

Active Transparency Rating 2020: Concerns and recommendations

The results from the active transparency rating conducted in 2020 along with some positive developments also show problems that have not been resolved for years.

- 1.** The "Access to information" sections (ATI sections) on the institutions' websites still do not perform the functions that derive from the APIA - to facilitate information seekers. Only 23 of the surveyed institutions maintain ATI sections whose content meets the goal laid out in the law.
- 2.** Although registration of the requests is mandatory, and although 69% of the authorities self-report that they have electronic registers of ATI requests, the data from our survey shows that only 50 out of all 562 institutions have notified the information seekers about the registration of the electronic request. Informing the requestor about the registration of the electronically submitted request is especially important for the successful work with the Access to Information Platform.
- 3.** The positive impact that the Open Data Portal has on publishing of databases and registers in open format also has a downside. Many of the registers that are published on the Portal are not available on the institution's website.
- 4.** In most of the webpages the requested information is published, but the publication is formal and incompatible with the user's needs. The information published is difficult to find and the ATI section gives no instructions on where it can be found.
- 5.** Although 84% of the institutions have adopted and published their own Internal Rules for working under the APIA, only 65% have them updated in accordance with the latest amendments in the law.
- 6.** There is a lack of coordination, i.e. there is no specific body to set common models and to assist authorities in following the models when it comes to publishing information and working with electronic ATI requests.