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Background and objective of this talk

Based on observations regarding FoI in the US, UK, Sweden and Germany and being personally involved in the legislation and the implementation of FoI in the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen, Germany

I found that there are similar problems in these countries with low usage according to different access barriers for interested citizens and long response times to requests etc, but very different approaches to legislative reforms to solve these problems.

And I found that there is very little scholarly research analysing these problems and comparing the different remedies.

With a background in E-Government research I will propose some topics for a research agenda for comparative analysis of FoI provision
About 45 researchers engaged in eDemocracy research found:
There is a reverse relation between the practical relevance of
different areas of eDemocracy and the amount of research
devoted to it:

- **E-voting** –> much research although not feasible for political elections
- **E-movements** high practical relevance – little research
- **E-information** -> at least high theoretical relevance - basis for voting and any other kind of political participation -> little social science / political science and computer science / information systems research, only some research in law

Two dominant views on FOI

The Legal View:
Definition of the access rights, exemptions, appellation procedures, commentaries, comparative synopses

The Reporting View:
Reports by agencies concerned, by supervising bodies or observing NGOs containing statistics on requests, response time etc.

There is not much scholarly work on FOI except for (comparative) legal studies.

Most documents are provided by government agencies or NGOs.
Freedom of information in a global sense:
Freedom of the media to provide information to the public

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS WORLDWIDE IN 2008

LA LIBERTÉ DE LA PRESSE DANS LE MONDE EN 2008
## Ranking by degree of restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slowakia</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>79.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Myanmar/Burma</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>96.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>96.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>103.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>108.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>114.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Freedom of Information in a more narrow sense = Citizens’ access to public information / documents

= the right of citizens to get access to information
- held by public authorities and
- which so far may not have been published
The right to access dates back to a Swedish Law in 1776, the term FoI to an UN declaration in 1946.

The present pattern has been established with the US Freedom of Information Act in 1967 and updated with the Electronic FoIA in 1996 and recently been amended by the Open Government Act 2207.

Germany was rather late (2005 Federal level, state level still uncomplete).
In the European Union 24 out of 29 Member States (except Cyprus, Luxemburg and Malta) have adopted FoI legislation 50% in the last ten years.

*Not all national laws have been implemented or are effective. See www.privacyinternational.org/foi/foi-laws.jpg
Article 19 of the UN universal declaration of human rights states: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.
• There is no common legislation in the EU as regards access in general to official information in the member states and no basis for it in the treaties (There is common legislation regarding access to environmental information).

• The European convention for the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms regulates the right of freedom of expression and information (Article 10). These rights have not, however, been considered by the European court for human rights to cover a general right of access to official information,…

• The right to receive information in the UN declaration may be seen as going further than the wording of the European convention.

*) Mrs. Elena Jäderblom, Swedish Ministry of Justice, Chair of Working Group Council of Europe
The Situation In Europe*)

- After the fall of the iron curtain massive reform of the public administrations took place in Eastern and Central Europe. As a part of the deconstruction of the totalitarian systems freedom of expression and information were high on the agendas of most states. In the past 10 – 15 years a great number of Eastern and Central European states have passed laws guaranteeing their citizens the right of access to official information. Among these are Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, the Baltic states, the Czech republic, Serbia, Montenegro, Moldova, Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia. Russia has been elaborating a law for several years, but as yet it has not been adopted.

*) Mrs. Elena Jäderblom, Swedish Ministry of Justice, Chair of Working Group Council of Europe
The Situation In Europe

- In Western Europe all of the member states of the EU have adopted laws, except Malta and Luxemburg. Germany is the latest example, where a law was adopted on the federal level in 2005. Other fairly recent examples are UK (2000) and Ireland (1998). The development in Western Europe has not had such a clear and uniform historical explanation as the events in Eastern Europe. Apart from growing awareness among the general public, the development of internet and the information society as a whole, discussions in the Council of Europe and the EU have contributed to this process.

- The massive progress as regards adoption of laws does not necessarily mean that there are not deficiencies. The degree of implementation and functioning of these laws vary and depend largely on the pace of the shift of political and administrative culture in each country.

- Countries with longer traditions in this area are struggling with the problems caused by the rapid technical developments, that often call for re-defining basic concepts such as “documents” and “access”.
The Situation In Europe

• The Council of Europe has recognised that it is necessary to develop common good standards as regards access to official information. Work started already in the early 1980s’ with the adoption of the recommendation no R(81)19 on access to information held by public authorities. This recommendation has been developed by the recommendation Rec(2002)2 on access to official documents. The latter has proved very useful as a tool in the legislative projects in later years.

• In 2005 the Council of Europe started work on the elaboration of convention establishing the principles on access to official documents. In practice the work is carried out in a group of experts with representatives from fifteen member states, under the umbrella of the Steering committee for human rights.

• In June 2008 the Parliamentary assembly submitted a request for an opinion from the Committee of Ministers on a Draft Council of Europe Convention on Access to Official Documents.

Rationale of the convention: Considering that exercise of a right to access to official documents:

(i) provides a source of information for the public;
(ii) helps the public to form an opinion on the state of society and on public authorities;
(iii) fosters the integrity, efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of public authorities, so helping affirm their legitimacy;

Considering therefore that all official documents are in principle public and can be withheld subject only to the protection of other rights and legitimate interests.
Linking the two dominant views via the Policy Cycle

- Political negotiation of reforms
- Ideas for Improvements
- Performance Reports
- Providing legal access rights and institutional regimes
- Adapting structure and processes of agencies concerned
- Operating requests

New Technical Options

Identification / assessment of problems

FOI Legislation

Fullfillmint
Different Types of Research

In a recent proposal for a European Research Network on Comparative e-Government Research a distinction was made between

**Descriptive research** aims at classifications (typologies, taxonomies) of the objects of research.

**Explanatory research** develops hypotheses/theories explaining differences in the provision of services and in diffusion, acceptance, usage, and efficiency.

**Evaluative research** selects, builds and applies indicators to assess the maturity, effectiveness, efficiency of structures and processes.

**Pragmatic research** directly provides recommendations or addresses questions of practice.

This research has been interdisciplinary and include and bring together

- Law
- Political Science
- Sociotechnical Studies, i.e. computer science, information systems, organization and administration science, media and communication studies, cultural studies,...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislation</strong></td>
<td>International Comparative Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Individual Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>National Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovations</strong></td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a few international comparative surveys/reports which provide a good starting point for more systematic descriptive and explanatory analysis.
Comparative Analysis

- Introduction
- The Right of Access
- Procedural Guarantees
- Duty to Publish
- Exceptions
- Appeals
- Sanctions and Protections
- Promotional Measures

Countries compared: Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States
PRINCIPLE 1. MAXIMUM DISCLOSURE
Freedom of information legislation should be guided by the principle of maximum disclosure

PRINCIPLE 2. OBLIGATION TO PUBLISH
Public bodies should be under an obligation to publish key information

PRINCIPLE 3. PROMOTION OF OPEN GOVERNMENT
Public bodies must actively promote open government

PRINCIPLE 4. LIMITED SCOPE OF EXCEPTIONS
Exceptions should be clearly and narrowly drawn and subject to strict “harm” and “public interest” tests; The three-part test must be positive (i.e. the harm to the aim must be greater than the public interest in having the information)
PRINCIPLE 5. PROCESSES TO FACILITATE ACCESS
Requests for information should be processed rapidly and fairly and an independent review of any refusals should be available

PRINCIPLE 6. COSTS
Individuals should not be deterred from making requests for information by excessive costs

PRINCIPLE 7. OPEN MEETINGS
Meetings of public bodies should be open to the public

PRINCIPLE 8. DISCLOSURE TAKES PRECEDENCE
Laws which are inconsistent with the principle of maximum disclosure should be amended or repealed

PRINCIPLE 9. PROTECTION FOR WHISTLEBLOWERS
Individuals who release information on wrongdoing - whistleblowers - must be protected
The CoE Draft for a convention qualifies as a yardstick for evaluative research

Article 1 General provisions
Article 2 Right of access to official documents
Article 3 Possible limitations to access to official documents
Article 4 Requests for access to official documents
Article 5 Processing of requests for access to official documents
Article 6 Forms of access to official documents
Article 7 Charges for access to official documents
Article 8 Review procedure
Article 9 Complementary measures
Article 10 Documents made public at the initiative of the public authorities

Article 11 Group of Specialists on Access to Official Documents
Article 12 Consultation of the Parties
Article 13 Secretariat
Article 14 Reporting
Article 15 Publication
Article 16 Signature and entry into force of the Convention

But the different aspects pose different requirements for research
### Needed FoI Research on the policy level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislation</strong></td>
<td>International Comparative Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the CoE Convention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Based on available reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative studies on the policy level only allow for macro views but can not detect barriers and lead to major improvements.
Challenges for research *

- Laws on access to official information need to deal with a number of common elements in order to form a comprehensive system. This is evident from the draft Council of Europe Convention on access to official documents. In certain areas there are still very different views and approaches among various countries, both as regards principles and the manner in which to implement them. Some of these topics would be very useful to explore more deeply in order to gain more knowledge about the reasons for differences (historical, political, administrative, organisational etc) and in order to work towards better solutions. In my experience the following topics in particular would benefit from more research.

- **Scope**
  The **bodies** that are obliged to respect a right of access: Government, administration, judicial bodies, legislator, bodies performing public functions, bodies that receive public funds?
  **Type** of information: Definition of all information held: Documents – where do they begin and end? How to deal with large masses of information in technical recordings?

*) Mrs. Elena Jäderblom, Swedish Ministry of Justice, Chair of Working Group Council of Europe
Limitations: How to maximize openness in systems where classification traditionally has meant automatic prohibition to release information. How shall public interest tests be carried out?

- **Handling of requests**
  Specification and research for documents: How specified must a request be, how much effort must an authority put into research and compilation of information?

- **Forms of access**
  Partial release: How to withhold secret information in a document when the rest is to be released?

- **Review and appeal**
  Possibilities to appeal and results of a review procedure.
Each Party may limit the right of access. Limitations shall be set down precisely in law, be necessary in a democratic society and be proportionate to the aim of protecting:

a. national security, defence and international relations;

b. public safety;

c. the prevention, investigation and prosecution of criminal activities;

d. disciplinary investigations;

e. inspection, control and supervision by public authorities;

f. privacy and other legitimate private interests;

g. commercial and other economic interests;

h. the economic, monetary and exchange rate policies of the state;

i. the equality of parties in court proceedings and the effective administration of Justice;

j. environment; or

k. the deliberations within or between public authorities concerning the examination of a matter.
Article 5  Processing of requests for access to official docs

1. The public authority shall help the applicant, as far as reasonably possible, to identify the requested official document.

2. A request for access to an official document shall be dealt with by any public authority holding the document. If the public authority does not hold the requested official document or if it is not authorised to process that request, it shall, wherever possible, refer the application or the applicant to the competent public authority.

3. Requests for access to official documents shall be dealt with on an equal basis.

4. A request for access to an official document shall be dealt with promptly. The decision shall be reached, communicated and executed as soon as possible or within a reasonable time limit which has been specified beforehand.
Article 5  Processing of requests for access to official docs

5. A request for access to an official document may be refused:
   (i) if, despite the assistance from the public authority, the request remains too vague to allow the official document to be identified; or
   (ii) if the request is manifestly unreasonable.

6. A public authority refusing access to an official document wholly or in part shall give the reasons for the refusal. The applicant has the right to receive on request a written justification from this public authority for the refusal.
Article 6 – Forms of access to official documents

1. When access to an official document is granted, the applicant has the right to choose whether to inspect the original or a copy, or to receive a copy of it in any available form or format of his or her choice unless the preference expressed is unreasonable.

2. If a limitation applies to some of the information in an official document, the public authority should nevertheless grant access to the remainder of the information it contains. Any omissions should be clearly indicated. However, if the partial version of the document is misleading or meaningless, or if it poses a manifestly unreasonable burden for the authority to release the remainder of the document, such access may be refused.

3. The public authority may give access to an official document by referring the applicant to easily accessible alternative sources.
Article 9 – Complementary measures

The Parties shall inform the public about its right of access to official documents and how that right may be exercised. They shall also take appropriate measures to:

a. educate public authorities in their duties and obligations with respect to the implementation of this right;

b. provide information on the matters or activities for which they are responsible;

c. manage their documents efficiently so that they are easily accessible; and

d. apply clear and established rules for the preservation and destruction of their documents
At its own initiative and where appropriate, a public authority shall take the necessary measures to make public official documents which it holds in the interest of promoting the transparency and efficiency of public administration and to encourage informed participation by the public in matters of general interest.
1. A Group of Specialists on Access to Official Documents shall meet at least once a year with a view to monitoring the implementation of this Convention by the Parties, notably:
   a. reporting on the adequacy of the measures in law and practice taken by the Parties to give effect to the provisions set out in this Convention;
   b. (i) expressing opinions on any question concerning the application of this Convention;
      (ii) making proposals to facilitate or improve the effective use and implementation of this Convention, including the identification of any problems;
      (iii) exchanging information and reporting on significant legal, policy or technological developments;
      (iv) making proposals to the Consultation of Parties for the amendment of this Convention ......
Different views on FOI along the Policy Cycle

- **Political negotiation of reforms**
- **FOI Legislation**
- **Ideas for Improvements**
- **Implementation**
- **Providing legal access rights and institutional regimes**
- **Adapting structure and processes of agencies concerned**
- **Operating requests**
- **Performance Reports**
- **Identification / assessment of problems**

**New Technical Options**
Statistics based on agencies reports or special offices

US (GAO) in 2000-2002

- 25 agencies received 2.3 Mio requests (Veteran Affairs 64 %),
- backlog decreased from 8% to 6%,
- 100,000 denied requests
- agencies spent $ 283 million for handling the requests
- and collected $ 6 million fees
- 4,900 full time equivalent personnel is dedicated to handling FoI requests
- only 14 of the 25 agencies allow for electronic submission of requests, although the DoJ recommends this for some time
UK Ministry of Justice

- 34,000 requests in 2006
- 91% answered in time (20 working days)
- only 60% were „resolvable“
- 24% denied
- 4% not fulfilled because the fee had not been paid
Research Questions

• Why are there so few requests?
  – Because people are so well informed and have other means of access?
  – Because people do not how to make use of their right?

• What are the Barriers to make use of this right:
  – Legal, financial, cultural ....
  – Some barriers are dealt with in reports, while others are not. In particular
    - The need to specify requests, i.e. the information or the document desired (title, date and more)
  • Requests have to be put to the agency, who owns the documents concerned

There is no user centered research on FoI
THE RIGHT OF ACCESS AND BARRIERS

Legal Barriers: reasons for denial
- Privacy of people concerned
- Business Secrets
- Public Safety

Financial Barriers
- Administrative fees
- Copyright fees

Practical procedural and knowledge barriers
-> „Unresolvable“ requests (40%)
  - Information not held by the agency addressed (16%)
  - Need for add. information to identify the information sought (7%)
-> No data about planned but not submitted requests!
Similar to eGoverment

Political negotiation of reforms

Ideas for Improvements

What can be learned from e-government research ???

FOI Legislation

Providing legal access rights and institutional regimes

Implementation

Adapting structure and processes of agencies concerned

Operating requests

Performance Reports

Identification / assessment of problems

New Technical Options
Challenges similar to e-government

• People did not know or did not find the online offers of different government agencies -> One Stop Government / e-Gov Finder
• There was no added value by just downloading forms -> reinvent / redesign work flows to provide added value,
• For example tracking and tracing of applications and requests
• In many cases providing additional value required back office reorganization within and between agencies
• Which in turn required more interoperability between different systems in different agencies
• There still are problems of usability
• Main lesson: Look at processes and management of processes
The Micro View: A Process Cycle of Request and Delivery

1. Information Need
2. Localize agency owning the Document
3. Submit request
4. Delivery of Desired Document or Denial

Localize agency owning the Document

Submit request

Delivery of Desired Document or Denial

Information Need
Information Need

Localize agency owning the document and identify title of document

Barrieres

Submit request

Identify desired document

Forward request to other agency

Find desired document and check eligibility

Delivery of desired document or denial
First reform: from pull to push

The original FoI legislation followed a pull model of information provision. The interested citizens had to go to an office, ask for the document, and it was pulled out for him. This mode is associated with high personnel cost.

With the advent of the World Wide Web, an option came up for an alternative mode which is much cheaper and which can be called push services.

The US FoIA from the beginning asked for reading rooms where agencies have to provide certain classes of documents, e.g. administrative staff documents, agency policy statements and final opinions.

With the eFoIA these documents have to be published electronically PLUS documents and records that have been subject to a request or that are likely to become subject of request.

Even the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has an "Electronic Reading Room" and a Reading Room Index.
First Reform: From Pull to Push: (e) Reading Rooms

Information need

Localize agency owning the document and identify title of document

(e) Reading Room

Go to (e) Reading Room + identify desired doc

Submit request

Delivery of desired document or denial

Publish documents

Find desired document and check eligibility

Identify desired document

Forward request to other agency
DoJ List of Electronic Reading Rooms

FOIA Reading Rooms

- What You Will Find in FOIA Reading Rooms
- Frequently Requested Records
  This includes records created by the Offices and Divisions of the Department of Justice after November 1, 1996.
  - Office of the Attorney General
  - Office of the Deputy Attorney General
  - Office of the Associate Attorney General

- Antitrust Division
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives
- Civil Division
- Civil Rights Division
- Community Relations Service
- Criminal Division
- Drug Enforcement Administration
- Environment and Natural Resources Division
- Executive Office for Immigration Review
- Executive Office for United States Attorneys
- Executive Office for United States Trustees
- Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Federal Bureau of Prisons
- Foreign Claims Settlement Commission
- Immigration and Naturalization Service
  *(INS was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security on March 1, 2003.)*
- INTERPOL—United States National Central Bureau
- Justice Management Division
- National Drug Intelligence Center
- National Security Division
- Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
- Office of Dispute Resolution
- Office of the Federal Detention Trustee
- Office of Information and Privacy
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

Records and the U.S. Department of State

- Generally, permanent records older than 25 years, or pre-1925 passport and pre-1940 visa records are with the National Archives and Records Administration.

- Certain records can be obtained without filing a request. The Electronic Reading Room provides access to frequently requested documents released under the FOIA, special records collections of continuing public interest, and the Department's Annual FOIA Reports.

- Some publications, including forms, reports, and, policy statements are electronically available through the Bureaus or Offices within the Department (see Publications).

The Department of State maintains records dealing with:

a. The formulation and execution of U.S. Foreign policy

b. The administration and operations of the U.S. missions abroad

c. Applications from U.S. citizens for U.S. passports

d. Visa requests from non-citizens to enter the U.S.

e. Consular assistance given to U.S. citizens abroad

f. Current and former employees of the Department
For surfing, not searching
Second reform:
Two strategies to improve responsiveness

Provide support to agencies concerned in supporting requesters:

• One stop portal
• Improved search functions
• Indexing of documents,
• Integrated Document Management System

Increase control of agencies concerned:

• Change of management and organization structure (FoI CIO)
• Process control by tracking and tracing
• Extended reporting obligations
• Third party reporting and intervening action
Second Reform A: Improve search for documents

Go to FoI Portal and search for documents

Information need

Submit request

Integrated DMS /RMS

Index and publish documents

Delivery of desired document or denial

Check eligibility

Identify and find Desired document
Fol is the freedom to start a request for information, which has to be checked and processed.

...is the freedom to start an administrative procedure which is only logically defined by law.
The case of Uddevalla (Sweden)

With EU funding the small city of Uddevalla (Sweden) introduced an comprehensive Document Management System for general purposes, and from the start designed it for internal and external Fol purposes as well.

Information about how search works

To general search function

To minutes, documents and agendas of council meetings, youth council meetings and executive board meetings

http://www.uddevalla.se/uddevalla/politikochpaverkan/sokahandlingar.4.6e6d7ae0112d08700af80000.html
The case of Uddevalla (Sweden)

Documents regarding council meetings (full-text available regarding agenda and previous meetings)

General search in the document "diary"

Special login for council members (documents related to council meetings)

Special login for citizens who want to access their personal data stored by the municipality (not yet running)

Uddevalla kommun

Hjärtat i Bohuslän
Där människor växer och erbjuds god livskvalitet

Välkommen till kommunens diarium

Välj Diarium när du vill söka bland kommunens ärenden och dokument.
Välj Sammanträden när du vill läsa kallelser och protokoll.
Påsinsyn och Förtroendevald är under utveckling och kommer att testas under våren.
The case of Uddevalla (Sweden)

Search according to:
- six areas, and/or
- free text search (words of the headlines and of documents-texts filled into the LEX-template (no index based search))

and/or dates (today/yesterday - to whole last year)
DMS from inside out: complex data model

The case of Uddevalla (Sweden)

Content type and area

Step of process – tracking for internal administrative purposes (planned)

Other documents related to this

Short description of content

Date of termination of administrative process

But no indexing based on a common thesaurus
Bremen FoIAct (2005) applying to 6 state ministries and about 60 agencies

General Publication Requirement

(1) The public agencies have to provide registers of their information collections and their purposes.

(2) They shall publish organization charts and filing and record plans, directives and ordinances and other information they have available when the interest of the public is obvious, unless there are legal reasons against it or unless publication would produce disproportionate expenditures.

(3) The public agencies shall make these and other suitable information in electronic form available for the public.

(4) The Free Hanseatic City of Bremen establishes a Central Information Register in order to facilitate the information retrieval (“make finding of information easier”). The public agencies are required to notify the Information Register of publications.

(5) Details are stipulated by statutory order.
Citizen centered access

How do people search for information?

If they now exactly what they are looking for
->by keyword an search function
If the know what they want but not how to name or spell it
->by an alphabetic list
If the only have a vague idea what they might want
->by a thematic catalog and/or by browsing through examples

Hard to provide for one agency.
requires DMS with indexing of documents
with user centered keywords
Considering the localization problem there should be an integrated system covering all agencies within the jurisdiction of the law
This will never happen just for FoI purposes. But an effective DMS is Required for internal document-/knowledge management anyway
Politik + Staat

Informationssuche

Suche nach Informationen aus der Bremen

Im zentralen elektronischen Informationsregal Informationen aus der bremischen Verwaltung. Bürgerinnen und Bürgern kostenfrei zur Verfügung stellen alle bremischen Gesetze und Rechtsverordnungen, internen Vorschriften und Beschlüsse.

Einfache Suche

Die Einfache Suche sucht in den Titeln der betrugsten Informationen sowie nach den eingebenen Stichwörtern.

Erweiterte Suche

Um die Suchkriterien zu verfeinern, stellt die Erweiterte Suche Auswahlfelder zur Verfügung, die die Informationen beispielsweise nach dem zuständigen Ressort oder den zugeordneten Themen einschränken können.

A bis Z-Index

Der A bis Z-Index sortiert alle eingestellten Informationen alphabetisch nach zugeordneten Stichwörtern und ermöglicht einen thematischen Überblick über alle vorhandenen Informationen.
Politik + Staat

Suche nach Informationen aus der Bremischen Verwaltung

Im zentralen elektronischen Informationsregister befinden sich Informationen aus der bremischen Verwaltung, die die Behörden der Bürgerinnen und Bürgern kostenfrei zur Verfügung stellen. Hierzu gehören u.a. alle bremischen Gesetze und Rechtsverordnungen, aber auch verwaltungsinterne Vorschriften und Beschlüsse.

Einfache Suche

Die **Einfache Suche** sucht in den Titeln der bereitgestellten Informationen sowie nach den eingegbenen Stichwörtern.

Erweiterte Suche

Um die Suchkriterien zu verfeinern, stellt die **Erweiterte Suche** Auswahlfelder zur Verfügung, die die Informationen beispielsweise nach dem zuständigen Ressort oder den zugeordneten Themen einschränken können.

A bis Z- Index

Der **A bis Z- Index** sortiert alle eingestellten Informationen alphabetisch nach zugeordneten Stichwörtern und ermöglicht so einen thematischen Überblick über alle vorhandenen Informationen.
Für politische und staatliche Fragen gibt es unter anderem folgende Schlagworte:

- Allgemeinbildende Schulen
- Apotheken (allgemein)
- Arbeit und Technik
- Arbeitschutz
- Arbeitserlaubnis
- Arbeitsmarktberichte
- Arbeitsmarktstrukturentwicklung
- Arbeitsplatzförderung
- Arbeitsrecht
- Architektenkammer
- Asyl
- Atomrecht
- Aufgabenplanung
Ergebnisanzeige der Dokumentensuche

Sie haben nach folgenden Kriterien gesucht:
Schlagwort: Apotheken (allgemein)

Es wurden 3 Dokumente gefunden.

1. **Titel:** Geschäftsverteilung bei der Senatorin für Arbeit, Frauen, Gesundheit, Jugend und Soziales
   **Dokumenttyp:** Geschäftsverteilungs- und Organisationspläne
   **Ressort:** Die Senatorin für Arbeit, Frauen, Gesundheit, Jugend und Soziales
   **Standort:** DOKUMENT ZUM AUFRUFEN
   → MEHR

2. **Titel:** Organigramm der Senatorin für Arbeit, Frauen, Gesundheit, Jugend und Soziales
   **Dokumenttyp:** Geschäftsverteilungs- und Organisationspläne
   **Ressort:** Die Senatorin für Arbeit, Frauen, Gesundheit, Jugend und Soziales
   **Standort:** DOKUMENT ZUM AUFRUFEN
   → MEHR

Datenbestand am 18.05.08: 1232 Dokumente
Progress is slow

- The central register is a separate one
- The original idea of generating the FOI-register as part of a state-wide DMS failed. It was not possible to standardize the different DMS of the different ministries nor to introduce a common standard for meta-data.
- Within the different local DMS or filing systems indexing of documents is not common.
- FoI provision means not only a cultural change regarding secrecy vs openness,
- it is also a cultural change regarding accurateness in filing documents, not to speak of the differences between the administrative view and the citizens´ view regarding keywords.

There is eGovernment research on the integration of information systems and IOIS.
Second Reform B: Process Control

Localize agency owning the document and identify title of document

Information need

Go to (e) Reading room

Submit request

Documents

Identify desired document

Issue ticket

Publish documents

Find desired document and check eligibility

Forward request to other agency

Delivery of desired document or denial

Report

Tracking and tracing
Second US reform 2005

US Executive Order 13, 392 by George W. Bush
„Improving Agency Disclosure of Information

Central message: FoI provision is a service
Agencies have to provide citizens centered ways to learn about the FoI process, about the status of a persons request and appropriate information about the agency’s response

Requests shall be processed in an efficient manner with measurable improvements
-→ chief FoI officer, public liaison staff
-→ monitoring, tracking and tracing of requests
-→ annual reports to the Attorney General
Recent US-legislation (S 2488)

After years of negotiations on Dec. 31st President Gortge W. Bush signed the Open Government Act S 2488 which amends the FOIA and among other regulations

• requires agencies to establish
  – (1) a system to assign an individualized tracking number for each FOIA request received that will take longer than 10 days to process, and
  – (2) a telephone line or Internet service that provides information on the status of a request;

• revises annual reporting requirements on agency compliance with the FOIA to require information on
  – (1) FOIA denials based upon particular statutory provisions,
  – (2) response times, and
  – (3) compliance by the agency and by each principal component thereof; and requires agencies to make the raw statistical data used in reports electronically available to the public upon request;
establishes within the National Archives and Records Administration an Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) to
– (1) review compliance with FOIA policies,
– (2) recommend policy changes to Congress and the President, and
– (3) offer mediation services between FOIA requesters and agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation; and authorizes the OGIS to issue advisory opinions if mediation fails to resolve a dispute;
## Needed FoI research on the micro level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search for documents</strong></td>
<td>Available options within and beyond FoI</td>
<td>Representative surveys on search behavior</td>
<td>Comparative studies on information retrieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usability</strong></td>
<td>----→</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Management / Integration of IS (IOIS)</strong></td>
<td>Available options within and beyond FoI</td>
<td>Review existing e-Gov research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Management</strong></td>
<td>dito</td>
<td>dito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Role of NGOs and web 2.0 in the Policy Cycle

Pressure

New Technical Options: Web 2.0

Political negotiation of reforms

Ideas for Improvements

The Role of NGOs

FOI Legislation

Providing legal access rights and institutional regimes

Structure and Processes of Agencies

Identification / assessment of problems

Performance Reports

Monitoring

Operating requests
Web 2.0 stands for
• user generated content
• participatory web and
• social communities.

There some initiatives regarding FoI Collecting and procviding deliberated documents and / or monitoring the processing of requests

• Can they substitute electronic reading rooms and registers by providing more user centered and user friendly access?
• Can they exercise some pressure on agencies by monitoring and publishing their processing of requests (denials, processing time)?
United Kingdom:  
What Do They Know  
started by My Society,  
who already run Fix my Street  

Does pressure from outside force progress, as it did with Fix My Street

How does the site work?  
You choose the public authority that you would like information from, then write a brief note describing what you want to know. We then send your request to the public authority. Any response they make is automatically published on the website for you and anyone else to find and read.
Make or explore Freedom of Information requests

First, type in the name of the UK public authority you'd like information from OR anything to search for

e.g. Liverpool, MRSA, Treasury

Ministry of Defence
Department for Work and Pensions
Department of Health
Edinburgh Council
Lambeth Borough Council
Royal Mail Group
British Broadcasting Corporation
Local Government Ombudsmen

More authorities...

Convictions of Serving Police Offic... Costs of evicting travellers
Commercial Access To Stolen Vehicle... Budgets for Strictly Come Dancing s...
Results of CROW Refuse collection
Out of Station Interchanges NON Conviction Data

More successful requests...
GovernmentDocs.org was created to advance the values of open and accountable government. **This site gives the public an unprecedented level of access to government documents by allowing users to browse, search, and review hundreds of thousands of pages acquired through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and other public disclosure, or “sunshine,” laws.**

With the GovernmentDocs.org system, citizen reviewers can engage in the government accountability process like never before. Registered users can review and comment on documents, adding their insights and expertise to the work of the national nonprofit organizations which are partnering on this project.
Willkommen

Startseite der gemeinsamen Aktenzentralliste des CCC und FoeBuD e.V.


Derzeit bietet das Portal folgende Möglichkeiten:
- Suchen von bereits gestellten Anträgen und eingestellten Akten
- Einstellen von Informationen über gestellte Anträge
- Hochladen von erhaltenen Akten

Wir möchten, dass alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger möglichst leicht und schnell vom neuen Informationsfreiheitsgesetz profitieren können. Leider nehmen die Behörden oft hohe Gebühren für die Herausgabe oder Kopie von Unterlagen und Schriftstücken. Hierbei können Sie die Dokumente, die Sie aus den Aktenkellern "befreit" und vielleicht teuer bezahlt haben, unkompliziert auch anderen Interessierten zugänglich machen. Das macht den Staat transparent, spart doppelte Arbeit und doppelte Kosten für alle Beteiligten.

Wir möchten Anträge und "befreite Dokumente" bündeln und dokumentieren. Dieses Portal lebt davon, dass Bürger/innen, Journalist/innen, Anwält/innen und andere Interessierte ihre "befreiten Dokumente" zur Verfügung stellen. Wie einfach das geht, erfahren Sie unter der Rubrik "Hinweise/Hilfe".

Dürfen wir das? Wir haben Juristen gefragt, und die sagten (für Juristen erstaunlich eindeutig) "ja". Etwas schwieriger könnte es sein, wenn Urheberrechte Dritter (also: von Nicht-Behörden) betroffen sind. Wir betreten Neuland.
First Count May 2008: 15 documents uploaded in almost one year

Second Count Nov. 2008: No new entries

9 requests filed

http://www.befreite-dokumente.de/
Research question on NGOs in the FoI Context

It seems in the FoI context communities are not as attractive as in other areas. If so, why?

Can they exercise some pressure on agencies by monitoring and publishing their processing of requests (denials, processing time)?
(probably Yes, but under what premises -> evaluative research)

Can they substitute electronic reading rooms and registers by providing more user centered and user friendly access?
(Probably No. They do not reach a critical mass. On the citizens’ side there is no expectation to find any kind of document at such portal. They either google or look at portals for the particular content area.)
Needed FoI Research on the macro level regarding Communities / Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of communities in the FoI context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services / functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FoI and E-Government Research

There is more FoI relevant research than originally expected

Trad. FoI Research
- law oriented
- macro view

Research on Social communities and movements

E-Gov-Research
- Micro view on Servicedelivery, integration of IS

Doesn’t FoI require administrative procedures based on modern technology?

Isn’t FoI part of eGovernment?

Researchers in the three areas should be more aware and increase exchange