

# Nordic+ Fact Sheet

Last Updated: August 2021


## ATTENDING MEMBER (TOTAL ACTION PLANS / TOTAL COMMITMENTS)

- |                    |                        |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| ➤ Denmark (4 / 70) | ➤ Estonia (5 / 57)     |
| ➤ Finland (4 / 33) | ➤ Latvia (4 / 45)      |
| ➤ Norway (4 / 61)  | ➤ Lithuania (5 / 32)   |
| ➤ Sweden (4 / 20)  | ➤ Netherlands (4 / 51) |
| ➤ Germany (2 / 29) | ➤ Scotland (2 / 10)    |

## COMMITMENT PERFORMANCE

The following data is based on all commitments evaluated by the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM).

**Nordic+ OGP members fall behind the EU27 and global averages in ambition, but perform higher on completion rates.**



## FEATURED THEMES

- ★ **Inclusion** - 28 Nordic+ commitments
- ★ **Civic Space** - 22 Nordic+ commitments
- ★ **Civic Engagement** - 45 Nordic+ commitments

# INCLUSION

## COMMITMENTS BY THE NUMBER<sup>1</sup>

❖ Norway: 8	❖ Netherlands: 1
❖ Scotland: 6	❖ Latvia: 1
❖ Denmark: 6	❖ Estonia: 0
❖ Germany: 4	❖ Lithuania: 0
❖ Finland: 2	❖ Sweden: 0

### Sample of Topics Covered:

- Inclusive public services
- Gender equality measures
- Plain language initiatives
- Inclusion of youth and LGBTQ+

## COMMITMENT HIGHLIGHTS

The following are a sample of Nordic+ inclusion commitments with special focus on plain language, gender, and/or youth.

➤ **Finland:** [Improving Understandability and Inclusion of Government Information](#)

Finland is committed to training government officials on the use of plain language, as well as increasing the inclusion of different societal groups through joint events for government and civil society.

**Action Plan:** 2019-2023

**Potential Impact:** Moderate

**Completion:** n/a

**Early Results:** n/a

➤ **Netherlands:** [Local Digital Democracy](#)

In their 2018 action plan, the Netherlands worked to promote the inclusiveness of democracy by creating new digital opportunities for public participation and collaboration in decision-making.

**Action Plan:** 2018-2020

**Potential Impact:** Moderate

**Completion:** n/a

**Early Results:** n/a

➤ **Germany:** [Create Youth Strategy](#)

Germany is seeking to actively involve youth in the development of a national youth strategy, including through a youth conference focused on reviewing its design and implementation.

**Action Plan:** 2019-2021

**Potential Impact:** Minor

**Completion:** n/a

**Early Results:** n/a

## COMMITMENT PERFORMANCE

The following data is based on Nordic+ inclusion commitments evaluated by the IRM.

- **Focus on gender:** 11 of 28 inclusion commitments make reference to gender.
- **Commitments are ambitious:** 11 of 20 inclusion commitments were assessed as having high potential impact. This is higher than the average rate for both EU members (42%) and all OGP members (43%).
- **High completion rate:** 10 of 12 commitments have been substantially or fully implemented, and two of 10 assessed commitments have shown strong early results.

<sup>1</sup> In OGP's database, inclusion commitments are categorized under "marginalized communities", defined as commitments that "affect traditionally marginalized populations, defined broadly to include many historically oppressed groups including persons with disabilities, women, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people, older individuals, youth, members of minority groups, indigenous people, internally displaced persons, refugees, asylum seekers, and migrant workers, and those of lower socioeconomic status."

# CIVIC SPACE

## COMMITMENTS BY THE NUMBER

❖ Latvia: 5	❖ Denmark: 1
❖ Lithuania: 5	❖ Finland: 0
❖ Estonia: 4	❖ Germany: 0
❖ Sweden: 4	❖ Netherlands: 0
❖ Norway: 3	❖ Scotland: 0

### Sample of Topics Covered:

- Transparent NGO funding
- Increasing NGO participation in policy-making
- Supporting freedom of expression

## COMMITMENT HIGHLIGHTS

The following are a sample of Nordic+ civic space commitments.

- **Denmark:** [Implementation of a New Charter for Interaction Between Volunteer Denmark/Associations Denmark and the Public Sector](#)

Denmark held regional dialogue meetings to discuss how to effectively implement a new charter for volunteering. Following implementation of the new charter, volunteering increased by seven percent.

**Action Plan:** 2014-2016

**Potential Impact:** Moderate

**Completion:** Complete

**Early Results:** Major

- **Estonia:** [Increasing the Transparency of the Funding of Non-Governmental Organisations](#)

Through their 2016 action plan, Estonia disclosed information about public sector funding to NGOs that was previously fragmented and not easily accessible to the general public online in one place.

**Action Plan:** 2016-2018

**Potential Impact:** Moderate

**Completion:** Substantial

**Early Results:** Marginal

- **Norway:** [Promote Freedom of Expression and Independent Media](#)

This commitment is the only Defending Journalists/Activists-related commitment made by a Nordic+ member. The commitment sought to promote Norway's new freedom of expression strategy by promoting the right to access to information internationally, but only reached limited completion due to lack of international support for their initiative.

**Action Plan:** 2018-2020

**Potential Impact:** Minor

**Completion:** Limited

**Early Results:** Did Not Change

## COMMITMENT PERFORMANCE

The following data is based on Nordic+ civic space commitments evaluated by the IRM.

- **Most focus on Freedom of Association:** 13 of the 22 commitments are related to Freedom of Association. No Nordic+ members have made commitments relevant to Freedom of Assembly and only one commitment is relevant to Defending Journalists/Activists.
- **Low rate of ambition:** Nine of 22 commitments were assessed as having high potential impact. This is lower than the 50% global average for civic space commitments.
- **Need more effective implementation:** 15 of 22 commitments have been substantially or fully implemented, but only one of 11 assessed commitments has shown strong early results.

# CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

## COMMITMENTS BY THE NUMBER

❖ Estonia: 16	❖ Finland: 3
❖ Latvia: 7	❖ Norway: 2
❖ Netherlands: 5	❖ Germany: 2
❖ Lithuania: 5	❖ Denmark: 1
❖ Scotland: 4	❖ Sweden: 0

### Sample of Topics Covered:

- Feedback loop creation
- CSO participation training
- Inclusive policy-making
- Online participation mechanisms

## COMMITMENT HIGHLIGHTS

The following are a sample of Nordic+ civic engagement commitments.

- **Germany:** [Citizen Participation in Environmental Policy and Urban Development](#)  
This 2017 commitment increased opportunities for German citizens to participate in environmental and urban development policymaking processes. The German government hosted four events, including a youth dialogue and a large-scale online consultation, to solicit citizens' inputs on environmental policy topics.  
**Action Plan:** 2017-2019  
**Potential Impact:** Moderate      **Completion:** Substantial      **Early Results:** Major
- **Estonia:** [Transparent and Inclusive Policy Making](#)  
To address concerns that CSOs are not well-informed on government policy-making, an Estonian government task force worked to gather input for an online policy drafting and co-creation workspace. The workspace aims to enable citizens to track the status of policy initiatives across the policy cycle and participate in different stages of policy making  
**Action Plan:** 2018-2020  
**Potential Impact:** Transformative      **Completion:** Complete      **Early Results:** Major
- **Scotland:** [Open Policy Making and Participation in Service Delivery](#)  
Scotland committed to testing a Participation Framework for public servants to use in order to increase collaboration between citizens and policy-makers. The tests included exploration of participation enabled by technology and an assessment of the Framework's impact on equality.  
**Action Plan:** 2018-2020  
**Potential Impact:** Transformative      **Completion:** n/a      **Early Results:** n/a

## COMMITMENT PERFORMANCE

The following data is based on Nordic+ civic engagement commitments evaluated by the IRM.

- **Average ambition rate:** 21 of 43 civic engagement commitments have been assessed as having high potential impact.
- **Focus on effective implementation:** 28 of 37 commitments have been substantially or fully implemented, but only 4 of 32 assessed commitments have shown strong early results.

## SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF OPEN GOVERNMENT

The OGP Global Report identifies next steps for OGP members on selected dimensions of open government, based on both IRM and third-party data from a variety of respected partners. This table shows the average scores of the Nordic+ members and their most common action implications.

Dimension of Open Government	Sub-Dimension	Third-Party Score (0-4)	Most Common Action Implication
<b>Anti-Corruption</b>	Beneficial Ownership	1.63	Consider Action
	Open Contracting	2.66	Consider Action
<b>Civic Space</b>	Freedom of Assembly	3.82	Share Innovation
	Freedom of Association	3.83	Share Innovation
	Defending Journalists and Activists	3.60	Share Innovation
<b>Open Policy-Making</b>	Participation in Lawmaking	3.42	Share Innovation
	Open Regulations	3.51	Share Innovation
<b>Right to Information</b>	Right to Information	2.52	Consider Action
<b>Open Data</b>	Water and Sanitation	2.11	Consider Action
	Health	2.69	Consider Action
	Education	2.39	Consider Action
<b>Fiscal Openness<sup>2</sup></b>	Transparency	3.13	Implement for Results
	Participation	0.77	Implement for Results
	Oversight	3.57	Implement for Results/Share Innovation

### Definitions

<b>Share innovation</b>	Strong third-party scores suggest most countries could play a peer-support role and share their experiences.
<b>Implement for results</b>	Most countries have strong commitments, but low third-party scores. Ensuring that commitments achieve impact is the next step.
<b>Consider action</b>	Most countries have low third-party scores and lack OGP commitments, which means they could consider reforms.


<sup>2</sup> Third-party scores only include data from Germany, Norway and Sweden.




## CO-CREATION PROCESS

The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) evaluates the level of public influence during the OGP process using the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation".

The following figure shows the level of public influence achieved by each member during their *most recently evaluated* co-creation process. **Co-creation processes in Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and the Netherlands include a high level of engagement with civil society, whereas governments drive the co-creation processes in the other Nordic+ countries.**



The following figure shows the level of public influence achieved by each member during their *three most recent* co-creation processes. **Most Nordic+ members have improved their level of public influence over time, but two members consistently remain below the minimum level ("Involve") required by OGP standards.** Stronger multi-stakeholder engagement, more opportunities for deliberation, and greater outreach with both government and civil society could improve co-creation.



<sup>3</sup> There was iterative dialogue *and* the public helped set the agenda.

<sup>4</sup> The government gave feedback on how public input was considered.

<sup>5</sup> The public could give inputs.

<sup>6</sup> The government provided the public with information on the action plan.