IRM judged that there has been substantial progress against the 2013 Open Contracting NAP Commitments, but that "taken together, these changes represent a minor move forward in the area of contractual openness."

Building on the solid implementation of specific 2013 open contracting milestones, but their modest overall impact, the 2015 NAP should renew a commitment to open contracting and push forward ambitious developments, with clear targets for coverage, data quality and auditing of contract transparency clauses: moving forward towards comprehensive disclosure of all contracts.

Main Objective

- Ensure all government contracting process are proactively disclosed. This should include disclosure of the text of contracts and all annexes and cover overseas development assistance.

- Ensure full adoption of the Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS) for disclosure, including the use of open identifiers for companies, charities and other bodies;

- Support greater citizen participation in the design, planning and monitoring of contracts, as per the [Open Contracting Global Principles](#).

Relevance

Contracting is a primary means of delivering public services. Increasing openness, including transparency and participation, in contracting ensures greater accountability for public funds, and opens up opportunities for greater citizen control over those services.

Better oversight of contracting information allows government to understand its supply chain better, driving more efficient procurement and use of public resources, and reducing government exposure to supply chain risks.

The Open Contracting Data Standard deploys open data as a key tool for open government, building on the technology and innovation pillar of the OGP.

Ambition

As a result of implementing the Open Contracting Principles:

- Government, the private sector, and civil society, will all have more information to engage effectively with public procurement.
- Citizens will guide procurement processes to produce better outcomes.
- Cases of inefficiency and corruption will be identified.

Milestones

1	HMG commits to apply the [open contracting partnership's global principles](#) to all organisations contracted to deliver public goods, services and infrastructure, including overseas development assistance.
2	Contracts Finder fully implements the Open Contracting Data Standard for all stages of the contracting process

3	Contracts Finder is updated to record the full details of contracts (in addition to awards), contract amendments, and the final termination of contracts.

10. Introduce a public contracting disclosure baseline

Ensure a common set of information is disclosed by contractors supplying government.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

It is difficult to track the delivery of contracted out public services: for example, to identify who work was ultimately subcontracted to, or who the beneficial owners of companies funds flow to are.

Contracts Finder only includes award notices, not details of final contracts, and there are no common standards for the information that suppliers contracting to government should provide back on their publicly funded projects.

The need for greater contract transparency was recognised by the coalition government which published a set of [transparency principles on the proactive release of contract information](#)[2]. This is a positive step but stronger guidelines are required to ensure a consistent baseline of contract information is released in all instances.

Main Objective

A baseline data requirement should be applied in all public sector contracts, requesting key information from contractors as part of their reporting. Where possible, this should be linked to the government's standard transparency clause and associated schedules in the model services agreement. Baseline data should also reflect the UK's commitment to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) and function to proactively develop standards for undertaking human rights due diligence. This data could be captured through the national Contracts Finder platform, and made available to support scrutiny of contracts. All such data should be provided in a machine readable format.

The baseline should be designed in collaboration with civil society and should contain, at a minimum:
- Fees paid by the contracting authority to suppliers
- Performance against headline KPIs (this will vary according to the type of service provision)

---

[2] Note, these are narrower than the Open Contracting Global Principles, which also set out the need for citizen participation in the contracting process.

- Details of the beneficial owners of the companies receiving funds through the contract (captured in the company register for UK companies; and reported separately for non-UK firms)?
- Names and open identifiers (e.g. company and/or charity numbers) of subcontractors, including how much money has been passed to these subcontractors?
- Information about contributions that members of the supply chain have made towards KPIs for the contract?
- For contracts over a given threshold, beneficial ownership and corporate structure information of the firm;
- Whether or not the contracts contain a requirement to provide information in response to FOI requests?
- Details of any arrangements undertaken to reduce tax due on the contract?

Where contracts are subcontracted or with financial intermediaries, they should pass on these requirements to those they contract with.

The baseline data requirements should be included in all government contracts, with a clear mechanism for public reporting of the data.

'Gagging clauses' should be routinely removed from government contracts as part of the process of creating a baseline data requirement. Otherwise, a scenario could arise where a 'gagging clause' is prioritised over the baseline data requirement because the information to be disclosed – for example on poor performance or value for money – is judged adversely to affect the reputation of the commissioner or prime contractor. The public interest is served by full disclosure of the facts about how taxpayers' money is being spent through government contracting, even if such disclosure adversely affects the reputation of the contractor or commissioning body.

Relevance

This commitment increases access to information on the use of public resources, providing a basis for greater public accountability, and civic participation. In uses new technologies to do this.

It is also of value to efficient and effective government: giving the government better information about its supply chain.

Ambition

For Open Government to be truly effective, citizens need to be able to 'follow the money' and understand how public services are being delivered, wherever they are being delivered with public money. Using contracts to ensure a basic level of transparency exists for the use of public resources in the private, public and voluntary sector requires an ambitious

commitment to overcome common excuses and barriers about commercial confidentiality or undue burdens - showing that open government can be, and should be, truly multi-stakeholder and cross-sector.

Milestones

1	Agree a baseline information set & data standard which lead the way in the implementation of the UNGPs
2	Develop tools (contract clauses, or schedule to the standard transparency clause), to implement the baseline
3	Update Contracts Finder to collect the relevant data

11. Promote public participation in contracting

Increase the opportunities for citizens to be involved in planning, tender and oversight processes

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Open Contracting principles call for citizens to be engaged in all stages of the contracting process, including design, planning and review.

Yet, there are few structured opportunities in the UK for citizens to participate: either in the planning for procurement, or in assessing whether goods and services delivered were of a high enough quality.

Main Objective

- Increase the opportunities for citizens to be involved in planning, tender and oversight processes - at both national and local level;

- Pilot digital tools that support citizens to engage in the planning, delivery and evaluation stages of contracting;

- Ensure there is a preferential option for those living in poverty and marginalised groups, so that public expenditure stimulates skills and entrepreneurship amongst these groups.

This may include creating visualisation and user-input tools that help citizens to discover aspects of the contracting pipeline relevant to them, and to provide their input and feedback on proposals, including those that will work for people who live in poverty and marginalised groups. Right now, the Contracts Finder platform is oriented solely towards suppliers: yet citizens often have key expertise on identifying precisely what the demands are in each local context as it changes over time, how to get the best value for money, and deliver the best services, for a planned procurement. Developing interfaces that can alert

citizens to planned contracts affecting their local area, or their subject areas of interest, and then tools that help solicit input from citizens, could offer an important way to crowdsource insights and experiences.

Similarly, at the implementation stage of contracting, citizens have a key role to play in oversight. Creating visualisations that can indicate contract performance (drawing on information provided as part of the common baseline in Commitment 2) and that invite feedback from the beneficiaries of contracts, opens up a further space to ensure contracted out public services are delivering effectively.

Relevance

Participation is a central theme of Open Government, and contracting is a central way in which public services are now delivered.

Increasing openness, including transparency and participation, in contracting ensures greater accountability for public funds, and opens up opportunities for greater citizen control over those services.

Better oversight of contracting information allows government to understand its supply chain better, driving more efficient procurement and use of public resources, and reducing government exposure to supply chain risks.

Ambition

The UK has a leading role to play in connecting the disclosure and participation aspects of Open Contracting. Public procurement and contracting are a vital strand in the Prime Minister's golden thread of conditions that enable countries to be successful the world over. It's the biggest part of government spending and it's the most at risk of corruption.

Government, the private sector, and civil society, will all have more information to engage effectively with public procurement.

Citizens will guide procurement processes to produce better outcomes. Civil society monitoring, for example, is transformational for service delivery, helping to halve the costs of textbooks in the Philippines and infrastructure such as roads, clinics and schools in various OGP countries.[3]

Milestones

1	Develop a pilot for citizen participation in the planning phase of contracting;
2	Develop interfaces to visualise contract performance, and invite citizen feedback on contract delivery;

[3]

http://www.open-contracting.org/why_finance_ministers_should_care_about_open_contracting

3	Develop a distinct element of the same pilot that is focused on: a) improving the participation of those living in poverty and marginalised groups b) on identifying the positive and negative outcomes outcomes of government expenditure on their quality of life and livelihood c) identifying learning from this evidence in multi stakeholder groups and applying this to the design of future government expenditure in order to create an option for people living in poverty and marginalised groups.

Open Data

12. Implement the UK's National Information Infrastructure:

Publish a plan and mechanism to compel the publication or creation, of core data assets that make up the UK's NII.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

In its last action plan, the UK government committed to identifying and defining a UK National Information Infrastructure. Opening up core data sets with wide economic, social and environmental potential was at the centre of the NII planning. Now is the time to put this into action. The UK government needs to take concrete action to create a strong data infrastructure for people inside and outside government to build on.

Main Objective

As part of the National Information Infrastructure, the government should invest in the sustainable publication of - or, if not currently collected by government, the creation -   core data assets as open data.

Relevance

Our data infrastructure is as important as our physical infrastructure. It powers many of our services and provides insights to help us make decisions. It is a baseline condition for a healthy, progressive society, and a competitive global economy. A well-maintained data infrastructure will undoubtedly increase interoperability and collaboration, efficiency and productivity across all sectors, nationally and internationally.

Ambition

Land valuations and geospatial data are just some data assets that have the capacity for immense economic and social impact. Address data in particular, has [demonstrated](#) the considerable potential and value in opening up core data sets. In order for this value to be realised, there must be a clear commitment to the progression and publication of these national data assets. A transparent and open process will ensure that data infrastructure will be cost-effective,demand driven and meet the needs of users.

Milestones

1	Work with data users to define the kinds of data inside and outside government that are to be considered core data assets for the purpose of the National Information Infrastructure.
2	Re-open dialogue on what information qualifies as socially, economically and environmentally valuable.
3	Invest in making core data assets available as open data, including: • a national address database • a registry of land valuations and beneficial ownership information • geospatial data
4	Identify/establish mechanisms for formal feedback/engagement with open data users as part of refining the NII and delivering future open data policies
5	Implement a framework for management of the NII that ensures data is maintained as much as possible using open standards, non-proprietary identifiers and open mechanisms for feedback and amendments.
6	Identify the datasets that government departments are obligated by statute to release and outline a strategy as to how and when these will be released.
7	Ensure that each core dataset released within the NII framework contains a clear course for community engagement including data users, service users, data subjects and data owners.
8	The Office for National Statistics and the wider Government Statistical Service should be given adequate resources to develop new ways of making data easily accessible to business and policy-makers, educational institutions and civil society.

13. Involve data users in shaping the future of open data

Establish a formal mechanism for open data users to communicate with Government and help to deliver the UK's open data NAP commitments

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed
The Open Data User Group (ODUG)'s mandate ended in May 2015. It's unclear whether there are any plans for a structured method of contributing user perspectives to government data policy making. The lack of representation for data users will limit the government's understanding of user needs for open data.

Main Objective

The UK government needs to commit to the creation of a formal mechanism to ensure user perspectives are a part of government open data policy making. The open data community can work with government to deliver its NAP open data commitments. The establishment of a representative group of open data users will allow for better understanding of the interests and issues for open data users.

Relevance

The open data community represents a significant resource for the UK government. Establishing a clear, structured and transparent method of communication will ensure that open data policies are informed and reflective of the needs of data users who build services with the data that government publishes. .

Ambition

In committing to establishing stronger links with both the open data community and a representative user group, the government will create a more transparent and accessible dialogue around open data needs, concerns and issues.

Milestones

1	Establish an advisory group to contribute to government open data policy making.
2	Define a clear objective for this group and delineate appropriate powers to allow them to achieve their objectives. As part of their remit, provide them with the power to review data request and release processes and deliver actionable recommendations.
3	Maintain direct links with the open data community to ensure the user group continues to be an accurate representation of user needs.
4	Use this group to coordinate with open data users and highlight additional areas of government policy that can be made more transparent, and/or drive efficiencies, using open data.

14. Make full use of data assets

Require the use of open data in decision making processes and actively encourage data use by citizens and service users for participation and accountability

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

At the moment, many departments release certain data assets as open data but don't use open data themselves to improve their decision making processes nor always encourage civil society and citizens to use the data to participate and hold the government accountable. For example, impact assessments accompanying policy decisions rarely ever include publication of the data and models underpinning the assessment. Nor is open data concerning government processes widely used to understand how these could be more efficient or transparent - e.g. data about FOI requests (how many, average response time, nature of request, data requested) for each department should be a fundamental part of reviewing the efficacy of FOI processes. In many cases, citizens and beneficiaries of government spending find it difficult to use and access data without the right training and user friendly tools.

Main Objective

Open data is an invaluable mechanism to enable greater transparency of government - how it works, how much things cost and where processes could be more efficient. However, it needs to be used so it can realise its accountability potential and drive change in government's' performance and responsiveness.

Relevance

Open data is a significant resource with vast potential for increasing transparency and efficiency within government. In embedding the use open data in decision making processes and using the wide-ranging potential of open data; the government will also play a significant and more informed role in accelerating the data publication cycle.

Ambition

The government requires that departments and agencies publish, use and reuse open data within its decision making process. Doing so will ensure that open data is embedded within government policy and the benefits and challenges remain a significant part of government procedure.

Milestones

1	● Require that departments and agencies publish certain kinds of data as open data, including:

	○ information about how certain personal data, like medical records and attribute based access data such as student records are being accessed and shared, and by whom
	    ○ information about aid spending - departments (beyond DFID) should aim to publish at least 80% of their total aid spending to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).
	    ○ information about planned policy reforms e.g. application for fracking, changes to housing planning policy etc.
	    ○ Implement plans to improve the use of open data within government - for example, by requiring that impact assessments use open data sources, and make available the data and models underpinning them as open data with open linked identifiers.

2	Require that departments and agencies have a plan on how they will promote use of data internally and by its stakeholders: ● For example, DFID should develop a two-year implementation plan for promoting aid data usage, including mapping its users of aid data, supporting capacity building and participation, by June 2016 and report on its implementation.

Open Evidence

15. Ensure the open and timely publication of government research

Ensure the open and timely publication of government research, through a standardised public register of all commissioned studies.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

The public cannot easily see whether research conducted or commissioned by government has been published.

Main Objective

Every government department and arms-length public body should publish a standardised record of all research it carries out, whether conducted by civil servants or commissioned through independent academic experts. The record would include what the research is looking at, who is conducting the study, and any agreements around the publication of results.

Relevance

Government conducts a large amount of research, either directly through the civil service and arms-length public bodies, or through independent academic experts it commissions. There have been high-profile examples where such research was delayed, modified, and misrepresented – or dropped altogether – apparently because the results were politically inconvenient. Recent examples include research looking at the rising use of food banks, international comparisons of drugs policy, and the effect of immigration on the jobs market, but researchers have come forward with numerous cases under previous governments.

This non-publication happens even though there are numerous codes of practice and guidelines in place requiring the prompt release of all government social research. Where this happens it undermines public scrutiny of government policy. Because government points to research to justify policy, there should be a presumption of open publication so that citizens can look at what they're being asked to accord authority to. And if taxpayers pay for research, they're entitled to know the results and what the quality of the study was. The impression that challenging results will be delayed or suppressed risks damaging the trust between government and researchers.

Currently it is not possible to assess the scale or significance of the non-publication of government research, as departments aren't required to hold or publish records of what research is being carried out, by whom, and any agreements around publication of results. Such a record would make it easier to hold government to account, allowing public scrutiny of cases where studies are delayed or suppressed.

Ambition

A standardised record of all government research would empower the public to scrutinise what research is being carried out, by whom, and what the results were. This transparency would make government more open, and help improve the trust between researchers and policymakers by making it harder for studies to be delayed or suppressed for political reasons.

Milestones

1	Cabinet Office to work with researchers and civil society organisatons to develop a standardised register for all departments and arms-length bodies to record all research studies they conduct or commission.
2	All departments and arms-length bodies to transfer all data on current and future research studies to the new register by end of 2016.

16. Provide a single point of contact for public requests for evidence

Each government department and agency should provide a single point of contact for public requests for evidence related to departmental policy.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Government departments and agencies do not provide a clearly identified contact that the public can request evidence from.

Main Objective

Each government department and agency will provide a single point of contact for public requests for evidence related to the department's policy.

A nominated individual in each department and agency will have responsibility for the contact point. At a minimum this will be a dedicated email address prominently advertised online and in communications.

This individual will monitor public requests for evidence; identify and collect appropriate information; respond to public requests promptly; and keep a public record of public requests received including the progress of ongoing requests.

Relevance

A single point of contact and an ongoing invitation for people to use it will increase civic participation. People sending a request to government for evidence underlying public policy, and getting an answer, is beneficial to public understanding. It will increase the public's access to information. It will mean the public will be less prone to misunderstanding on issues such as vaccination, agricultural policies and screening programmes.

Institutionalising responding to public requests will be a sign that government accepts its accountability to people, as in the 1980s companies accepted accountability to consumers by introducing dedicated phone lines and addresses for customer services and as public bodies accept their responsibility to properly look after public data by providing a point of contact for enquiries under the Data Protection Act 1998 for example.services, and when public bodies accepted their responsibility to properly look after public data by providing a point of contact for enquiries under the Data Protection Act 1998 for example.

Ambition

A single point of contact for requests for evidence used to shape public policies answers the government's commitment to empower and transform the relationship between citizens and governments, as set out in the UK National Action Plan 2013 – 2015. It also answers the government's commitment to public engagement in policy making.

An open and ongoing invitation to people to ask the Government for its evidence will make government more open and will improve the relationship between citizens and the government. Obfuscation and delays in implementing easy ways for the public to engage in policy making until now has put departments in a bad light. An open invitation and a direct, clear route for citizen's questions will address this.

An institutionalised single point of contact will reduce time delays. There will be no need for people to engage the Freedom of Information Act request process. A dedicated individual in place will reduce the passing around of public enquiries within and between departments to try to find someone to answer that frustrates people now. This will save government time and money too and enable government to provide other relevant resources and information that helps people to focus and refine future requests.

Milestones

1	Government announces plan to introduce named single points of contact in every department. (SPOC)
2	Facilities to record dated requests and dated responses are established (in line with current government guidelines on public response times).
3	All UK governmental departments and agencies internally identify responsible individual/post to act as a SPOC.
4	Every Government department and agency has announced and is clearly displaying SPOC information on GOV.UK

17. Make the use of evidence in policy formulation and evaluation transparent

Introduce an evidence transparency standard that shows how government has considered evidence in policy formulation and evaluation

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Citizens are unable to access the evidence behind government policy formulation and evaluation. If government is to be held properly to account for its decisions and actions, citizens need to be able to understand the way government has used evidence in making its decision and be able to access it readily.

Main Objective

Government should publish the data and evidence that underpin any new policies it announces, and should also commit to regular and long term evaluation of policies. As a first step, government departments and agencies should commit to an "evidence transparency standard" to "show the workings" behind government policy and decisions in a way that is easy for any interested citizen to access. This should include a commitment to reference published data that underpin policy and decisions, in accordance with the principle of equal access to statistics and underlying analysis.[4]

---

[4]

http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/statorg/Principles_stat_activities/principles_stat_activities.pdf

The standard would break down into five key components, which follow a chain of reasoning from diagnosis to hypothesis to implementation to evaluation :

- Why does the government think action is necessary (its **diagnosis** of the issue)
- Why the government has chosen a specific intervention (the **what** question)
- Why the government has chosen a specific way of delivering the intervention (the **how** question)
- Why the government thinks this is worth doing (the **value for money** question)
- How the government proposes to tell whether its working (the **testing and evaluation** question)

Relevance

Citizens deserve to know the basis on which government is making the decisions that affect them. Making policy when resources are tight is difficult but this only makes it more important that policy makers are open about how they have taken into account the probable quantified consequences of alternatives. When we lack the data to inform choices between options in important policy areas, the government should invest in getting it.

Ambition

Open government should rely upon good quality data and statistics, and the first step in ensuring the public can judge the quality of evidence behind policy is to ensure citizens can access that evidence. An evidence transparency standard would allow citizens to judge the extent to which policies and evaluations are informed by evidence.

Milestones

1	All government departments and agencies should commit to an evidence transparency standard, developed in consultation with researchers and civil society organisations.
2	Government should publish the data and evidence that underpin any new policies it announces in accordance with this standard, and should also commit to regular and long term evaluation of policies.

Open Information

18. Promote comprehensive freedom of information rules

The Freedom of Information Act should be protected and its scope widened to achieve comprehensive coverage of public sector bodies and the companies they own or control.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Freedom of Information is the foundation stone of open government which allows citizens to ask questions, and receive information, on the issues that matter to them. However, Freedom of Information does not currently apply to all public bodies, and often important information is inaccessible from bodies providing public services on the behalf of government.

Contractors providing public services are not themselves subject to the FOI Act. However, the FOI right does apply to information which a contractor holds *on behalf of* an authority. Deciding what information is held on the authority's behalf is not easy and depends on what the contract itself says. This varies from contract to contract. Often, important information is considered to be held for the contractor's purposes, not the authority's, and is therefore inaccessible under FOI.

Main Objective

Where a service is provided on behalf of a public authority by another body, or is otherwise supported by public funds, information about the quality of the service and way in which it is provided should be available under FOI.

The Freedom of Information Act should be extended to all public bodies, unless powerful reasons for excluding a body are found during public consultation.

Relevance

Freedom of Information is the cornerstone of open government, as it allows citizens to request information about issues that are relevant to them.

Ambition

To achieve comprehensive FOI coverage of public authorities and bodies providing public services on their behalf.

Milestones

1	**Implementation Options** 1. Amend the FOI Act to provide that any information about the way in which a public service is provided under contract is automatically considered to be held on the authority's behalf. All such information could then be obtained under the FOI Act via a request to the authority, subject to the Act's exemptions. 2. Amend the FOI Act to provide that major contractors are brought directly under the Act themselves in relation to their public sector contracts. FOI requests could then be made directly to those contractors. 3. Introduce a standard clause into new contracts, providing that all information held by the contractor about the service is available under the FOI Act. This would gradually extend the public's FOI rights as new contracts with this clause were introduced, however the process would be a slow one. Each of these options would apply to sub-contractors as well as contractors.
2	The government should publish a comprehensive Register of Public Bodies. This should include: (a) bodies already defined as public authorities for the purposes of the UK and Scottish FOI Acts and Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) (b) bodies which meet the Office of National Statistics' criteria for public bodies. (c) companies owned or partly owned by one or more bodies on the register, including those jointly owned with private sector bodies. The register should indicate for each body whether it is currently subject to the UK or Scottish FOI Act or EIR or whether it is not covered.
3	The government should publish a roadmap for bringing those public bodies not currently subject to FOI/EIR under the legislation. Any exceptions should be limited to those where, following public consultation, powerful reasons

	for excluding the body have been established.
4	When publishing impact assessments for bills involving the creation of new public bodies or the transfer of responsibilities from existing public bodies, a statement of the FOI/EIR status of the bodies concerned should be mandatory.

19. Ensure the integrity, usability and sustainability of government information

Ensure a holistic approach to the management of government information of all kinds so as to facilitate openness now and in the future.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Accountability requires access to information with integrity. Technical standards for information integrity exist, but must be applied consistently across government if openness initiatives are to be meaningful. In an increasingly digital environment, information integrity entails capturing and managing information from creation onwards, through interoperable systems and mechanisms. More needs to be done to develop an information management environment within government that enables information integrity and openness.

Main Objective

The main objective of this commitment is to strengthen government's ability to establish and preserve the integrity of public sector information, so that it can be opened and trusted. Actions should include:

1. Enacting a new Public Records Act that would empower TNA to lead on information management.

The National Archives (TNA) should be a leader in developing, co-ordinating and implementing the necessary standards, systems and mechanisms, but the Public Records Act does not sufficiently empower TNA. Some of the recommendations of the 2014 records

management review[5] conducted by Sir Alex Allan highlight TNA's inability to enforce compliance[6], under current legislation. In comparison, Scottish legislation of 2011 gives National Records of Scotland the sort of powers TNA needs.[7] This will need to be addressed if TNA is to support good practice in the creation and management over time of records and data to deliver high quality information with integrity and reliability.

2. Delivering on commitments to address deficiencies in the management of public sector records.
The 2014 review of government records management by Sir Alex Allan resulted in recommendations that TNA has publicly committed to act on.[8] The OGP National Action Plan should be used to reaffirm TNA's commitment, and to encompass commitments resulting from the digital records management review Sir Alex is currently undertaking.

3. Identifying a strategy for introducing into open data initiatives the technical knowledge developed in the records management, data science, and digital preservation communities, to strengthen information integrity in support of meaningful openness.

As an example on one initiative: the Scottish Government's Data Strategy for public sector information is governed by the 'Data Linkage Framework', which requires government departments and agencies to acknowledge the importance of data quality in facilitating the use of data to maximize its value. The aim is to strengthen data, for instance in terms of accuracy and the level of disaggregation required. Operating within this Framework, the Data Sharing and Linkage Service is being delivered through collaboration between NHS National Services Scotland and National Records of Scotland.

4. Ensuring the infrastructure is in place to enable government information to be, and remain, accessible and usable.

This should involve further developing or extending the TNA's Digital Records Infrastructure (DRI), developing a transparent process by which decisions can be made about the present and future value of data, particularly as open data, to inform decisions on investment in their sustainability, and maintaining a cost-effective, holistic preservation strategy that

---

[5]

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/370930/RECORDS_REVIEW_-_Sir_Allex_Allan.pdf

[6] For example, Sir Alex recommended that all departments should be required to undertake an Information Management Assessment and to commit to the programme of action plans and review, but TNA does not have the power to require this of departments. Relatedly, Sir Alex recommended that the Ministry of Justice should secure the Lord Chancellor's support for TNA in its dealings with other departments, but this does not sufficiently address TNA's lack of 'teeth'.

[7] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/12/contents

[8]

http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/manage-information/policy-process/reviewing-records-management-government/

includes datasets and other information published online (particularly reviewing the Web Archives' frequency of captures to improve government accountability for the datasets it releases, and its functionality, considering enabling users to 'watch' pages and to be notified of changes).

Relevance

This commitment extends Commitment 5 in the UK Government's 2013 National Action Plan. That commitment is important because it recognised that records management is an essential underpinning of open government. This continues to be important. An holistic approach to effective management of all types of government information, including records and data, is particularly important in a financial environment that is challenging for public bodies. Commitment 5 supported OGP Grand Challenges 2, 3 and 5, but we believe it can and should also support Grand Challenges 1 and 4. Furthermore, the UK IRM's progress report for 2014/15 stated: 'The IRM researcher would emphasize the importance of records preservation and management for the wider open data agenda. Future plans should ensure that the issue remains a central part—particularly awareness of problems raised by hybrid and digital records'.[9]

Ambition

The ambition of this commitment is to establish an environment that ensures information integrity, so that information can be searched, retrieved and released efficiently with assurance that it is reliable and authentic.

Milestones

1	Enacting a new Public Records Act that would empower TNA to lead on information management.
2	Delivering on commitments to address deficiencies in the management of public sector records.
3	Identifying a strategy for introducing into open data initiatives the technical knowledge developed in the records management, data science, and digital preservation communities, to strengthen information integrity in support of meaningful openness.
4	Ensuring the infrastructure is in place to enable government information to be, and remain, accessible and usable.

---

[9] UK IRM's 2014-2015 Progress Report, pg 42.

Open Local Government

20. Establish an Open Local Government Partnership

Work with local authorities and civil society to scope out and develop an local open government partnership.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Local government has always played an important role in UK democracy and public service provision, and that role is only becoming more important as greater powers are being devolved from central to local government. Local government is therefore an increasingly important focus for open government reform.

Pockets of good open government practice already exist across the country, but they are scattered and often restricted to specific projects or small teams and departments. There is currently no mechanism or incentive for spreading existing or supporting new innovations in openness in local government.

By adopting an Open Government Partnership model, open government practice can be developed and spread across local government.

Main Objective

The features and principles of the Open Government Partnership can be adapted and applied to local government in the UK, to help develop and spread open government practice and tackle the challenges being faced by local governments and communities.

An Open Local Government Partnership would need to be developed in collaboration by a wide range of stakeholders, including local authorities, national government, civil society organisations and citizens. Its features could include:

- Open and inclusive - The project could start by identifying a number of local authorities already interested in and/or making progress on aspects of open government, but it would be open to any local authority to join on the condition that they agree to a high level statement and commit to developing their own open government action plan. As such, the membership of the partnership would grow organically over time.
- Peer support - The partnership would work on the basis that there is already distributed practice of open government in local government, with organisations excelling in different areas. Some work could be conducted up front to scope out the different aspects of openness for local government to develop a number of

illustrative commitments and collect together useful resources and examples. However, the focus of the partnership would be on the sharing of practice between members - building up an ever more detailed picture of what open government can mean for local government.

- Race to the top - The partnership would seek to instigate a race-to-the-top whereby local public organisations would compete with one another to be more "open". Local authorities would be encouraged to sign up to commitments already pioneered by others, but also to develop new stretching commitments that set them apart from the rest.
- High level cover for reformers - The Open Local Government Partnership would become something that politicians and senior officials want their organisation to be associated with, providing high level buy-in for reformers within those organisations to implement open government reforms.
- Involves public organisations, civil society and SMEs - The partnership could be governed at a national level by representatives from participating local authorities, civil society and SMEs. Members would be required to develop and agree their commitments in partnership with local civil society and SMEs, and include them in the assessment of their progress.
- Independent and non-partisan - The partnership sould be managed by organisations independent from national government and any political party. Local councils invited to pioneer the project will be selected to include a spread across the main political parties.

For an open local government partnership to be adopted and be effective, it needs to be established and owned by local authorities. The open local government partnership idea is not prescriptive and the shape it might take is dependant on the aims and aspirations of the participating local authorities.

National government would:

1. Support the initial scoping and development of the idea by helping to convene relevant stakeholders
2. Develop links with the Open Government Partnership community and other relevant sub-national OGP initiatives
3. Showcase innovative developments under the umbrella of the UK's membership of the OGP.

Relevance

This commitment furthers OGP values by extending the principles and process underlying the OGP to local government. It is particularly relevant at a time when the OGP is grappling with how best to involve sub-national governments.

This initiative would mark a significant innovation in the OGP that could be adapted and adopted by other member countries.

Ambition

An Open Local Government Partnership would become a catalyst for increasing the openness, transparency, responsiveness and accountability of local government in the UK. It would develop a network of local authorities and reformers committed to the principles of open government, supporting them to develop, commit to & share actions designed to make local government more open. It would become recognised as a kitemark for good government and spread the principles and practice of open government across local government.

Milestones

1	Relevant stakeholders are identified
2	An Open Local Government Partnership Summit is held to share practice of open government and identify pioneers to establish the partnership
3	A diverse group of founding local authorities is identified and a civil society steering group is selected
4	The process, governance and declaration of the partnership is agreed
5	The founding members develop and publish open government action plans
6	These action plans, or key actions within them, are showcased as a relevant OGP event
7	The Open Local Government Partnership is financially sustainable and secures increasing levels of engagement from local authorities and civil society

21. Include local governance and engagement frameworks as part of devolution deals

Include local governance and engagement frameworks as part of devolution deals.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Devolution will have a significant impact on the lives of people throughout England, initially in combined authority areas and as devolution arrangements spread wider. They present

significant governance and scrutiny challenges and opportunities. The speed of devolution, among other factors, means not all authorities are sufficiently considering how to engage the public and overcome these challenges.

Main Objective

The objective is for Government to develop a framework to support applicant councils and nascent combined authorities to think through the governance and public engagement and involvement challenges presented by devolution. Formed of key questions councils and combined authorities need to address, satisfactory completion of the framework document - and thereby demonstration of plans to overcome the relevant challenges - would be a condition of a devolution deal. The framework would not be prescriptive about how each area should tackle each challenge, leaving each council and combined authority to develop solutions appropriate to their specific situation.

The framework document could cover areas from public involvement, to policy development and performance (how policy would be developed by a combined authority, how performance would be monitored, and how non-executives could be involved in these processes), partnership working, and the structures and resources to support these systems and arrangements.

Relevance

This commitment advances transparency, accountability and involvement by ensuring these values are considered and prioritised by local authorities as part of devolution deals, by providing a framework for local authorities to work through.

Ambition

The impact of this commitment is to ensure local authorities consider and prioritise transparency, accountability and involvement as part of devolution deals, by providing a framework for local authorities to work through.

Milestones

1	The Government holds a roundtable for Councils, Combined Authorities and civil society stakeholders on the content of the Framework.
2	The Government publicises a finalised Framework
3	Councils and Combined Authorities seeking devolution deals complete the Framework. Government actively encourages and supports the completion of the Frameworks.

4	Government tenders for an independent evaluator to review the Framework to see whether or not it is successful in ensuring adequate governance, scrutiny and engagement processes are in place in areas with a devolution settlement. Combined Authorities, civil society stakeholders, and members of the public from the relevant areas are involved in the review.
5	Depending on the findings of the review, the Government continues with the Framework as it is, or considers alternative or additional methods for ensuring good governance, scrutiny and engagement practice under devolution. Combined Authorities and civil society stakeholders are involved in the development of any new mechanisms. The milestone could include a Governance and Engagement in Devolution conference for Combined Authorities, local councils and civil society stakeholders, to share best practice and the review findings, think about next steps and encourage a race to the top.

Open Parliaments & Courts

22. Make all parliamentary data freely available

All parliamentary data to be freely available for the public to download and/or re-use.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Parliamentary data is inconsistently available or not available at all.

Main Objective

The UK Parliament, Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly should make their data freely available and openly accessible to the public so that the public can download, re-use and re-share. This includes all documents, data, audio and video content.

No material should have its usage restricted through any unreasonable copyright restrictions and it is expected that at most the constraints would be Parliamentary Copyright (which allows for sharing and re-use).

Relevance

This addresses issues of civic participation and public accountability.

Milestones

1	Publishing UK Parliament Hansard data in near-real time machine readable format.
2	Publishing parliamentary record in near-real time machine readable format for Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly
3	Publishing all plenary and committee video in open and re-usable format for UK Parliament, Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly
4	Publishing in open data format in near-real time for UK Parliament, Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly list of members, register of members' interests, draft legislation, amendments to draft legislation, voting records, committee reports, standing orders (and related).

23. Increase citizen involvement in the legislative process

Open up parliament so more people can contribute.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Bring citizens closer to the parliamentary process

Main Objective

The parliaments and assemblies of the UK should be encouraged to experiment with new ways that enable the public to contribute to the different stages of the parliamentary process. This would range from putting questions to ministers, addressing and commenting on committees and within the pre-legislative, legislative cycles and during post-legislative scrutiny. This can include further opportunities for remote hearings and public access to committees and debates and also the the use of digital tools to make parliament more accessible to the public who would otherwise find it difficult to physically attend.

Relevance

Those who take part in the parliamentary process shape the future, but all too often this is a narrow subset of the population and unrepresentative of the wider population. Digital tools allows our legislatures to step out beyond the chamber or committee room in new ways, whether it's taking the parliament out to the people or allowing people to come to parliament through new digital channels, this is about strengthening democratic participation and rebuilding trust as much as it is about enhancing public accountability.

Ambition

More people will be able to contribute to what happens in their parliament, this helps legislations better reflect people's lives and makes parliaments more transparent and accessible.

Milestones

1	Develop a method for public questions and engagement during (or prior to) Westminster Hall debates in the House of Commons.
2	Pilot the method

24. Enshrine Parliamentary Openness

Formally adopt The Declaration of Parliamentary Openness.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Enshrining openness at the heart of our parliaments.

Main Objective

The UK Parliament, Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly should formally adopt The Declaration of Parliamentary Openness.

This sets out 44 principles for advancing parliamentary openness, grouped under four headings:

Promoting a Culture of Openness:
Parliamentary information belongs to the public. Parliamentary information shall be able to be reused or republished by citizens with any limited restrictions narrowly defined by law. To enable a culture of parliamentary openness, parliament must enact measures to ensure inclusive citizen participation and a free civil society, enable effective parliamentary monitoring, and vigorously protect these rights through its oversight role. Parliament shall also ensure that citizens have legal recourse to enforce their right to access parliamentary information. Parliament has an affirmative duty to promote citizen understanding of parliamentary functioning and share good practices with other parliaments to increase openness and transparency. Parliament shall work collaboratively with PMOs and citizens to ensure that parliamentary information is complete, accurate, and timely.

Making Parliamentary Information Transparent:
Parliament shall adopt policies that ensure proactive publication of parliamentary information, and shall review these policies periodically to take advantage of evolving good practices. Parliamentary information includes information about parliament's roles and functions, and information generated throughout the legislative process, including the text of introduced legislation and amendments, votes, the parliamentary agenda and schedule, records of plenary and committee proceedings, historical information, and all other information that forms a part of the parliamentary record, such as reports created for or by parliament. Parliament shall provide information on the management and administration of parliament, parliamentary staff, and comprehensive and detailed parliamentary budget information. Parliament shall provide information about the backgrounds, activities and affairs of members, including sufficient information for citizens to make informed judgments regarding their integrity and probity, and potential conflicts of interest.

Easing Access to Parliamentary Information:
Parliament shall ensure that information is broadly accessible to all citizens on a non-discriminatory basis through multiple channels, including first-person observation, print media, radio, and live and on-demand broadcasts and streaming. Physical access to parliament shall be provided to all citizens, subject to space and safety limitations, with clearly defined and publicly available policies for ensuring access by media and observers. Parliamentary information must also be available free of charge, in multiple national and working languages, and through tools, such as plain language summaries, that help ensure that parliamentary information is understandable to a broad range of citizens.

Enabling Electronic Communication of Parliamentary Information:
Parliamentary information shall be released online in open and structured formats that allow citizens to analyze and reuse this information using the full range of technology tools. Parliamentary information shall be linked to related information and be easily searchable, as well as downloadable in bulk to encourage the development of new technologies for its exploration. Parliamentary websites enable communication with citizens even in societies with limited Internet penetration, by facilitating information access to intermediaries, which can further disseminate the information to citizens. Parliamentary websites shall seek to use interactive tools to engage citizens and offer alert or mobile services. Parliament shall give preference to the use of non-proprietary formats, and free and open-source software. Parliament has a duty to ensure technological usability of parliamentary information, while guaranteeing the privacy for those accessing the information.

Relevance

Signing the declaration is a commitment to openness and transparency and therefore is a way to hold the parliament to account for its actions (or non-actions)

Ambition

The Declaration is only a document but recognising the commitments within are important for driving a cultural change within legislatures are they move towards being more open and focussed on serving the wider public as well as members.

Milestones

1	Members of the House of Commons, the House of Lords, Scottish Parliament, National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly formally adopt the Declaration of Parliamentary Openness.

25. Open up the court system to public scrutiny

Open data of the daily case flow schedule and outcomes of their courts and tribunals

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

Courts are the basis of justice, and justice must be seen to be done. The current court process is opaque.

Main Objective

The UK judiciary, magistracy and courts and tribunal service should make available as open data the daily case flow schedule and outcomes of their courts and tribunals. This would greatly increase transparency of the courts for the general public whom they serve.

It has been an established principle since the 17th Century that the courts should be open except in special circumstances but 19th Century working practices in fact make them highly opaque. Publication will also improve the efficiency of the courts in the delivery and administration of justice - where poor information is well understood to contribute to inefficiency and poor outcomes.

Data about the justice system has some special attributes not found in other areas, such as issues around contempt of court where reporting restrictions apply or juveniles are involved, or the 1974 Rehabilitation of Offenders Act and its concept of 'spent offences'. However, these issues could easily be handled in a system that operates with a set of internal data standards - very similar to the way in which a public internet and a private secure intranet work on the same open data standards, but one is published and one is held securely.

Relevance

Justice being seen to be done is the foundation of democracy and the power of the state. The UK's rankings in the openness assessments are extremely poor.

Ambition

The count process is transparent to citizens and supported by good information.

Milestones

1	Data standards are developed with legal data community that define what data should be published, and how.
2	Justice data systems updated with modern contracting and development processes, with the support of MoJ Digital existing workstreams.
3	Open Data published on case schedules in courts.
4	Open Data published on the outcomes of courts and tribunals around the UK, including publication under a permissive license of all written judgments.

Privacy

26. Publish departmental data release registers

Provide a complete Data Release Register, listing all data flows of individual level in/between departments and other public bodies and why, readable by the public.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

There is no transparency on how and where Departments share individual level data as part of sharing of bulk personal datasets.

Main Objective

Provide a complete Data Release Register, listing all data flows of individual level in/between departments and other public bodies, readable by the public.

While initial Registers will be incomplete, due to Departments themselves not being aware of all data flows (some are annual or less often), the Register should be a complete-as-known list.

Departments currently have an unknown number and range of "bulk personal datasets" covering individuals, and share them in ways which are opaque to both the department, other departments, and the public.

Moving towards a comprehensive register of all bulk personal datasets, and the flows thereof, is a necessary prerequisite to understanding those flows, and raising public confidence in their use.

Relevance

In meetings, civil servants often complain that the public think that Departments/projects (should) share data far more than they actually do. Irrespective of the accuracy of that position, the civil service has demonstrated a fundamental gap in the evidence base for a public debate:

How does Government share data between bodies/departments, and on what basis?

Absent a comprehensive list, the debate on data sharing will be characterised by "trust us" from Government, scepticism from the public, and an increasing data trust deficit ever made worse by Government mistakes. Comprehensive and complete data release registers will begin to provide a knowledge base which can be read and the situation known, rather than bureaucratic weasel words which require trust that is routinely broken. Over time, Departments should assure completeness for stated time periods, and for any new flows

to be added. The HSCIC [already regularly publishes](#) such a register for flows of individual level medical records.

The Open/Data community can then build tools on top of such registers for notification/analysis purposes, such as the Data Disclosure Standard.

Ambition

It is widely accepted that "data sharing" will rise in importance and volume.

Following the care.data fiasco in the Department of Health and NHS England, the HSCIC has for over a year published a "data release register" of what data leaves the organisation, where it goes, and why.

Every Department should follow their lead, and publish such a register.

Milestones

1	All departments and bodies to routinely publish a regular Data Release Register.
2	Departments to certify that their Data Release Register is complete for the time period it covers.

---

27. Introduce citizen centric data usage reports

Provide all citizens with a report on how their individual level data has been used by government services.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

No citizen currently knows how Government has used their data.

Main Objective

When a citizen requests, for the services requested by a citizen, Digital Services should provide the citizen with a report on how their individual level data has been used by those services. All uses and flows of a citizen's individual level data within and out of a department/body should be securely and sensitively collated, and made available to a citizen in a secure and confidential digital manner.

Implementation details are important, to avoid this becoming a dossier on citizens: https://medconfidential.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/gov-data-usage-report-april-2015.pdf

https://medconfidential.org/2014/what-is-a-data-usage-report/

Every citizen should be able to see an individual "data bank statement" of how/where Government has used their record and why.

If you don't know where your data has gone, there's no way to know whether your wishes are being respected. And when there is a problem, there's no way to know whether you were personally affected.

To assuage concerns, citizens must be able to understand precisely where their data has gone, and why, through citizen centric data usage reports. This will give the citizen the tools to understand/question inappropriate flows, and Government the ability to communicate directly with a citizen when there is a data incident that may, or more likely may not, impact them.

Relevance

While Data Release Registers provide necessary insight into where some data flows within Government, and are a large step to solving the problem, they do not provide an individual with any detail on whether *their* data was included in any item in the register.

"Bulk Personal Datasets" have been defined by Parliament as "large databases containing personal information about a wide range of people". Parliament's Intelligence and Security Committee in its 2015 report, 'Privacy and Security: A modern and transparent legal framework', also concluded that as a Dataset of this type "may be highly intrusive and impacts upon large numbers of people, it is essential that it is tightly regulated". Currently, the existence of such datasets is highly opaque.

When data incidents occur, and they will continue to do so, there is no simple message that can be given to citizens about what happened, and what they should do about it, that is individualised to them.

Ambition

Over time, no citizen's data should be used by Government without them being able to understand why.

Milestones

1	Willing departments make available digital data usage reports, delivered by GDS & ONS to ensure no operational uses.
2	Development of roadmap for all uses of, and flows in/out of, population scale databases to be included in the report to citizens.

28. Increase the transparency of surveillance

Increase the transparency of surveillance activities to improve accountability and secure public trust.

Status quo or problem/issue to be addressed

At all levels of government, surveillance tools are used without giving the public adequate information about the surveillance in place, the benefits it brings, and the rights of citizens with respect to it.

Main Objective

- Establishing principles for transparency when national security agencies, police forces, local authorities and other government bodies use surveillance tools;
- Promoting clear principles for both public and private sector transparency with respect to any activities that surveil, track and profile citizens (e.g. use of CCTV, online tracking, facial recognition tools);
- Increasing the open reporting of national security surveillance activity whenever doing so would not threaten ongoing operations;
- Re-examine the use of secret courts and proceedings, with a public debate about the balance of risks to safety, and risks to democratic freedoms, that these create;
- Improve the independent scrutiny of those aspects of the secret state which cannot be made transparent;

Relevance

The UK is one of the most CCTV surveilled countries in the world. The [surveillance commissioner](#) has recently argued that we need [greater transparency about the use of CCTV](#), including body worn CCTV cameras.

Edward Snowden's revelations have shown the extent of mass-surveillance by the UK Government and it's allies.

Secret courts processing surveillance gathered materials threaten to undermine basic principles of open justice.

At the London Open Government Partnership Summit in 2013, Aruna Roy [put the issue of Surveillance on the agenda](#) with questions to William Hague and John Kerry: highlighting the need for us to not bracket out 'issues of national security', but to think about how surveillance also need to be critically examined within the open government landscape.

Open government and democratic freedoms are threatened by the inbalance of power brought about by the widespread deployment of surveillance technologies. The OGP needs to address these issues, and a space is needed for a positive, constructive dialogue about getting a better line drawn between between secrecy for security, and transparency for accountability.

Ambition

A commitment to debate and action on sensitively applying principles of openness to surveillance at all levels of government will directly address one of the most important countervailing pressures against openness in our state.

It will help to set the right boundaries between openness and secrecy, recognising that legitimate surveillance functions better when citizens have trust in the systems, and demonstrating the applicability of openness to this sector.

Milestones

1	Revise and update guidance for public sector on the use of CCTV, body cameras, facial recognition and other algorithmic analysis tools - with an emphasis on informing the public of when such tools are in use;
2	Commission an independent review and parallel deliberative democratic exercise to explore the right boundaries between secrecy and disclosure of details of state surveillance activities;
3	Develop a clear approach to **transparency reports**, allowing companies to disclose, within reasonable timeframes, aggregate details of all requests from state agencies for information, and requiring authorities requesting information to publish their own aggregate reports of the requests they have made.