

# Bridging the Gap: Unravelling Local Government Data Sharing Barriers in Estonia and Beyond

Katrin Rajamäe Soosaar<sup>1</sup> and Anastasija Nikiforova<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Association of Estonian Cities and Rural Municipalities, Tartu, Estonia, katrin.raja@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia, Nikiforova.anastasija@gmail.com

**Abstract:** Estonia's digital government success has received global acclaim, yet its Open Government Data (OGD) initiatives, especially at the local level, encounter persistent challenges. Despite significant progress of national OGD initiative in OGD rankings, local governments lag in OGD provision. This study aims to examine barriers hindering municipalities from openly sharing OGD. Employing a qualitative approach through interviews with Estonian municipalities and drawing on the OGD-adapted Innovation Resistance Theory model, the study sheds light on barriers impeding OGD sharing. Practical recommendations are proposed to bridge the gap between national policies and local implementation, including enhancing awareness, improving data governance frameworks, and fostering collaboration between local and national authorities. By addressing overlooked weaknesses in the Estonian open data ecosystem and providing actionable recommendations, this research contributes to a more resilient and sustainable open data ecosystem. Additionally, by validating the OGD-adapted Innovation Resistance Theory model and proposing a revised version tailored for local government contexts, the study advances theoretical frameworks for understanding data sharing resistance. Ultimately, this study serves as a call to action for policymakers and practitioners to prioritize local OGD initiatives.

**Keywords:** Barrier, Innovation Resistance theory, Interview, Local government, Municipality, Open data, Open data ecosystem, Open data portal, Open Government Data, Technology adoption, Qualitative approach

## 1 Introduction

Estonia, known as a “digital state” or “e-country”, has struggled with maintaining and providing Open Government Data (OGD) (McBride et al., 2018) despite its success in digital governance. Significant advancements have been observed since 2020, with Estonia rising from 24th place in 2018 to 5th place in the European Open Data Maturity Report (Publications Office of the European Union, 2023) by 2020 and maintaining a top position in subsequent years due to substantial improvements in policy indicators and the impact dimension. However, while overall, Estonia's journey in open data governance showcases significant progress and leadership at the national level, there are persistent challenges in data provision and quality at the local government level (Rajamäe-Soosaar & Nikiforova, 2024).

Local administrative level data, being closest to cities citizens often being generated by its citizens, industries, academia, and public authorities for their public service mission, carries great value for various range of open data ecosystem stakeholders, but until now still their full potential is not utilized due to an intertwined set of organizational, technological, and legal barriers (Liva et al., 2023; Fusi, 2021; Sandoval-Almazan et al., 2021). As of mid-2023, only 12 out of 79 (15%) Estonian local governments, including 15 urban municipalities and 64 rural municipalities, had published any data on the national OGD portal (with one more published after the study), with larger municipalities like Tallinn and Tartu being the main contributors.

A study conducted in 2022, examining the information systems of local government revealed that the information systems of municipalities (Proud Engineers, 2024) found that local government information systems in Estonia do not form a coherent integrated ecosystem. Knowledge of service management and development is generally low, and most local governments do not prioritize data management and open data.

The Estonian Digital Agenda 2030<sup>1</sup> also highlights the digital divide between local authorities and state agencies. This underscores the need for a more in-depth examination of municipal issues to investigate possible causes.

The objective of this study is to examine Estonian OGD development at the national and local levels, identifying the main barriers municipalities face when openly sharing OGD, defining corrective actions to improve the situation. To achieve the objective, we conduct qualitative analysis of barriers faced by local governments when opening their data through interviews with local governments, whose protocol is developed by drawing from the OGD-adapted Innovation Resistance Theory (IRT), which is intended to study functional and psychological factors OGD barriers, empirically identifying predictors affecting public agencies' resistance to openly sharing government data (Nikiforova and Zuiderwijk, 2022). While focusing on examining barriers associated with the governmental data sharing by local governments, this study also validates the model, as it remains so far to be conceptual model with no application to the real-world context.

The findings from local government interviews are used to propose improvements for the current Estonian OGD ecosystem and its local data ecosystem in particular. As one of the authors is involved with the Estonian Association of Municipalities, which represents the common interests and arranges co-operation of local governments being responsible for developing and implementing the digital transformation plan of local governments (incl. data governance and open data), we intend to use these results to support municipalities in developing data governance and open data initiatives by transforming these recommendations into actions.

Given the limited research on local OGD or local data ecosystem, this study offers new insights into the role of local governments/ municipalities in providing open data and the associated barriers and enablers. By focusing on Estonia, the study serves as call for action for more research and practical efforts to address challenges at the local level, as the integral yet often overlooked part of open data ecosystem, aiming for a more resilient and sustainable open data ecosystem. This is even more so, considering that we demonstrate that even in the case of very successful national OGD initiative (as evidenced by high ranking in the OGD indices and benchmarks), it may lag at the local level. This discrepancy highlights the need for focused attention on enhancing OGD efforts within municipalities to match the nation's trend-setting status. The results could inform data governance and open data policymaking, offering practical recommendations for national and local authorities to enhance Estonia's open data landscape.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides background on the topic, Section 3 presents methodology. Section 4 presents the results of the interviews with local governments' representatives on barriers and enablers towards OGD publishing and maintenance and the recommended measures for local data ecosystem improvement. Section 5 establishes discussion, acknowledges limitations, suggests future research directions, while Section 6 concludes the paper and stresses practical and theoretical contributions of this study.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Related literature

The OGD ecosystem at local and regional levels in Europe shows slow progress. This is particularly true for Estonia, despite its advanced e-government infrastructure, which has rarely been the focus of OGD research, with only a few studies investigating the reasons for its low OGD maturity, although both at the national level (Kassen, 2019; McBride et al., 2018). There has been no recent examination of Estonia's rapid evolution from “follower” to “trend-setter” (in ODM reports). Research on local government-level

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.mkm.ee/en/e-state-and-connectivity/digital-agenda-2030>

OGD in Estonia is notably lacking, a trend seen across Europe. Most studies at European level that focus on the local data ecosystem, concentrate on open data platforms, data usage and sharing, and digital maturity assessments in municipalities, with limited attention to local OGD and barriers public agencies face when opening data, as evidenced by a systematic literature review by Rajamäe-Soosaar & Nikiforova (2024).

Given the potential of city and municipal data, there is a need for research on regional and local OGD ecosystems, focusing on the progress of open data initiatives, barriers to data sharing, and user perspectives. While OGD adoption has been extensively studied at the national level, the used methods can be adapted to the local government context, e.g., established technology adoption models. However, current research primarily emphasizes technology acceptance models, which aim to identify factors predicting technology use, while overlooking the reluctance towards data opening.

For example, studies such as Wirtz et al. (2019) used the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to examine OGD use determinants. Talukder et al. (2019), Zuiderwijk et al. (2015), and Shao (2023) employed the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) to explore behavioral intentions towards OGD adoption in various national contexts. Islam et al. (2023) integrated UTAUT with the Information System Continuance Model to investigate sustained usage intentions of OGD platforms in Bangladesh, similar to Yang and Wu (2022) in Taiwan, who combined UTAUT and the DeLone and McLean IS Success Model. Weerakkody et al. (2017) used the Diffusion of Innovations Theory (DOI) to identify predictors influencing public sector open data use. Some studies adopted hybrid approaches, combining multiple theoretical models (e.g., Wang et al., 2020; Lnenicka et al., 2022; Islam et al., 2023).

While these studies primarily investigate OGD acceptance from the user perspective, some have shifted focus to the OGD provider's perspective, elucidating factors that impact adoption by government agencies. For instance, Wang and Lo (2016) used the Technology–Organization–Environment (TOE) framework to explore key determinants such as perceived benefits, barriers, organizational readiness, and external pressures in Taiwan. Hossain et al. (2022) proposed a model integrating seven context-specific TOE variables to understand factors shaping OGD initiatives. Huang and Huang (2022) examined individual and organizational factors influencing public servants' intention to implement OGD policies in Taiwan, using the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB).

Nonetheless, the reluctance perspective with identification of surrounding barriers to-wards data opening, remains crucial as being capable to pinpoint actual issues and challenges that need to overcome to successfully adopt the phenomenon. The Innovation Resistance Theory (IRT) offers a promising approach to identifying barriers preventing the acceptance of OGD. OGD-adapted model has been proposed by Nikiforova and Zuiderwijk (2022), though it has never been tested, i.e., it remains a theoretical concept that requires validation in real-world scenarios with its further refinement, should such be needed. To this end, this study addresses this gap by using the proposed theoretical model to examine barriers Estonian local governments are facing, while by doing so, validating the model and evaluating its appropriateness to the studied problem.

## **2.1 Estonian OGD journey**

Estonia launched its first national open data portal in 2015. Initially, it hosted a small number of datasets, where by 2018 – 3 years after the portal launch - data availability was limited to 89 datasets, found by users inconvenient to use it (McBride et al., 2018; McBride et al., 2020). A major factor affecting insufficient focus on open data movement in Estonia is typically considered to be due to the X-Road - the national interoperability infrastructure that provide a unified and secure data exchange system, used by Estonian public sector institutions for exchanging data and offering services to the citizens, thereby reducing the emphasis on open data initiative and making policymakers sceptical regarding OGD initiatives (McBride et al., 2018). The state of the art, however, changed with the societal and international pressure, including the importance of OGD in international e-Government rankings (McBride et al., 2020), and entering into a

contract with Open Knowledge Estonia (non-profit organization) to improve the performance of Estonia's OGD ecosystem done by the Estonian Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications in 2018, which led to substantial improvements. By 2020, the number of datasets, unique users, applications, and open data events had significantly increased, propelling Estonia's ranking in the European Open Data Maturity report from 27th to 14th place (McBride et al., 2020). A pivotal role in this transformation was played by legislation.

By 2021, amendments to the Estonian Public Information Act aligned with EU Directive 2019/1024, imposing new obligations for public information provision and re-use. These included requirements for open data descriptions, availability of research data, immediate release of dynamic data, non-restrictive re-use conditions, and free access to high-value datasets.

As a result of this transformation, Estonian efforts have been recognized in various EU and global rankings. E.g., the European Open Data Maturity Report shows Estonia's impressive journey from 27th place in 2018 to a "trendsetter" position by 2020, reaching 4th place in 2023. This progress highlighted substantial improvements in policy indicators and the impact dimension, despite persistent challenges in data provision from smaller local governments and issues with the quality of open data, particularly regarding the currency of data and metadata, and linked data. In the OECD OURdata Index of 2023, Estonia ranked 4th out of 36 countries, excelling in policy content and government data literacy programs. However, the country scored lower in the availability of high-value datasets and impact monitoring. The most recent report by the Open Data Inventory (ODIN) ranked Estonia 5th in Northern Europe and the 11th position globally (as of 2022). ODIN also identified coverage as a key area for improvement, particularly in social statistics and subnational data availability, based on data from Statistics Estonia. This again points to the shortcomings in local-level data provision. The World Justice Project, while not primarily focused on open data governance, ranks Estonia 9th globally and 7th regionally in 2023. Estonia scores highly for publicized laws and government data but ranks lower in "Civic Participation" and "Complaint Mechanisms" (13th out of 31 countries). Overall, Estonia's journey in open data governance showcases significant progress and leadership, especially at the national level, while highlighting ongoing challenges in local data provision and quality.

Most benchmarks focus primarily on central governments, where the Global Open Data Index is one of those few that covers regional or local levels, but it has not covered Estonia in any of its assessments. Unfortunately, this project has been archived, limiting in-depth insights into local open data landscape.

In 2021, the new open data portal ([avaandmed.eesti.ee](http://avaandmed.eesti.ee)) was launched, which is powered by a custom-made platform for the open data portal tailored to meet specific needs better than the CKAN platform that powered the first Estonian OGD portal. By January 2024, the portal hosted 1,807 datasets, reflecting significant growth. However, only 12 out of 79 local governments in Estonia had contributed to the portal, publishing fewer than 170 datasets in total. The primary contributors among these were the municipalities of Tallinn and Tartu. Both cities have also dedicated portals for geospatial data.

Low local governments participation rate, however, may be due to the fact that, in accordance with the Estonian Public Information Act, local governments must maintain a document register and disclose certain documents, such as legislation, contracts, and public letters, from their Document Management System (DMS). The public document register includes documents not subject to restrictions, such as private data. Municipal websites typically feature direct links to the public view of their DMS, allowing access to JSON files containing legislation, contracts, and official correspondence from nearly 50 local governments. Few municipalities have published links to their DMS datasets on the OGD portal. For Anija, Harku, and Saue Municipalities, the portal notes that the data was migrated from the previous version of the national OGD portal without publisher review. Nine other local governments have updated their dataset metadata on the national portal. Most municipalities, however, have not done none of the above providing the access to their DMS through their websites. To this end, as we found out during the discussion with the representative of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, a new Data Portal/Gateway will be developed soon, integrating the State Information System management system (RIHA) and the Open Data Portal, with

improved usability for a better user experience. To address these challenges, Estonia plans to integrate the State Information System management system (RIHA) with the Open Data Portal and improve its usability. However, despite high rankings and increase in popularity of the OGD portal, indicated by the number of datasets it hosts and usage statistics (download rates, rating and feedback along with the use cases (134 use-cases as of May 2024)), within the local context of Estonia open government data (OGD) is not widely recognized. A 2024 survey<sup>2</sup> for the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications found that only one-third of Estonians had heard of "open data," and just 17% understood its meaning. However, 71% of respondents still considered open data important for society. In summary, while Estonia has improved its positions in many open data rankings, local governments are still lagging, as evidenced by the modest number of municipalities publishing data on the national portal. A survey on open data awareness revealed that the topic is relatively unknown to the public, which may also be a constraint at the local administrative level. These findings are used as for developing an interview protocol to identify the main barriers local governments face in sharing and maintaining open data, directly addressing the research question of this study.

### 3 Methodology

To answer the research question, we conduct a qualitative study driven by technology adoption theory to empirically identify the main barriers Estonian local governments face in sharing and maintaining open data.

To this end, we utilize the model proposed by Nikiforova and Zuiderwijk (2022) to study barriers associated with the OGD opening. They propose an OGD-adapted IRT model to study the resistance of public authorities to openly share government data.

Innovation Resistance Theory (IRT), in turn, was developed by Ram and Sheth in 1989 (Ram and Sheth, 1989) arguing that consumers resist innovations despite their necessity and desirability due to several barriers that inhibit their adoption. According to IRT, barriers are categorized into: (1) functional barriers that arise when consumers face significant changes from adopting the innovation, related to product usage, value, and risks; (2) psychological barriers, which stem from consumers' traditions and perceived product image, often conflicting with prior beliefs.

IRT has been widely applied in marketing and business research (Ma and Lee, 2019; Dwivedi et al., 2023), with many studies empirically evaluating consumer resistance to innovations (Talwar et al., 2020). However, its application in the e-government domain is limited to two studies, with (Prakash and Das, 2022) that examines citizens' resistance to digital contact tracing apps during the COVID-19 pandemic and (Nikiforova & Zuiderwijk, 2021) that proposed the model we are using in this study.

Nikiforova & Zuiderwijk's (2021) conceptual model consists of five main IRT barrier categories, each associated with OGD barriers identified through a literature review (Table 1). Based on these barriers, five hypotheses were formulated to study public authorities' resistance to openly sharing government data in the form of "*[Construct ∈ {Usage barrier; Value Barrier; Risk barrier; Tradition Barrier; Image Barrier}] has a positive effect on public agencies' resistance toward openly sharing government data*" (H1: Usage barrier, H2: Value Barrier, H3: Risk barrier, H4: Tradition Barrier, H5: Image Barrier) (Nikiforova & Zuiderwijk (2021, p.3). We employ these hypotheses, tailoring them to the specific context of our study. As such, our hypotheses are:

**H1:** *Usage barrier (UB) positively influences local governments' resistance to openly sharing government data .*

**H2:** *Value barrier (VB) positively influences local governments' resistance to openly sharing government data .*

---

<sup>2</sup> [Open data portal \(eesti.ee\)](https://open.eesti.ee)

**H3:** Risk barrier (RB) positively influences local governments' resistance to openly sharing government data .

**H4:** Tradition barrier (TB) positively influences local governments' resistance to openly sharing government data .

**H5:** Image barrier (IB) positively influences local governments' resistance to openly sharing government data.

Table 1. The proposed model and its elements (Nikiforova & Zuiderwijk, 2022)

Barrier	Measurement item
<b>Usage Barrier (UB)</b>	UB1: It is difficult to attain the appropriate quality level for open government data to be shared openly UB2: It is difficult to prepare data for publication so that they comply with OGD principles UB3: It is difficult to prepare data for publication so that they become appropriate for reuse UB4: Data are difficult to publish on the OGD portal due to the complexity of the process UB5: Data are difficult to publish on the OGD portal due to the unclear process UB6: Data are difficult to publish on the OGD portal due to their limited functionality UB7: Open government data portals often do not allow for semi-automation of the publishing process UB8: It is difficult to maintain openly shared government data
<b>Value Barrier (VB)</b>	VB1: My organization believes that openly sharing government data is often not valuable for the public VB2: Many open government datasets are not appropriate for reuse VB3: Many open government datasets suffer from data quality issues (completeness, accuracy, uniqueness, consistency etc.) VB4: The public gains of openly sharing government data are often lower than the costs VB5: My organizations' gains of openly sharing government data are often lower than the costs VB6: Data preparation is too resource-consuming for my organization VB7: Open government data do not provide any value to my organization VB8: Open data that my organization can openly share will not provide value to users VB9: The amount of resources to be spent to prepare, publish and maintain open government data outweigh the benefit my organization gains from it
<b>Risk Barrier (RB)</b>	RB1: My organization fears the misuse of openly shared government data RB2: My organization fears the misinterpretation of openly shared government data RB3: My organization fears that openly shared government data will not be reused RB4: My organization fears violating data protection legislation when openly sharing government data RB5: My organization fears that sensitive data will be exposed as a result of opening its data RB6: My organization fears making mistakes when preparing data for publication RB7: My organization fears that users will find existing errors in the data RB8: My organization fears that openly sharing its data will reduce its gains (otherwise the organization could sell the data or use it in another beneficial way) RB9: My organization fears that openly sharing its data will allow its competitors to benefit from this data
<b>Tradition Barrier (TB)</b>	TB1: Freedom of information requests are sufficient for the public to obtain government data TB2: My organization is reluctant to implement the culture change required for openly sharing government data TB3: Employees in my organization lack the skills required for openly sharing government data TB4: Employees in my organization lack the skills required for maintaining openly shared government data TB5: My organization is reluctant to radically change the organizational processes that would enable openly sharing government data
<b>Image Barrier (IB)</b>	IB1: My organization has a negative image of open government data IB2: My organization believes that open government data is not valuable for users IB3: My organization fears that openly sharing government data will damage the reputation of my organization IB4: My organization fears that the accidental publication of low-quality data will damage the reputation of my organization IB5: My organization fears that associating them to incorrect conclusions drawn from OGD analysis by OGD users will damage the reputation of my organization

Figure 2 presents the model, with the numbers in brackets indicating the number of measurement items defined for each barrier, as presented in Table 1.




Figure 2. Research model and proposed hypotheses (the numbers in brackets refer to the number of measurement items in Table 1) (Nikiforova & Zuiderwijk, 2022)

While the model is approach-agnostic, allowing to utilize both the quantitative and qualitative approach, the authors recommend a qualitative study for richer insights, particularly in understanding the nuanced challenges of individual organizations, navigating conversation, considering the unique setting of an individual organization. As such, the study proposes conducting interviews with representatives of public agencies.

To this end, an interview protocol is developed based on the model, as described in the next section along with the sampling approach utilized in this study.

### 3.1 Interview protocol

The initial interview protocol, based on the proposed OGD-adapted IRT model by Nikiforova & Zuiderwijk (2021), was tailored to suit the objectives of this study. It was expanded to encompass (1) the OGD ecosystem (5 questions), and (2) organizations' experience with the Estonian national portal [avaandmed.eesti.ee](https://avaandmed.eesti.ee). As the interviews focused on local governments, all the questions were adapted to municipalities' perspective. The final interview protocol is available in Supplementary Materials and on ZENODO [link to be added upon acceptance]. To avoid language barrier, the interview protocol was translated into the respondent's native language – Estonian.

The interview protocol comprises four major sections. The first section delves into the general profile of the organization represented by the respondent and their awareness of open data. This includes inquiries about the local government, the respondent's role, the type of data collected by the municipality, and their awareness of the concept of "open data." The later question was added in the light of the survey that revealed limited awareness of open data amongst Estonian residents<sup>3</sup>.

The second section includes questions about sharing openly data on municipal website or portal and national open data portal. Most of the Estonian local governments have not published any data in national portal, but there might be datasets that are openly shared on the municipal website (e.g., document registers) (as analysis of Estonian Open Data Portal documented in Section 4 revealed). The Public Information Act indicates the data that should be disclosed in open format also by local governments, if possible and appropriate, and would not involve disproportionately great effort. Hence, this interview section was split into two separate blocks repeating questions to gain more insight on the experience with both hubs and identify possible datasets that possess the characteristics of open data on local level websites.

The second section addresses openly sharing data on municipal websites or portals and the national open data portal. Most of the Estonian local governments have not published data in national portal, but there might be datasets that are openly shared on the municipal website (e.g., document registers) (as found in (Soosaar & Nikiforova, 2024)). The Public Information Act indicates the data that should be disclosed in

<sup>3</sup> <https://avaandmed.eesti.ee/>

open format also by local governments, if possible and appropriate, and would not involve disproportionately great effort. Hence, this interview section was split into two separate blocks repeating questions to gain more insight on the experience with both hubs and identify potential datasets that possess the characteristics of open data on local level websites.

In the light of the above, this section contains questions:

- 1) *whether the municipality has ever openly shared its own data or the data it collected from other sources;*
- 2) *what were the drivers for doing this or what were the reasons for not sharing them openly;*
- 3) *what type of data the municipality shared openly? and how often;*
- 4) *what was the process of openly sharing data? and who within the organization were involved;*
- 5) *what challenges the organization faced in openly sharing data;*
- 6) *what have been the specific cases, where municipality's open data was reused by third party?*

The latter question was added to this section to identify possible use cases of OGD usage, which could contribute to better understanding of the local data ecosystem. If the local government had not shared data on national open data, additional question about the reasons for not doing it were asked.

The third section focuses on IRT model-related questions. As this study is explorative in nature, each measurement item was converted into an open-ended question of the form *“To what extent do the following situations form a barrier to openly sharing your organization's data: ...”* where each barrier listed in Table 1 is then addressed.

Open-ended question and long responses were given preference over closed-ended questions (yes/no) as the interest was to delve into the respondents' real experiences with obstacles encountered by local governments. Before addressing specific barriers, respondents were provided with a definition of each barrier and asked if any challenges related to openly sharing data were encountered. The same question was asked after addressing each specific barrier, i.e., *whether there are any other barriers that could form a barrier?* (see Table A.1 1). After all the barriers' related questions have been asked, additional general question was included to identify any additional barriers not covered in the predefined categories. These additional questions would help to verify whether all potentially relevant barriers were captured, aiding in the validation and refinement of the model.

The final section explores the overall open data ecosystem and potential improvements. It seeks the respondent's perspective on various aspects, including their perception of the OGD ecosystem, awareness of policy documents or initiatives, suggested actions at national and municipal levels, and the perceived value of open data. As such, it consists of 5 questions:

- 1) *how the respondent sees the OGD ecosystem and its actors;*
- 2) *whether respondent is aware of policy documents or initiatives guiding developments of OGD on Estonian or European level;*
- 3) *which actions should be taken at the national level;*
- 4) *which actions by municipalities to improve the disclosure of open data by local governments;*
- 5) *what is the benefit or value of open data?*

### **3.2 Interview sample**

When assembling the interview sample, selection criteria were established based on several factors for municipalities, namely (1) population size, (2) geographical diversity, (3) presence on the national open data portal.

Considering the wide variation in population across local governments, ranging from 165 registered inhabitants to over 50,000 residents with the average number of residents of 17 381 (According to Estonian



Population Register<sup>4</sup> as of 01.01.2024), the selection aimed to encompass municipalities from three categories based on population size: those with fewer than 10,000 residents, those with 10,000 to 50,000 residents, and those with over 50,000 residents. To ensure representation from different regions, municipalities from each geographical area (e.g., Northern, Southern) were included in the sample. Finally, the local governments that have published data in national open data portal were identified based on results of the respective analysis in (Rajamäe-Soosaar and Nikiforova, 2024). The objective was to include approximately one-third of the municipalities already sharing data on the national portal, thereby incorporating their experience into the study. On the other hand, municipalities without prior experience with the national portal provided valuable insights into the barriers preventing data publication.

The selection process resulted in 16 local governments, out of which 12 consented to participate in the interviews, forming the final sample. Informed consent for recording the interviews and utilizing the collected data was obtained from participants prior to the interviews, with both parties digitally signing the consent form.

All interviews were conducted online in Estonian using MS Teams software and were recorded. The recordings were then converted into MP3 audio files using VLC software and transcribed using an Estonian speech recognition and transcription tool Textiks<sup>5</sup>. The transcriptions were subsequently analysed using qualitative data analysis software NVivo, with coding based on the interview protocol questions. The list of codes, along with the number of files and references, is provided in the Table B.1, while the results are presented in the next Section.

## **4 Results of interviews with local governments on barriers and enablers towards OGD publishing and maintenance**

This section presents results of interviews conducted with 12 local governments across Estonia, aimed at identifying the obstacles associated with the publication and maintenance of OGD at the local level in Estonia. Organized in alignment with the sections outlined in the interview protocol (as detailed in Section 2.2.1), the results provide insights into: (1) the general profile of the respondents, (2) the organization and its stance on open data, (3) usage barriers, (4) value barriers, (5) risk barriers, (6) tradition barriers, (7) image barriers, and (8) the broader landscape of the open data ecosystem. Finally, the most relevant barriers and the recommendations for actions at both the national and local levels are provided.

### **4.1 General profile of the respondents**

Interviews with the 12 municipalities included in the sample were conducted between March and April 2024. In two cases, there were 2 respondents from one municipality, while the other 10 interviews were conducted one-on-one, involving a total of 14 respondents.

Half of the interviewed local governments have populations ranging from 10,000 to 50,000 inhabitants, while 3 municipalities have over 50,000 residents and 3 have fewer than 10,000 residents according to the population registry. Half of the respondents held top-level managerial positions such as Mayor, Deputy Mayor, or Member of Municipal Council. 29% were Top/Leading Specialists (e.g., Data Manager, IT Advisor), and 3 respondents held mid-level management positions (e.g., head of department).

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.siseministeerium.ee/en/activities/population-procedures/population-register>

<sup>5</sup> [tekstiks.ee](https://www.tekstiks.ee)

## 4.2 Organization and provision of open data

In the first part of the interview exploration centred on the type of data collected and published by the organization represented by the interviewee, along with the associated challenges and drivers for openly sharing data.

Two municipalities (LG<sup>6</sup>4, LG7) underscored that all functions and tasks outlined in the Local Government Organisation Act<sup>7</sup> and other legislation necessitate data collection or processing. The types of data mentioned by all respondents include:

- data collected by providing (e-)services (e.g., benefits, permits, applications);
- document management system (local governments regulations, correspondence, etc.);
- data about the municipality's personnel (e.g., salary data, interview summaries);
- data collected into national registers (e.g., population register, education information system);
- data collected due to legal obligation (e.g., register of pets, register of cemeteries);
- geospatial data connected to land use and infrastructure (e.g., detailed plans, lighting, playgrounds);
- surveillance and sensor data (e.g., cameras, pollution sensors);
- analyses and surveys (e.g., satisfaction surveys).

Some local governments (LG2, LG4, LG7) emphasized that while it is not mandatory to use GIS software and create WMS services of their spatial data, they have allocated additional financial and human resources to it. Two respondents highlighted that they collect additional data besides education information register, such as information about hobby/recreational education. One respondent (LG11) categorized the bases for data collection into three categories: data collected by law, based on consent, and data collected under contract.

Respondents' awareness of the concept of "open data" was examined to understand their prior exposure to this topic and put the focus on open government data. Most of the **respondents were aware of the term "open data"** and could mention several principles of open data, but many acknowledged that it is somewhat challenging to distinguish between "data" and "open data" in the context of local government. **Two-thirds of the interviewed municipalities were unaware neither of both general open data principles<sup>8</sup> and the obligation arising from the Public Information Act**, which stipulates that open data should, if possible, be published in machine-readable format and should include data descriptions describing datasets and data (metadata).

Questions about sharing organizational data on the municipal portal and national portal (section two of the interview) were divided into two separate blocks, as 7 of the interviewed local governments had not published any data on the national portal. The first part focused on **municipal website or portal**. Most respondents mentioned that they comply with § 28 of Public Information Act<sup>9</sup> that stipulates the obligations of local government agencies to disclose data and information on their website, but in addition, they publish more data, e.g., geospatial data. Table 2 summarizes the **main types of data that respondents openly share on their websites**. The format of these data varies greatly, and in many cases, machine-readable formats are not provided.

Table 2. Main type of data on municipal website/portal

Type of data	Description	Cases
Development plan, budget strategy and annual budget	The drafts and final versions of these documents should be available	All

<sup>6</sup> Local Government

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/501072023003/consolide>

<sup>8</sup> [https://public.resource.org/8\\_principles.html](https://public.resource.org/8_principles.html)

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/503052023003/consolide>

Spatial plans	Comprehensive spatial plan and detailed spatial plans in line with Planning Act <sup>10</sup>	All
Services of municipality	Description of services, grants, permits etc. that the local authority offers to residents	All
Other geospatial data	Map layers, e.g., public transport routes and stops, local authority agencies, parking areas, public waste stations and containers, playgrounds etc.	LG1, LG2, LG11, LG4, LG5, LG7, LG9, LG 12
Statistical data	Different statistics about the municipality	LG4, LG5, LG11, LG7, LG10
Document register	Local government legislation, contracts, and public correspondence	All
Visualised budget implementation	Interactive visualisation of local government budget implementation by MS PowerBI	LG1, LG 10, LG3, LG 9
Procurement plan	Annual plan of procurements	All
Contacts	Contacts of local authority bodies (council and administration) and agencies (e.g., schools, kindergartens, libraries)	All

The **process of openly sharing data** on municipal websites varies depending on the size and internal processes of the local government. In some cases, the responsibility for publishing specific data on the municipal website or designated geoportal lies with the data owner or department. Smaller municipalities often have only one website administrator, who collects data from data owners or to whom the data owners turn when data needs to be updated.

The **primary driver for openly sharing data on municipal websites** (stimuli) in most cases is the obligation outlined in the Public Information Act and other legislation regulating the disclosure of specific information. However, some respondents emphasized that this is not the sole motive for public disclosure of local government data.

Other motives highlighted by the respondents include:

- transparency of the local government agencies (LG3, LG5, LG6, LG8);
- output, whose production was supported by public funding and therefore should be publicly available (driven by their own intent rather than law or regulation) (LG10, LG4);
- informing citizens and facilitating citizen autonomy (LG4, LG9, LG10).

Additionally, LG7 and LG9 pointed out that the data was initially collected to optimize their internal processes or service delivery, and afterward, it was openly shared with the public.

Interviewed organizations acknowledged various **challenges they have faced or are facing in openly sharing data on municipal websites**, which are categorized with examples in Table 3.

Table 3. Challenges that municipalities have faced in openly sharing data

Challenge	Description or example of the challenge
Lack of human resources	Lack of human resources or current personnel is too engaged with day-to-day activities (LG6, LG8, LG10) LG10: <i>“Each department is responsible for their own things on the website and if they don’t have the skills to put it there or the rights, then the Communication Specialist has been there for that. Of course, when people have changed or someone is on vacation, a challenge always arises”</i>
Technical platform	The sharing of data should be done with less effort - technical platforms have limited functionalities (LG11, LG12)
Lack of competence and understanding	Lack of data competencies in the organization – data governance or management, data analytics, open data, data quality management etc. (LG3, LG5, LG1, LG9, LG10)
Security and privacy issues	Decision-making on data that can be publicly shared due to possible privacy breach. E.g., some spatial data (e.g., locations of sensors) could be reused for criminal motives (e.g., cyber-attacks, theft) or should be not published for national security reasons (LG1, LG2, LG9)

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/504072023008/consolide>

Reusability	Difficulties in data preparation to be shared as open data (open data principles-compliant) due to format in which they are stored by the organization (LG12) LG12: <i>“There is a lot of information on the website that could actually be grouped under open data, but it's not in machine-readable format today.”</i> Possible mistakes when anonymizing data for sharing (LG9)
Organization processes	Difficult to implement the data management and publication process, so that every data owner understands and fulfils it (LG7)

Local governments are cognizant of various stakeholders/ **parties who reuse the data** municipality shares, including:

- 1) students, who use the data for research purposes and projects, such as developing new applications;
- 2) journalists, who use financial data and document register as the basis for their articles;
- 3) actors involved in spatial planning (e.g., real estate developers), who use GIS portals;
- 4) entrepreneurs, who use spatial data and plans to inform their business decisions;
- 5) residents, who use data about road and street closures or snowploughing to plan their trips effectively;
- 6) Members of Municipal Council use financial data in their decision-making processes.

It's worth noting that while some respondents mentioned the Members of the Municipal Council as users of the data shared on their website, they can be considered internal users rather than third parties.

Some of the interviewed organizations demonstrated awareness of examples where municipal open data was reused to bring public value. These instances included:

- applications in public transportation domain, such as bus schedules and real-time bus departure information;
- Waze that uses data on street and road closures to enhance their application's functionality;
- Minuomavalitsus.ee<sup>11</sup> that publishes a systematic overview of local governments' services, incorporating data collected by municipalities.

However, certain organizations lacked understanding of both reusers and use-cases, which emerged as a barrier, as discussed in later sections.

As previously mentioned, five of the interviewed local governments had published some data on the Estonian open data portal [avaandmed.eesti.ee](http://avaandmed.eesti.ee). At the time of writing (May 2024), one municipality from the sample had also published data on the national portal.

Datasets published by these municipalities on national portal range from common datasets including geospatial, budget data and document registers to specific sector information like transport, education, and planning, reflecting the varied needs and activities of different local governments. Geospatial data is shared by largest municipalities, namely Tallinn and Tartu, whereas smaller municipalities predominantly publish document registers. Notably, the municipality with the most datasets mentioned a recent reorganization of datasets on the national portal, combining those related to the same service. As such, the overall number seemingly decreased, however, the content remained unchanged. At the time of the interview, they had three types of datasets on the portal: (1) “classical machine-readable formats” as comes from respondents (e.g., JSON, CSV, XML), (2) spatial data for GIS software (e.g., map layers), and (3) historical data that is not updated (e.g., annual budget of a specific year as PDFs).

The main **driver for sharing data on the national portal** was often the initiative of key personnel within the municipality, and in most cases the first datasets were published already years ago. Two of the respondents admitted to not updating datasets since their initial disclosure and lacking awareness of the data-sharing process. I.e., LG1 mentioned that: *“...this became relevant for a moment when there was this open*

<sup>11</sup> <https://minuomavalitsus.ee/en>

*data portal, but no one has dealt with it more systematically... at least for about a year and a half this topic has not been relevant at all.”*

**Challenges faced by local governments in sharing data** on the Estonian national portal included:

- no possibility to get datasets usage statistics (e.g., downloads in the last month/year). The overall statistics page of the portal is not usable – not possible to sort by data owner or dataset name;
- time-consuming metadata filling process – organization has to fill all metadata fields when adding a new dataset (no pre-filled fields);
- inability to convert data to various formats within the portal, while different user groups need different format of the data;
- lack of preview functionality for uploaded dataset;
- difficulty in identifying valuable datasets for publication.

Seven municipalities had not shared any data on national portal, with four citing lack of **awareness or resources as the main reason**. For example, when elaborating on the possible reasons of lack of awareness of national portal existence, LG10 mentioned: *“There are so many topics here that perhaps some letters may have been overlooked or a notification has gone missing. I don’t know of any other reason.”* LG3 brought out: *“... we don’t have the so-called resources or capability today to undertake this work, to gather these things together and start publishing them. In our house, it’s more like this... the problems are on the objects, if there’s a fire today, you deal with putting out that fire, rather than looking at how to possibly prevent future fires in this context - attention is paid to this, but rather less.”*

There was an interesting case with one municipality that believed it was already sharing data on the national portal, as they had communicated with the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications, provided the necessary information, and assumed it would be published on the portal. However, no data had actually been shared. This situation highlights a misunderstanding of roles within the OGD ecosystem. Local governments often assume that data sharing is centrally managed by the Ministry, while the Ministry expects local governments, as the data owners, to handle the publication themselves.

Another reason mentioned by LG12 is that *“Many open data of municipality are today, for example, based on information systems and these information systems are located at service providers. And getting the data from there is also a bit problematic, because this is not foreseen in service level agreements.”*

After general understanding of organizations experience with the OGD until now has been established, let us discuss specific barriers as implies form the model.

### **4.3 Usage barriers**

Most of the usage barriers can be indicated as relevant for majority of the municipalities when openly sharing data.

Half of the respondents (6) agreed that the **inappropriate quality level of the municipality’s data (UB1)** can be one of the barriers of openly sharing data. 2 respondents mentioned that the barrier lies more in the fact, that the quality level of the data is unknown or undefined. Two municipalities thought they may have quality issues in some operation fields and 2 of the respondents did not see quality as a barrier.

Majority of the interviewed municipalities (8) assessed the **process to prepare data for sharing as complicated (UB2)**. 3 respondents, in turn, do not consider it complicated and one interviewee could not evaluate it due to lack of knowledge about this process. For the reasons for complexity of data preparation process, LG10 mentioned that in many cases they are doing manual work with no means of process automation, as well as lack of data management system. LG12 added that: *“...the information systems provide data differently and they have not taken it into account.”* LG3 raised the competence issues: *“If there are no competencies and awareness in the organization, for example about the national portal, then it is*

*difficult because someone has to start understanding it from scratch.*” LG7 indicated the process itself is not complicated, but it is difficult to make data owners to implement and follow this process.

The **process to make municipality’s data reusable by others (UB3)** was found to be complicated or somewhat complicated by 8 respondents, but the reasons varied quite a lot. In more detail, they were:

- 1) anonymization that in some cases requires manual or tailored solutions (LG10);
- 2) difficult to select the most appropriate format for data further reuse, e.g., JSON, CSV or XML (LG12);
- 3) time required to be dedicated to preparing a thorough documentation/description of the data, if done thoroughly (LG4);
- 4) limited knowledge and understanding of what is meant by “reusability” (LG3, LG5).

Two respondents assess the process itself not to be complicated, but “...*rather the concern is that we have no knowledge who is the user of this data*” (LG11) and “...*it is hard to find out what this necessary amount of data is that someone could actually use*” (LG4).

The next three barriers (UB4, UB5, UB6) concerned the open data portal - [avaandmed.eesti.ee](http://avaandmed.eesti.ee) (i.e., all further responses to be treated as referring to national portal).

5 interviewees could not assess whether the **process to publish data on an open data portal is complicated (UB4)** as they had no knowledge or previous experience with it. One respondent mentioned that they started to create an account in the portal, and with some questions related to the process to which they had no immediate answers and therefore they stopped at that point. Some other challenges the municipalities (LG4, LG6, LG7) had faced were the same with those already mentioned in previous sub-section, namely: (1) publishing is too time-consuming (preparing metadata by manually filling respective form); (2) difficulty in creating APIs and getting data moving between the systems; (3) preparation of data in appropriate formats.

Only four respondents (LG8, LG10, LG11, LG5) agreed that the **process of publishing municipality’s data on an open data portal is unclear (UB5)**. 3 municipalities mentioned that there are good guidelines available in the portal and the process is quite straightforward, “...*but maybe if you are using APIs, that might require more knowledge, but overall, most people could manage*” (LG6). One municipality that has not published data there mentioned: “*I read the guide, according to the guide, it seems like you have steps that you complete and it is supposed to work, but since I haven’t tested it, I don’t know if it actually works.*” LG12 raised a different concern: “*I have understood that whatever is put up [in the portal] will be published... there seems to be no control.*” LG8 and LG9 mentioned again the awareness as one of the key factors, stressing that “... *when this knowledge [about publishing in OD portal] reaches that level, that it’s actually maybe really some things that need to be done, then we would have a lot more data available through this portal.*”

Half of the respondents admitted that they cannot comment on the **functionality of open data portal (UB6)**, as they had not used the Estonian OD portal. For example, LG5 mentioned: “...*why I haven’t used it, maybe because I haven’t understood the benefits of it. Just collecting data doesn’t provide any value. No one can value data until what you have collected reflects something back to us.*” Two municipalities find the national portal satisfactory with enough functionalities. However, two other municipalities criticized several aspects, such as (1) the limited functionality of the search tool; (2) the current portal's non-compliance with the Data Description Standard<sup>12</sup>, which sets requirements for interoperable data descriptions; (3) the presence of many datasets that refer users to another system, requiring them to open another system to actually access the data.

Majority of the interviewed municipalities (9) acknowledged that **lack of possibility to semi-automate process to openly share its data (UB7)** is a barrier. “*If it were much easier to share data in open data*

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.kratid.ee/en/juhised>

portal, we would publish much more” (LG5) and “...if there were interfaces, it would make everything easier for us” (LG6). As most of the Estonian local authorities use standard solutions and information systems, two respondents (LG1, LG12) suggested that the interface with the portal should be between the standard solution already, so that same datasets of different local governments would be published through API.

The last question regarding usage barriers concerning **process to maintain data once published (UB8)** was understood differently by respondents – some of them kept in mind the maintenance of all the data municipality is managing and others referred to the data published in open data portal. As for the latter, LG7 mentioned: “*At the moment the portal has no functionality to set up storage deadlines for datasets and you have to track somewhere else that*”. On the other hand, LG6 did not see it as a problem: “*In some cases, it's good to keep certain things there. They're not going anywhere, if the need should arise.*” Other usage barriers that form a barrier for municipalities to openly share its data are grouped in Table 4.

Table 4. Other usage barriers

Usage barriers	Description or examples of the barriers
Lack of resources	No distinguished function or person who is responsible for open data and/or data management (LG1) Lack of financial and human resources (LG2, LG3) In some areas there is no data and creating it from scratch is very time-consuming (LG2)
Limited knowledge and awareness	The meaning of open data is unclear (LG12) Users of OD can make statistics, but not conclusions based on data (LG5) The awareness about the national portal is limited, it is not visible enough for users (LG9) Overall data competences and awareness of open data is low (LG1, LG10, LG3)
The value of organization’s OD unclear	Not clear, who is the user of local level open data and therefore the value is unclear (LG1, LG3, LG10)
The “best” format of open data not defined	There are many machine-readable formats available, and it is unclear, which format would be most valuable for the users (LG4)
Unclear, what to publish	Limited knowledge of the users’ needs – what datasets are wanted by users, i.e., high-value datasets (LG7) Difficult to prioritize, which data should be published (LG1)
Technical solutions	Lack of solutions, that would make the data processing more convenient (LG10)

#### 4.4 Value barriers

Next, barriers related to organizational beliefs and values were discussed, focusing on overall views on open government data and the organization's specific datasets. Some respondents found it challenging to distinguish between these perspectives, leading to answers for questions VB2 and VB3 being more focused on the organization’s open data.

Most respondents (9) agreed or somewhat agreed that employees in their municipality believe that **openly sharing government data is often not valuable for the public (VB1)**. For example, LG11 noted: “*...Often the purpose of it is not seen, as to why or for whom it is needed.*” Conversely, three municipalities, who provided examples of use-cases they were aware of in the first section of interview were more positive about it: “*...I actually think that the value of data to the public as a user is understood*” (LG9).

More than half of municipalities (7) acknowledged that people in their organization tend to believe that **many open government datasets are not appropriate for reuse (VB2)**. Some reasons mentioned by respondents were that: (1) some data becomes useless when anonymized (LG10); (2) it is hard to see, who could be the user of a specific data organization owns (LG9); (3) there is a belief that nothing useful can be done with open data (LG3). 3 respondents were neutral about this question and 2 interviewees did not see this as a barrier, for example LG7: “*...considering that local governments operate at the level of power closest to the individual, on the contrary, opportunities may arise to value the data, which affects the daily lives of as many people as possible.*”

Nearly all municipalities (10) agreed that the organization believes that **many open government datasets suffer from data quality issues** (e.g., completeness, accuracy, uniqueness, consistency, etc.) (VB3). The most mentioned issues were inconsistency and inaccuracy. One example from LG8 states that *“The average salary or workload of teachers is a big mess...if the source data is incorrect, then it is not possible to get correct results.”* LG9 brought out that the reason for this belief might be the fact that people in organization tend to be too critical about their data. LG7 complemented this discussion with the following: *“...as far as I know, few agencies, organisations, companies have made quality determinations to their databases...so, if you do not know the quality, that means it is of questionable quality.”*

Most respondents (8) rather agreed (but not strongly) with the belief in organization that **public gains of openly sharing government data are often lower than the costs** (VB4). For example, LG6: *“In terms of human resource cost... so much time is spent on it, but at the same time this information is not consumed, nothing is created based on it, so the question arises, why is it needed”* and LG10: *“...you are doing a lot of work within that, but what do you do with that data after that... it is just nice, that you're getting some kind of overview, but well, what's next.”* One municipality (LG4) argued that it is hard to have a straight answer, as some datasets are more valuable and interesting than others, but if the aim was to publish everything, then the costs would be too high compared to the public gains thereby pointing to the issues associated with data prioritization.

Only four municipalities believe that the **organization’s gains of openly sharing government data are often lower than the costs** (VB5). For example, LG3: *“... if it were the other way around, if great benefits were seen, it would probably already be dealt with.”* Three respondents had no opinion on this.

Half of municipalities agreed that **data preparation is too resource-consuming for their organization** (VB6), as *“you have to process the data and it takes time”* (LG10). Two respondents (LG9, LG8) brought out that today it is not too resource-consuming, but they were not sure about sharing data on national portal, as they had no previous experience with it. One municipality mentioned that the biggest issue, i.e., the process that takes most resources is the data management, not sharing open data.

Half of the local governments rather agree with the belief that **open government data do not provide any value to their organization** (VB7). For example, LG12: *“...people have not understood the value of open data”* and LG3: *“...the common understanding is that if you do something, direct return is important... indirect benefits don't tend to be seen”*. Some respondents commented that it could be the case in some fields or departments, but not a general belief in their organisation.

Most of the respondents (7) acknowledged that people in their local authority tend to believe that **open data that they can openly share will not provide value to users** (VB8). Two municipalities mentioned that geoinformation may be an exception here, as the officials see more value in it. LG7 commented: *“...rather, there's no such belief, but very much would help if we knew more, what data users need.”* LG 2 highlighted another aspect that officials in the organization that do not work with open data cannot see its value.

The final value barrier - the **number of resources to be spent to prepare, publish and maintain open government data outweigh the benefit my organization gains from it** (VB9) – lead to ambiguous responses. Only 4 municipalities totally agreed with it. Three respondents rather disagreed and five of them did not have a clear answer. For example, LG10: *“To a certain extent, I think benefits are seen, but if it starts to take most of the working time, it will go the other way.”* LG9 points out that: *“I rather think that this is not the case...we overestimate the effort we must put into it and underestimate the benefit. The benefit of such things is often underestimated, as it is often indirect.”*

The other value barriers that respondents see as a barrier for their municipality to openly share its data that were not covered by the model are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Other value barriers

Value barriers	Description or example of the barrier
----------------	---------------------------------------



Duplicated data collection by different agencies	Same kind of data is gathered by different agencies – brings the question, which of them is reliable or which data to use as a basis. E.g., in case of residents of municipalities, the data of Estonian Population Register and Statistics Estonia is different (LG10)
Value of open data portal unclear	The value of Estonian open data portal is unknown to public (LG12) Anonymized data in some cases is useless and can only be used for statistical purposes (LG2)
Terms “data” and “open data” are unclear	Understanding of the term “data” and “open data” is different, not uniform and needs clarification amongst the officials (LG3, LG7)
Open data not prioritized	Open data is not a priority for organization (LG8, LG10)

#### 4.5 Risk barriers

Risk barriers pertain to the uncertainty regarding the financial, functional, and social consequences of using or publishing open data. Most of the risk barriers of the model were found relevant or somewhat relevant by the respondents, with only one barrier deemed not applicable.

Half of the respondents (6) agreed that the **fear of the misuse of openly shared government data (RB1)** may be a barrier. Three municipalities raised concerns about security, not only criminal activity, but also cybersecurity, which is a new topic in regards the situation in the world. On the contrary, some respondents argue that open data *per se* means that the possibilities of misuse are already minimized.

The **fear of misinterpretation of openly shared government data (RB2)** was somewhat more often acknowledged, as 8 respondents raised different concerns connected to it. For example, LG2: *“Many officials also fear that if we publish too much, people will start asking too much or get too aware... I don't see fear in it, but, well, some do”*. Some gave the example of financial data and documents, that might be the source of misinterpretation as people have limited understanding of this data. Conversely, two respondents mentioned that if someone makes a false interpretation or draws an incorrect conclusion from the data, it reflects the individual's limited understanding rather than an issue with the data itself. LG7 commented: *“...this possibility exists, but we try to minimize it.”*

6 municipalities agreed that this might be the case in their organization that people **fear that openly shared government data will not be reused (RB3)**. For example, LG3 pointed out that: *“...it could be from this view that who needs them at all and why we should do it.”* Four respondents did not consider this fear a barrier to openly sharing data. For example, LG6 mentioned: *“...I think we are not afraid of this, as we have offered data and it is up to users to do something with it”*. Two municipalities mentioned that the “fear” is not relevant, but “belief” that OGD will not be reused is relevant (covered in previous section on value barriers).

The majority of interviewed municipalities (10) acknowledged the **fear of violating data protection legislation when openly sharing government data (RB4)**, particularly among officials handling personal data. Respondents highlighted several reasons and additional concerns: (1) the boundaries of what constitutes personal data are delicate or blurred (LG11, LG4); (2) fear of injunctions by the inspectorate (LG12); (3) hesitancy to process data due to data protection concerns (LG4); (4) previous cases or negative experiences have made people cautious (LG7); (5) document management systems are primary sources where data that should not be openly shared could be exposed (LG7, LG9). Two municipalities expressed confidence that this fear is not widespread in their organization, as there is a clear understanding of what data to restrict.

The respondents were more ambivalent about the **fear that sensitive data will be exposed as a result of opening its data (RB5)**. Half of them agreed with it and some referred that it is connected to the previous question, and this might be relevant to their organisation. But some respondents commented that sensitive information is usually removed from data during the preparation of opening data and it cannot be the case that, for example *“...data of disabled persons is accidentally exposed”* (LG4).

Less than half of the municipalities (5) agreed or somewhat agreed with the **fear of making mistakes when preparing data for publication (RB6)**. For example, LG10 mentioned: *“...it is also feared, but maybe less than compared to the previous two [fears]”* and LG1 complemented: *“...as we cannot be sure about*

*the quality of our data, then the fear is automatically there.*” LG7 pointed out, that this is not a widespread fear, but some people are more worrying. Two respondents did not see it applicable to their organization, as this fear could be relevant if they would process and share more data than today.

The **fear that users will find existing errors in the data (RB7)** received mixed feedback. One respondent mentioned that it is probably the biggest fear related to data (LG5) and two municipalities acknowledged that this fear might be relevant, but not to the extent that it forms a barrier to share data (LG1, LG4). This fear could be related to the problems with quality of data (LG11) and human fear of making mistakes (LG3, LG6). On the contrary, nearly half of respondents held the opposite perspective, for example LG12: “*...if somebody finds mistakes, it's good, we'll find out there's something wrong. That's the feedback, that's good,*” and LG8: “*...it's overall positive, then we know that somebody uses it.*”

Majority of municipalities do not find the **fear that openly sharing its data will reduce its gains (RB8)** relevant as they cannot see the possibility, how municipality could sell the data or whether it is even possible by law. One respondent provided an interesting example, how companies are gathering data of procurements from municipalities’ websites and then offer this data for the service provides, who have joined their procurement/tender platforms.

The **fear that openly sharing organization’s data will allow its competitors to benefit from this data (RB9)** was found irrelevant, as municipalities are public sector bodies and could not see, who the competitors in their territory might be. The local governments are watching each other’s initiatives and, in some cases, compete over residents, but in terms of data there is no competition.

Other risks or fears mentioned by respondents that might form a barrier for the municipality to openly share its data are provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Other risk barriers

Risk barrier	Description or example of the barrier
Security issues	Publishing of some type of data might be used for criminal motives (e.g., cyber-attacks, security breach) (LG1, LG2)
General fear of the unknown	LG3: “Lack of data awareness creates fears, as everything unknown seems scary to some people”
Lack of resources	Overall lack of resources (LG7)

#### 4.6 Tradition barriers

Tradition barriers were considered somewhat less relevant by respondents compared to usage and value barriers. The interviewed municipalities split in thirds in responses regarding the belief that **Freedom of information requests are sufficient for the public to obtain government data (TB1)**. The respondents who were subtle commented, that “*...this might be the case of some fields of activity, but not a widespread belief*” (LG5). Two municipalities brought out that if enough data is already published, then there are less information requests, and it means less work with them.

The **reluctancy to implement the culture change required for openly sharing data (TB2)** was not seen as a barrier by most of the respondents. LG9 and LG10 pointed out that major cultural shift was done during the administrative reform<sup>13</sup> and LG3 commented they are on the transition point, where the readiness for change is somewhat there, but the traditions also prevail. LG5 commented: “*It depends greatly on management and politicians...in our case there is rather desire to publish more*”. LG2 and LG7 admitted that there might be some people in organization who are reluctant to change, but this cannot be applied to the entire organization.

Half of the respondents (6) agreed that **employees in their municipality lack the skills required for openly sharing data (TB3)**. Three municipalities thought that the basic skills exist, but there might be some specific skills that need development. LG1 broadened the issue: “*...starting with the notion of what*

<sup>13</sup> Estonian administrative reform was implemented in 2015-2017, for further information access: <https://www.agri.ee/en/administrative-reform-2015-2017>

value the data carries... it is viewed as only in the context of their own department and no one can assess in the context of an organization or the customer point of view.” Some respondents referred to the national OD portal and admitted that they have no experience with it, but it would probably be only the first time a new thing to learn.

The respondents interpreted the question regarding the **lack of the skills required for maintaining openly shared data (TB4)** differently. Most referred to the overall data maintenance and did not perceive it as a problem, as it aligns with their daily practices. However, some municipalities, particularly those responding from the perspective of maintaining data in the national portal, acknowledged that manual maintenance requires someone to oversee the data (e.g., ensuring it is up-to-date), which consumes time.

Most municipalities rather would not agree that **organization is reluctant to radically change the organizational processes that would enable openly sharing government data (TB5)**. The arguments were following: (a) the management is positive about the change, but some employees are reluctant (LG10), (b) the desire for change is there, but lack of financial and human resources are the barriers for change (LG3, LG11), (c) open data is not valued and not prioritized (LG5).

Other tradition barriers mentioned by respondents, which might hinder the municipality from openly sharing its data, are detailed in Table 7. Interestingly, while most municipalities did not acknowledge reluctance to change in culture or processes as a barrier (TB2), several of them emphasized during the discussion of other tradition barriers the general resistance to changes within the organization. This included negative attitudes towards any kind of changes among the personnel, indicating a broader cultural reluctance to embrace new approaches or initiatives.

Table 7. Other tradition barriers

Tradition barrier	Description or example of the barrier
Open data is not a priority	There are main functions that people are used to doing, open data is something new (LG1) Open data is not valued (LG5)
Reluctance/resistance to change	Habit of doing things the same way as done previously (LG2) Negative attitude towards change (LG3) It is difficult to change the mindset of people, who are used to do things as always (LG5)
Technophobia - irrational fear of technology	Fear that digitalisation brings more work than savings (LG9)
Lack of data management processes	Estonian data management Framework is difficult to understand and implement at local level (LG6)

#### 4.7 Image barriers

Majority of the interviewed municipalities (8) consider that their **organization do not have negative image of open government data (IB1)**. Two respondents mentioned that the image is neutral, as LG10 commented: “*[The negative image] may be a case for some data...as time goes on, the more people want their work to have a meaning...time resource versus the benefits of it is being considered in their work.*”

Half of the respondents agreed or rather agreed that their organization **believes that open government data is not valuable for users (IB2)**. 4 municipalities rather did not agree, they acknowledged that there might be a few people who believe it (LG6) or it might be relevant in case of some datasets (LG4). LG8 commented: “*...rather they fear it or do not know, whether the data is valuable or not.*”

The municipalities split into two regarding the **fear that openly sharing government data will damage the reputation of their municipality (IB3)**. Half of them disagreed, for example, LG7 commented: “*...rather, we strive for such a reputation that it shows us in a better light.*” The other half of respondents rather agreed that: (a) this fear might be the case for some data (LG1), (b) it could be connected to the fear of making mistakes and data quality issues (LG10), (c) data can reveal the “real picture”, which is not as good as expected (LG3, LG9). LG5 pointed out that some employees fear that open data related to their work might show them in a poor light.

Majority of the respondents (9) admitted that the **fear that the accidental publication of low-quality data will damage the reputation of their municipality (IB4)** may be applicable to them. Two of them specified that this is more a risk they must mitigate.

Half of the municipalities acknowledged that their organization **fears that being associated with incorrect conclusions drawn from OGD analysis by OGD users will damage its reputation (IB5)**. Examples provided by respondents include instances of (1) wrong conclusions based on document registers (LG10), (2) media making incorrect interpretations (LG11, LG9), and (3) the challenge of disproving such incorrect conclusions (LG9).

Most interviewees did not see any other image barriers for their municipalities to openly share its data. But LG9 raised an interesting point: *“The topic of open data is not one that receives significant public credit, and therefore, it is not given excessive attention. ...if it were something exciting, there might be a desire to support those who are considered cool... this kind of order would probably change a lot and a lot of data would come on the market.”*

#### 4.8 Other barriers

Half of the respondents identified additional barriers beyond those covered by the model utilized for the interviews, primarily falling into the categories of usage and value barriers. However, some highlighted barriers are not initially included in the model, which could inform its refinement:

- 1) lack of data awareness – individuals working in local authorities may lack awareness of the concept of open data or have an overall understanding gap regarding data;
- 2) lack of data competence – there may be insufficient knowledge and skills to work with data, such as data governance or management, data analytics, and data quality management;
- 3) lack on human resources - there may be no designated function or person responsible for open data and/or data management;
- 4) lack of financial resources – there might be an overall shortage of funds to fulfil all obligations imposed on local governments;
- 5) lack of clarity on what data to publish – uncertainty exists regarding which data would be most valuable for users;
- 6) difficult in prioritizing data - challenges arise in determining which data should be published first.

#### 4.9 Open data ecosystem

The final part of the interview covered overall open data ecosystem – its actors, the benefit of open data, measures to improve the current situation and the awareness of policy documents and initiatives.

All the respondents were able to identify at least two **open data ecosystems actors**: the data owners (e.g., municipalities, state agencies) and the data users/ consumers (e.g., private sector, academia, journalists, other public agencies). Additionally, half of the interviewees mentioned some form of mediator or intermediary – such as a platform, portal, or solution – that facilitates consumer access to, viewing, downloading, or requesting data. Two municipalities identified another key actor - regulatory body and Data Protection Inspectorate, responsible for creating regulations and ensuring compliance. Furthermore, one respondent highlighted stakeholders who stand to benefit from open data initiatives.

The majority of top-level management respondents indicated a lack of awareness regarding **policy documents or initiatives guiding open data development** at either the Estonian or European level (e.g., Estonian Digital State 2030). However, some of them specified that employees responsible for this domain likely possess knowledge about them. Additionally, three municipalities pointed out that these documents often inadequately address the needs of local government levels, portraying them as more akin to slogans or aiming to enhance the digital state's reputation.

Several recommendations were made regarding **actions to be taken at the national level** (e.g., Ministry) to facilitate municipalities in disclosing more open data and adhering to related requirements:

- **defining most important or valuable datasets that municipalities should prepare and share** on the national portal (LG1, LG12, LG6) serving as a pivotal starting point for open data initiatives at the local level;
- resolving the issues concerning the revenue base of local governments, as it is challenging to contemplate necessary changes when basic municipal services lack resources (LG11, LG3);
- resolving problems with compatibility and interfaces such as data duplication across different databases and manual insertion, with the need to streamline data management processes (LG10);
- more practical guidance, training and assistance tailored to municipalities from the state agencies, rather than solely offering general documentation and informational events (LG12, LG11, LG6, LG7);
- implementing direct application programming interfaces (API) between standard software used by local governments and the national open data portal to enhance data exchange efficiency (LG12, LG5);
- showcasing the benefits and value of municipal open data (LG5, LG1);
- defining specific measures for municipalities that would incentivize them to publish more open data defined (e.g., the portal [minuomavalitsus.ee](https://minuomavalitsus.ee)<sup>14</sup>).

The majority of respondents (8) agreed that average and smaller municipalities are likely unable to handle this topic on their own and emphasized the inevitability of cooperation among them. They suggested several **actions that could be taken by local governments**:

- implementing uniform information systems across municipalities to ensure consistent data collection and management practices (LG5, LG12);
- enhancing awareness among local government employees about the importance and benefits of open data initiatives (LG2, LG9);
- facilitating knowledge exchange platforms for sharing insights and advancements in data analytics developments among municipalities (LG1);
- ensuring the proper implementation of data management and governance frameworks to streamline the process of publishing open data (LG5, LG6, LG7);
- providing guidance or training on open data initiatives through associations such as the Association of Estonian Cities and Municipalities (LG8, LG11, LG12);
- harmonizing or standardizing datasets related to similar municipal functions to ensure interoperability and facilitate cross-municipality data usage (LG4);
- integrating data management practices with strategic management processes to enhance the use of data in decision-making within municipalities (LG5).

Based on the barriers identified in the previous subsections, the first priority should be to raise awareness and build competence regarding municipal data. As highlighted by LG2: *“Awareness needs to be significantly increased to truly understand the data that local governments produce themselves. That’s where the focus should be directed...it doesn’t make sense to hold or duplicate data that already exists elsewhere in the country, which I see happening frequently. By doing so, the work itself becomes more focused”*.

Despite the challenges faced by municipalities and the barriers they experience within the studied context, and often a lack of awareness of the value of data, many municipalities do recognize the **benefit or value of open data**, which are provided in Table 8.

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://minuomavalitsus.ee/en>

Table 8. Opinions on benefit or value of open data

<b>Benefit or value</b>	<b>Description or example</b>
Increase of service quality	The quality of some services might increase due to the analysis made by combining open data (LG1) Use of geospatial information by architects, planners etc. makes processes faster and of higher quality (LG2)
Public value creation	Even if the value is not seen now, there might be someone there who already foresees it (LG7)
New services	New services created by private or third sector (LG4, LG6, LG7)
Proactive services and prevention activities	Linked data could be a basis for proactive services and prevention activities, e.g., road closures in Waze application (LG10)
Smarter decisions	Open data can be helpful in the decision processes, e.g., designing public services or business (LG8, LG12) The biggest value comes from knowledge and correct/accurate conclusions that are drawn on data (LG3, LG5, LG9)
Less referrals from residents	Residents have more data available, and the number of referrals decreases because of it (LG2)
Prevent the spread of misinformation	It is possible to rely on data in case of intentional dissemination of misinformation (LG3)
Rise of data awareness	Enables to increase data awareness and data literacy, e.g., data analysis skills (e.g., already on lower levels of education) (LG4)

#### 4.10 Recommendations for ecosystem improvements

Based on interviews with local governments, several barriers considered most relevant by respondents were identified. From these barriers, we derive recommendations to overcome or mitigate them, as suggested by interviewees.

The results of the interviews revealed 18 barriers of the IRT model with which at least half of the respondents agreed. The highest number (6) was related to value barriers, 4 to both risk and usage barriers, 3 to image barriers, and 1 to tradition barriers. Consequently, all categories of IRT barriers are relevant for local governments, albeit to different extents. Table 9 presents (1.1) the barriers not included in the initial model as identified from interviews and (1.2) the most relevant barriers already included in the model, where barriers addressing similar or overlapping issues are combined. Additionally, it provides (2) the recommended measures for ecosystem improvement at (2.1) national level (e.g., policymakers, portal owner) and (2.2) local level (individual or local governments collectively).

Table 9. Most relevant barriers and recommendations for improvements

<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Measures at national level (e.g., policymakers, portal owner)</b>	<b>Measures at local level (individual LG or collectively)</b>
Lack of data awareness/ competence Lack of skills for openly sharing data (TB3)	Practical guidance, training and help for municipalities	Guidance and training offered by Association of Estonian Cities and Municipalities, knowledge exchange about data governance and analytics developments, e.g., best practices
Lack of human and financial resources	Revision of the revenue base of local governments Specific measures for municipalities that would motivate them to allocate resources there	Increase awareness of existing employees, identify “data enthusiasts” within organization
Lack of clarity, what data to publish	Centrally agree upon the most relevant/valuable datasets, that local governments must publish themselves (e.g., initiated by ministry in cooperation with local governments)	
Inappropriate data quality (UB1, IB4, VB3)	Adaption of central data governance guidelines (including data quality) for municipalities	Implementation of data management/governance & automated data quality management procedures
Complexity of data preparation (for reuse) (UB2, UB3) Resource intensity of data preparation (VB6)	Solutions that would make the data processing more convenient (augmentation and automation), enhancement of OD portal	Publishing of data in formats that require minimal additional work

Barrier	Measures at national level (e.g., policymakers, portal owner)	Measures at local level (individual LG or collectively)
No semi-automate process to publish data (UB7)	Direct application programming interfaces (API) between standard software (used by local governments) and national open data portal	
Lack of OGD value awareness for public/ users (VB1, IB2, VB8)	Benefits and value of municipal open data should be evidenced by use-cases; make usage statistics of datasets available to publishers	Uniformed information systems that provide more uniformed data
Datasets not appropriate for reuse (VB2)	Datasets related to the same municipal functions could be harmonized/uniformed by defining uniform granularity level	
Public gains lower than costs (VB4)	Demonstrate the impact of open data through showcases/ use-cases/re-uses, success stories	Testimonials about OGD use-cases,
Fear of misuse and misinterpretation (RB1, RB2)	n/a	n/a
Fear of violating data protection regulations and exposure of sensitive data (RB4, RB5)	Clear guidelines and examples of different cases	Implement processes that mitigate the risks
Incorrect conclusions drawn from OGD (IB5)	Improvement of overall data analytics skills (e.g., in general education, adult training)	

For certain barriers (designated as n/a in Table 9), specific countermeasures or activities were not identified during the interviews with local governments. This particularly applies to fears of misuse and misinterpretation (RB1, RB2), for which potential measures to alleviate concerns might include: (1) enhancing overall data literacy for all actors in the open data ecosystem through initiatives such as seminars, workshops, and courses, (2) establishing feedback mechanisms and platforms for the exchange of best practices, and (3) developing and promoting awareness of robust data governance policies.

Moreover, the qualitative analysis uncovered the primary user groups and some use cases of open data at the local level known to municipalities, including students, journalists, entrepreneurs, residents, spatial planning actors, and council members. This insight could serve as a valuable foundation for fostering collaboration among municipalities and conducting a more comprehensive analysis of user needs.

## 5 Discussion and Limitations

While Estonia has demonstrated progress in open data rankings, there are still notable areas for improvement, particularly at the local government level. Despite major cities like Tallinn and Tartu are publishing their data as OGD, the majority of municipalities have yet to contribute to the national portal. This discrepancy underscores a broader issue of limited awareness and understanding of open data among both the public and local administrative bodies. Despite the recognized importance of open data, there is a noticeable lack of research focusing on OGD at the local government level, not only in Estonia but also internationally. Acknowledging the growing significance of local and smart city open data portals within the broader ecosystem (Liva et al., 2023; Lnenicka et al., 2024) and a noticeable lack of research focusing on OGD at the local government level (Fusi, 2021; Sandoval-Almazan et al., 2021), not only in Estonia but also internationally (Rajamäe-Soosaar and Nikiforova, 2024), it is imperative to address the current limitations in local open data provision and to enhance the visibility of local OGD in the national portal.

To address this gap, this study aimed to identify the barriers preventing Estonian municipalities from openly sharing data and to propose effective strategies to overcome these obstacles. To this end, qualitative analysis was conducted, employing the OGD-adapted Innovation Resistance Theory model, through interviews with 12 local governments. Results highlighted that while municipalities collect diverse data types, various challenges in openly sharing data on persist.

Challenges faced by municipalities include human resource constraints, technical platform constraints, lack of data competencies, and difficulties in preparing data to be shared as open data due to the format in which they are stored. Technical platform constraints associated with the Estonian open data portal (1) the

inability to get usage statistics for datasets, (2) the time-consuming process of filling metadata fields with lack of automation of the process, (3) difficulty in creating APIs and getting data transferred between the systems, (4) preparation of data in appropriate formats, (5) difficulty in prioritizing and identifying high-value datasets for their further publication. More than half of the municipalities interviewed had not yet shared any data on the national portal at the time of the interview, primarily due to either a lack of awareness or insufficient resources. However, following the interviews, some municipalities indicated their intention to address this issue soon or to allocate more attention to it within their organizations. Another challenge highlighted was the difficulty in accessing data from information systems hosted by service providers, which was not foreseen in service level agreements.

The barrier types covered by the IRT model include various usage, value, risk, tradition, and image barriers. The most relevant barriers for openly sharing the data include: (1) lack of awareness and skills for open data sharing (TB3), (2) insufficient human and financial resources, (3) uncertainty about what data to publish, (4) concerns about data quality (UB1, IB4, VB3), (5) the complexity and resource intensity of data preparation for first-time publishing and further re-use (VB6, UB2, UB3), (6) lack of data publishing process automation (UB7), (7) lack of understanding of the value of open data for the public/users (VB1, VB2, VB8, IB2) and belief that public gains are lower than costs of data opening (VB4), (8) fears about misuse and misinterpretation of opened data (RB1, RB2), (9) fear of potential violations of data protection regulations (RB4, RB5), and (10) the possibility of incorrect conclusions being drawn from the data (IB5).

The interviewees proposed several measures to address these barriers at both national and local levels. These recommendations could serve as input for developing specific action plans to assist local governments in navigating the challenges of open data. For instance, interviewees suggested conducting awareness-raising activities and providing practical guidance and training, strategies that have also been supported by previous studies (Golub and Lund, 2021; Kawashita et al., 2022). Additionally, they highlighted the importance of automation and implementing motivation measures for local governments.

Furthermore, the analysis uncovered that while data governance guidelines have been established by the central government, they often lack applicability to municipalities and necessitate adaptation to local contexts through practical sample procedures. Solutions that streamline data processing, such as augmentation, automation, and APIs, were also recommended to reduce manual workload.

Given that the value and benefit of open data emerged as the most significant barrier, there is a pressing need to emphasize its importance by showcasing evidence through use-cases, testimonials, and success stories. This aligns with the findings of previous research (Lassinantti et al., 2019; Lnenicka et al., 2024; Ansari et al., 2022; Hein et al., 2023; Chokki et al., 2022), which underscores the importance of understanding the various types of data users and their motivations in leveraging open data for valuable impact. Moreover, making detailed usage statistics and analytics of datasets on the national portal available to data publishers would enable them to monitor user interest effectively.

One of the key measures to address the current situation involves reaching a consensus on the most relevant and valuable datasets that local governments should publish, a notion supported by existing literature (Kević et al., 2023; Utamachant & Anutariya, 2018; Nikiforova, 2021). Additionally, it is crucial to address the security aspect of open data, particularly concerning spatial data (in line with (Yang et al., 2015)). These actions necessitate collaboration between local governments and the national level, including the ministry. Harmonizing datasets related to specific services by defining uniform granularity levels and data dictionaries could further streamline the process and contribute to the interoperability of published data (in line with (Hein et al., 2023; Kawashita et al., 2024; Ali et al., 224)).

The prevalent fear among municipalities regarding potential violations of data protection regulations (in line with (Li et al., 2024)) underscores the importance of clear guidelines and the implementation of processes to mitigate associated risks. Active monitoring by the Inspectorate and adherence to GDPR regulations are essential steps in this regard.



However, this study has several limitations. Firstly, the primary findings rely on qualitative analysis derived from interviews with local stakeholders, inherently introducing subjectivity into the results. However, this methodological choice was deliberate, as qualitative approaches offer a deeper understanding of the subjective experiences and contextual nuances that quantitative methods may overlook and help to identify unforeseen factors that may influence the phenomenon under investigation.

Secondly, the sample size is constrained to 15% of Estonian municipalities (12 out of 79), potentially impacting the generalizability of the findings. Future research endeavors could benefit from employing a quantitative approach that encompasses all Estonian municipalities, thus offering broader insights and enhancing the objectivity of the conclusions.

Thirdly, since the research focuses specifically on Estonian local governments, the results may not be directly applicable to other contexts with differing administrative systems. It is essential to interpret the findings within the context of Estonia's unique governance structure and consider potential variations in other countries.

Lastly, given the dynamic nature of the topic, the results reflect a snapshot in time, emphasizing the immediate relevance of their application in enhancing the local data ecosystem and associated data provision. Furthermore, it is recommended to replicate the study in the future to identify any remaining barriers or new challenges that may have emerged. By using the presented results as a baseline, future iterations of the study can evaluate the impact of interventions and assess changes in perceived barriers over time.

## **6 Conclusions and future research directions**

This study aimed to examine the barriers hindering open data sharing within local authorities in Estonia. By focusing on the specific context of local government data sharing practices, we contribute to the broader understanding of open data governance and implementation, particularly within the context of local data ecosystem, which is an integral part of the open data ecosystem.

The core contribution of this study lies in its examination of the challenges faced by Estonian local governments in embracing open data initiatives. By delving into the reasons behind the disparity between central government and local authority efforts, as evidenced by the Estonian Digital Agenda 2030, key impediments and actionable solutions were determined.

Through interviews with representatives from local governments, this research sheds light on the complexities surrounding data sharing practices at the municipal level. It not only uncovers the primary barriers inhibiting open data sharing but also highlights potential enablers that could facilitate smoother implementation. From enhancing awareness and skills among local government stakeholders to improving data governance frameworks and infrastructure, it offers a roadmap for creating a more conducive environment for open data sharing leading to more resilient and sustainable open data ecosystem. The study also revealed and communicated with interviewees some simple steps for improvement, e.g., publishing open data of local government document management systems on national portal with one of the municipalities published data after the interview.

Given that several databases the municipalities are using for data collection, are centralized or national, it is crucial to study, which municipal data should be published by local governments themselves and in which cases the central register/body should be the publisher. This requires cooperation between local governments and the national level and could be one of the future research directions. In addition, as the quality of open data and metadata were often named during interviews as potential barriers preventing data opening or complicating it, as well as data maintenance, the future studies could take this into focus, including considerations of integrating of respective mechanisms for their control and improvement into the OGD portal. In addition, the study implicated gaps in knowledge about the actual users and their needs, thus mapping the main user groups of local-level OGD and developing detailed use-cases of data reuse would be valuable to bring more comprehensive view. The qualitative analysis on local level OGD provision barriers and enablers could be complemented with quantitative analysis, to validate the relevant barriers identified by this study.

By validating the OGD-adapted IRT model, which has not yet been tested in real-world scenarios, and proposing refinements based on empirical evidence, this study contributes to the advancement of theoretical frameworks for understanding resistance to data sharing. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the model is applicable at both the national level that it was originally developed for and local data ecosystem to which it was tailored in this study. As such, this study also proposed a revised version of the instrument tailored for local government context. As part of the model validation by its application to Estonian case, all barriers were found to be relevant, while in addition, municipalities raised some barriers not included in the initial model falling predominantly to the categories of usage and value barriers. These implications can serve as possible additions for the OGD-adapted IRT model refinement upon they are validated.

## **Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process**

During the preparation of this work the authors used Copilot in order to improve formatting, styling and translation. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

## **References**

- Ali, M., Papageorgiou, G., Aziz, A., Loukis, E., Charalabidis, Y. and Pellicer, F.J.L., 2024. Towards the Development of Interoperable Open Data Ecosystems: Harnessing the Technical, Semantic, Legal, and Organizational (TSLO) Interoperability Framework. In 25th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research (dg.o 2024), June 11–14, 2024, Taipei, Taiwan. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3657054.3657160>
- Ansari, B., Barati, M. and Martin, E.G., 2022. Enhancing the usability and usefulness of open government data: A comprehensive review of the state of open government data visualization research. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(1), p.101657.
- Chokki, A.P., Frénay, B. and Vanderose, B., 2022, April. Open Data Explorer: An End-to-end Tool for Data Storytelling using Open Data. In AMCIS 2022.
- Dawes, S.S., Vidiasova, L. and Parkhimovich, O., 2016. Planning and designing open government data programs: An ecosystem approach. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(1), pp.15-27.
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Balakrishnan, J., Das, R., & Dutot, V. (2023). Resistance to innovation: A dynamic capability model based enquiry into retailers' resistance to blockchain adaptation. *Journal of Business Research*, 157, 113632.
- Golub, K. and Lund, A., 2021. Why open government data? The case of a Swedish municipality. *Journal of Data and Information Science*, 6(1), pp.120-138.

- Fusi, F., 2021. Smaller cities, greater barriers? Moving data sharing ahead in US local governments. In *Research Handbook on E-Government* (pp. 65-82). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Huang, Y.C. and Huang, T.Y., 2022, October. Why Do Public Servants Intend to Open Government Data? The Case of Taiwan. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance* (pp. 344-352).
- Kassen, M., 2019. Open data and e-government-related or competing ecosystems: a paradox of open government and promise of civic engagement in Estonia. *Information Technology for Development*, 25(3), pp.552-578.
- Kawashita, I., Baptista, A.A. and Soares, D., 2022. Open government data use by the public sector-an overview of its benefits, barriers, drivers, and enablers.
- Kević, K., Kuveždić Divjak, A. and Welle Donker, F., 2023. Benchmarking geospatial high-value data openness using GODI Plus methodology: a regional level case study. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 12(6), p.222.
- Islam, M. T., Talukder, M. S., Khayer, A., & Islam, A. N. (2023). Exploring continuance usage intention toward open government data technologies: An integrated approach. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 53(4), 785-807.
- Lassinantti, J., Ståhlbröst, A. and Runardotter, M., 2019. Relevant social groups for open data use and engagement. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(1), pp.98-111.
- Li, Y., Yang, R. and Lu, Y., 2024. A privacy risk identification framework of open government data: A mixed-method study in China. *Government Information Quarterly*, 41(1), p.101916.
- Liva, G., Micheli, M., Schade, S., Kotsev, A., Gori, M. and Codagnone, C., 2023. City data ecosystems between theory and practice: A qualitative exploratory study in seven European cities. *Data & Policy*, 5, p.e17.
- Lnenicka, M., Nikiforova, A., Clarinval, A., Luterek, M., Rudmark, D., Neumaier, S., Kević, K. and Bolívar, M.P.R., 2024. Sustainable open data ecosystems in smart cities: A platform theory-based analysis of 19 European cities. *Cities*, 148, p.104851.
- Ma, L. and Lee, C.S., 2019. Understanding the barriers to the use of MOOCs in a developing country: An innovation resistance perspective. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 57(3), pp.571-590.
- McBride, K., Olesk, M., Kütt, A. and Shysh, D., 2020. Systemic change, open data ecosystem performance improvements, and empirical insights from Estonia: A country-level action research study. *Information Polity*, 25(3), pp.377-402.
- McBride, K., Toots, M., Kalvet, T. and Krimmer, R., 2018. Leader in e-government, Laggard in open data: Exploring the case of Estonia. *Revue française d'administration publique*, (3), pp.613-625.
- Mohammad A. Hossain, Shams Rahman, Mohammed Quaddus, Elsie Hooi, and Abdus-Samad Olanrewaju. (2022). Factors Affecting Performance of Open Government Data Initiatives: A Multi-Method Approach Using Sem and FSQCA. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*, 1-20.
- Molodtsov, F., Nikiforova, A. (2024). "An Integrated Usability Framework for Evaluating Open Government Data Portals: Comparative Analysis of EU and GCC Countries". In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research*
- Nikiforova, A., 2021, October. Towards enrichment of the open government data: a stakeholder-centered determination of High-Value Data sets for Latvia. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance* (pp. 367-372).
- Nikiforova, A. and Zuiderwijk, A., 2022, October. Barriers to openly sharing government data: towards an open data-adapted innovation resistance theory. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance* (pp. 215-220).
- Prakash, A.V. and Das, S., 2022. Explaining citizens' resistance to use digital contact tracing apps: A mixed-methods study. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, p.102468.

- Publications Office of the European Union., Open data maturity report 2023. LU: Publications Office, 2023. Accessed: Jan. 17, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2830/384422>
- Rajamäe-Soosaar, K., Nikiforova, A. (2024). "Exploring Estonia's Open Government Data Development as a Journey towards Excellence: Unveiling the Progress of Local Governments in Open Data Provision" In Proceedings of the 25th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research
- Ram, S. and Sheth, J.N., 1989. Consumer resistance to innovations: the marketing problem and its solutions. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 6(2), pp.5-14.
- Sandoval-Almazan, R., Valle Gonzalez, L. and Millan Vargas, A., 2021, June. Barriers for Open Government implementation at municipal level: The case of the State of Mexico. In DG. O2021: The 22nd Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research (pp. 113-122).
- Shao, D. (2024). Empirical analysis of open government data usage in Tanzania. *Information Discovery and Delivery*, 52(1), 73-84.
- Talukder, M. S., Shen, L., Talukder, M. F. H., & Bao, Y. (2019). Determinants of user acceptance and use of open government data (OGD): An empirical investigation in Bangladesh. *Technology in Society*, 56, 147-156.
- Talwar, S., Talwar, M., Kaur, P. and Dhir, A., 2020. Consumers' resistance to digital innovations: A systematic review and framework development. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 28(4), pp.286-299.
- Utamachant, P. and Anutariya, C., 2018, July. An analysis of high-value datasets: a case study of Thailand's open government data. In 2018 15th international joint conference on computer science and software
- Wang, H. J., & Lo, J. (2016). Adoption of open government data among government agencies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(1), 80-88. Hein, A., Engert, M., Ryu, S., Schaffer, N., Hermes, S. and Krcmar, H., 2023. Building open government data platform ecosystems: A dynamic development approach that engages users from the start. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(4), p.101878.
- Wang, D., Richards, D., Bilgin, A. A., & Chen, C. (2020). A predictive model for citizens' utilization of open government data portals. In *Digital Libraries at Times of Massive Societal Transition: 22nd International Conference on Asia-Pacific Digital Libraries, ICADL 2020, Kyoto, Japan, November 30–December 1, 2020, Proceedings 22* (pp. 159-175). Springer International Publishing.
- Weerakkody, V., Irani, Z., Kapoor, K., Sivarajah, U. and Dwivedi, Y.K., 2017. Open data and its usability: an empirical view from the Citizen's perspective. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 19, pp.285-300.
- Wirtz, B. W., Piehler, R., Thomas, M. J., & Daiser, P. (2016). Resistance of public personnel to open government: A cognitive theory view of implementation barriers towards open government data. *Public Management Review*, 18(9), 1335-1364. *engineering (JCSSE)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- Yang, T.M., Lo, J. and Shiang, J., 2015. To open or not to open? Determinants of open government data. *Journal of Information Science*, 41(5), pp.596-612.
- Yang, T.M. and Wu, Y.J., 2021. Looking for datasets to open: An exploration of government officials' information behaviors in open data policy implementation. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(2), p.101574.
- Zuiderwijk, A., Janssen, M., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2015). Acceptance and use predictors of open data technologies: Drawing upon the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *Government information quarterly*, 32(4), 429-440.

## Appendix

### Appendix A. Example of transforming usage barrier and associated items into interview questions

Barrier and measurement items	Interview questions
Usage barrier (UB)	<b>Q12.</b> Are there any usage barriers related to the required changes in your municipality's routines that form a challenge for openly sharing your municipality's data? (UB)
	<b>Q13.</b> To what extent do the following situations form a barrier to openly sharing your municipality's data:
<b>UB1:</b> It is difficult to attain the appropriate quality level for open government data to be shared openly	– an inappropriate quality level of your organization's data? ( <b>UB1</b> )
<b>UB2:</b> It is difficult to prepare data for publication so that they comply with OGD principles	– a complicated process to prepare data for sharing? ( <b>UB2</b> )
<b>UB3:</b> It is difficult to prepare data for publication so that they become appropriate for reuse	– a complicated process to make your municipality's data reusable by others? ( <b>UB3</b> )
<b>UB4:</b> Data are difficult to publish on the OGD portal due to the complexity of the process	– a complicated process to publish your municipality's data on an open data portal? ( <b>UB4</b> )
<b>UB5:</b> Data are difficult to publish on the OGD portal due to the unclear process	– an unclear process of publishing your municipality's data on an open data portal ( <b>UB5</b> )
<b>UB6:</b> Data are difficult to publish on the OGD portal due to their limited functionality	– limited functionality of open data portals? ( <b>UB6</b> )
<b>UB7:</b> Open government data portals often do not allow for semi-automation of the publishing process	– no possibility to semi-automate my organization's process to openly share its data? ( <b>UB7</b> )
<b>UB8:</b> It is difficult to maintain openly shared government data	– the need and a complicated process to maintain data once published ( <b>UB8</b> )
	<b>Q14.</b> Are there any other usage barriers that form a barrier for your municipality to openly share its data? ( <b>UBn</b> )
Value Barrier ( <b>VB</b> )	...
Risk Barrier ( <b>RB</b> )	...
Tradition Barrier ( <b>TB</b> )	...
Image Barrier ( <b>IB</b> )	...

### Appendix B. Codes used in NVivo to analyse the interviews

Name	Description	Inter-views	References
Image barriers		12	56
IB1. Negative image of OGD	your municipality has a negative image of open government data	10	11
IB2. Belief that OGD is not valuable for users	your municipality believes that open government data is not valuable for users	11	11
IB3. OGD damages reputation of LG	your municipality fears that openly sharing government data will damage the reputation of your municipality	10	10

Name	Description	Inter-views	References
IB4. Accidental publication of low-quality data damage reputation	your municipality fears that the accidental publication of low-quality data will damage the reputation of your municipality	11	12
IB5. Incorrect conclusions drawn from OGD	your municipality fears that associating them with incorrect conclusions drawn from OGD analysis by OGD users will damage its reputation	9	9
Other image barriers		3	3
OD ecosystem	questions about overall open data ecosystem and potential improvements	12	66
Actions by LG individually or in cooperation	Which actions should be taken by local governments themselves to improve the publication of open data? (individually or in cooperation)	12	13
Actions on national level	Which actions should be taken at the national level (e.g., Ministry) to help municipalities disclose more open data and comply with the requirements related to open data?	11	13
Benefit or value of OD	What could be the benefit or value of open data in your opinion?	11	20
OGD ecosystem actors	How do you see the whole open data ecosystem – which actors and what does it include?	10	12
Policy documents or initiatives of OGD	Are you aware of any policy documents or initiatives guiding developments in the field of open data on Estonian or European level? Are you aware of Estonian Digital State Development Plan?	8	8
Organization and municipal portal		12	75
Cases of reuse of OD	specific cases, where your municipality's open data was reused by third party	11	21
Challenges of sharing data	What challenges did your municipality face in openly sharing data?	11	15
Drivers to share data on municipal portal		8	8
Process of sharing data	how the process of openly sharing data worked and who within your municipality was or were involved?	11	12
Type of data on municipal portal	What type of data did your municipality share openly and how often?	12	19
Organization and national portal		12	28
Cases of reuse of OD	specific cases, where your municipality's open data was reused by third party	1	1
Challenges of sharing data	What challenges did your municipality face in openly sharing data	4	6
Drivers to share data on national portal		3	3
Process of sharing data	how the process of openly sharing data worked and who within your municipality was or were involved	3	3
Reasons for not sharing data		7	11
Type of data on national portal	What type of data did your municipality share openly and how often	3	4
Organization of the interviewee	some questions about the organization you are working for	12	33
Role of respondent in LG	What is your role in this municipality	12	13
Type of data LG collects	What type of data does your municipality collect	12	20
Overall barriers	Are there any other barriers that form a barrier for your municipality to openly share its data (not limited to the categories above)	9	12
Overall understanding of OD		10	12
Risk barriers		12	94

Name	Description	Inter-views	References
Other risk barriers		8	8
RB1. Fear of misuse of OGD	-the fear of the misuse of openly shared government data	11	11
RB2. Fear of misinterpretation of OGD	-the fear the misinterpretation of openly shared government data	11	12
RB3. Fear that OGD not reused	the fear that openly shared government data will not be re-used	11	11
RB4. Fear of violating data protection	-the fear violating data protection legislation when openly sharing government data	12	13
RB5. Fear that sensitive data is exposed	-the fear that sensitive data will be exposed as a result of opening its data	9	9
RB6. Fear of making mistakes	the fear making mistakes when preparing data for publication	9	9
RB7. Fear that users find errors in data	the fear that users will find existing errors in the data	11	11
RB8. Fear that OGD reduces gains	the fear that openly sharing its data will reduce its gains (otherwise the municipality could sell the data or use it in another beneficial way)	6	7
RB9. Fear that OGD allows competitors benefit	the fear that openly sharing its data will allow its competitors to benefit from this data	3	3
Tradition barriers		12	65
Other tradition barriers		7	9
TB1. Information requests are sufficient	your municipality believes that Freedom of information requests are sufficient for the public to obtain government data	11	11
TB2. Reluctancy to implement culture change	your municipality is reluctant to implement the culture change required for openly sharing government data	12	13
TB3. Lack of skills for openly sharing data	employees in your municipality lack the skills required for openly sharing government data	11	12
TB4. Lack of skills to maintain OGD	employees in your municipality lack the skills required for maintaining openly shared government data	10	10
TB5. Reluctancy to change organisational processes	your municipality is reluctant to radically change the organizational processes that would enable openly sharing government data	10	10
Usage barriers		12	113
Other usage barriers		11	13
UB1. Inappropriate quality	an inappropriate quality level of your municipality's data	12	13
UB2. Preparation of data complicated	a complicated process to prepare data for sharing	12	12
UB3. Make data reusable complicated	complicated process to make your municipality's data reusable by others	10	12
UB4. Publishing in OD portal complicated	complicated process to publish your municipality's data on an open data portal	12	13
UB5. Publishing of OD unclear	unclear process of publishing your municipality's data on an open data portal	10	11
UB6. Limited functionality of OD portal	limited functionality of open data portals	11	14
UB7. Semi-automate process to share OD	no possibility to semi-automate my municipality's process to openly share its data	12	12
UB8. Maintain data once published	the need and a complicated process to maintain data once published	11	13
Value barriers		12	113
Other value barriers		8	9
VB1. OGD not valuable for public	openly sharing government data is often not valuable for the public	12	12

<b>Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Inter-views</b>	<b>References</b>
VB2. Datasets not appropriate for reuse	-many open government datasets are not appropriate for reuse	12	12
VB3. Datasets have quality issues	many open government datasets suffer from data quality issues (completeness, accuracy, uniqueness, consistency, etc.)	11	11
VB4. Public gains are lower than costs	the public gains of openly sharing government data are often lower than the costs	12	13
VB5. Org. gains are lower than costs	your organization's gains of openly sharing government data are often lower than the costs	7	9
VB6. Data prep. too resource-consuming	data preparation is too resource-consuming for your organization	11	11
VB7. OGD provides no value to org.	open government data do not provide any value to your organization	11	11
VB8. Org. OGD provides no value to users	open data that your organization can openly share will not provide value to users	10	13
VB9. Spent resources vs benefits to organization	number of resources to be spent to prepare, publish and maintain open government data outweigh the benefit my organization gains from it	12	12