

Summary

Rambøll and Vista hereby present a final report of the project "Simplification of reporting, - documentation- and routine requirements". The project is conducted in the period September-April 2014-2015 on behalf of KS. This chapter presents a summary of the report's main findings.

Our study has identified a number of possible simplifications in reporting and documentation requirements in two municipal sectors. In both sectors there are potential gains in simplifying reporting requirements, improve guidance and utilize and coordinate technical solutions. Within physical planning, land use and environment most can be gained by adapting the municipals administrative computer system to make them compatible with existing registers. That way, a lot of the KOSTRA reporting in this sector in the long term can be liquidated. The biggest simplification potential in the health care sector is about to tighten up and cut out the "nice to have" questions in existing reporting forms and reducing the amount of documentation in regards to supervision with the municipals health care services or in dealing with appeals.

It is the sum of the demands that are perceived as particularly burdensome. State authorities should therefore be critical to the need for current reporting and think twice before they introduce new requirements.

The aim has been to identify simplifications

In this report, we have mapped reporting, documentations and routine requirements in municipals health and care sector and reporting requirements within physical planning, land use and environment. The purpose has been to 1) identify and map state and locally issued requirements for procedures and documentation, 2) identify and map reporting requirements stemming from national legislation, and 3) identifying and proposing reduction, simplification and standardization of the identified reporting, documentation and routine requirements.

The municipalities views on the reporting and documentation regime

Reporting requirements are primarily driven by state authorities need for information to monitor how the legislation works and are observed across the municipalities. The municipalities express a general understanding that there is a need for reporting. Reporting is important for the state to be able to verify sectors, to meet the information and data needs of sectors over time and that municipalities should ensure that there is consistency between the actual activities and laws governing this. Yet, the increasing reporting requirements create frustration in the municipalities. This is especially true of the KOSTRA- reporting. The majority of the interviewees agree that questions confusion and frequent changes break down the motivation to report fully in KOSTRA. According to the municipalities KOSTRA-reporting can and should be simplified in both sectors. The municipality's frustration and suggestions for simplifications also relates to unclear terminology and inconsistent use of terminology between IPLOS and KOSTRA.

The municipalities also express a general understanding for the documentation requirements in the health and care sector, and that the documentation requirements need to be comprehensive. Although, there is a perception that documentation requirements have become greater in recent years, the documentation is still important to ensure that the municipalities are providing the services they should. An important feedback from the municipal sector is that it is not the requirements in itself that are challenging or difficult to adopt to, but that different types of technological systems are not always designed to comply with the documentation requirements.

Regarding other reporting within physical planning, land use and environment not registered in KOR, we find that this is primarily about surveys and ad hoc reports on current affairs to the political leadership in the municipalities. The same applies in the health and care.

Who benefits from the reporting and documentation regime?

This project reveals that there are differences between sectors when it comes to who benefits from the reporting and documentation regime. Within physical planning, land use and environment,

there is no doubt that the benefit of the reporting regime is asymmetrical. State authorities experience the highest benefits from the collected data. Municipalities the least, and they also carry the cost of the reporting requirements. Reporting on air quality and keeping of the land register can clearly be categorized as "need to know". The rest of the reporting can be categorized as "nice to have" and can be simplified, coordinated and cut.

The benefit of reporting on local air quality is considered very high and is about citizens' health and quality of life. Our assessment is that this reporting cannot be simplified. But an improvement in the compatibility between existing electronic systems will ease the work of reporting in the municipalities.

It would also be difficult to reduce the reporting requirements in the land register given the great utility value we document. Further work on the functionality of the land register and training in how to report and use it will simplify the workload in the municipalities and help improve data quality.

If we compare this sector with the health care sector, our findings indicate that there the benefits of the reporting and documentation regime is equal between municipalities and state authorities. The municipalities are in agreement that the benefits are acceptable in relation to the time they use for reporting and documentation.

Large and comprehensive actions will give the best results

We have identified a number of possible simplifications. In isolation, many of the proposed simplification will individually contribute to reducing the reporting costs (increased benefit). This applies particularly for the exploitation of technological solutions. If one wants to reduce the overall reporting and documentation burden within the two sectors one must take large and comprehensive action.

Better use of technological solutions

Big steps to improve the utilization of technological solutions are necessary. Our assessment is that the costs for the municipalities will decrease considerably if / when you get / have *compatible systems*. Our report shows that there is little double reporting to state authorities, with the exception of a few examples. Within physical planning, land use and environment municipalities have to keep a "shadow account" of information to be reported. This duplication will be reduced by direct reporting from a system and systems that are integrated with reporting in general and especially KOSTRA.

We have also identified examples of how to better *take advantage of existing registers*. An example is KOSTRA and the land register. Another example is the further coordination of IPLOS and KOSTRA. These are examples of things that are being work on today, for instance through KS program KommIT. Timeframe for the completion of these projects are uncertain, and there have been delays in parts of the work.

There is a need for better utilization of available and new technologies. This relates both to the municipalities' own systems in both sectors, but also in the current state reporting solutions and to SSB. It is not the reporting requirements in itself that is challenging, but lack of coordination and use of different technological systems helps increasing the cost of reporting for the municipalities. The municipalities own systems are often considered a barrier to ensure an effective compliance of the reporting and documentation requirements.

Better utilization of existing technology will all in all probably increase the motivation for reporting in the municipalities since the current situation is perceived as a burden. The biggest simplification potential lies in better technical solutions.

Coordination with other simplification projects

This study and various other simplification projects at state level should be coordinated in a joint time and action plan. In that way simplification actions can be implemented at the same time and

in a manner that prevents duplication in terms of, for example, shadow accounting, or that several municipalities perform the same reporting and documentation exercise. It is natural that coordination of simplification measures are linked to the ongoing simplification actions in the national government. The Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation will have to play a key role, as well as other sectorial authorities, KS and SSB.

Other comprehensive actions

In addition, other measures such as *better use of information letters* sent out each autumn to the municipalities stating changes in KOSTRA forms must be utilized better. Every KOSTRA contact must be e mail recipient, including the municipalities.

In addition, we believe that all *the guidelines* should be included in the KOSTRA forms (also on paper version), as well as making the guidelines a sort of an encyclopaedia. The KOSTRA guidelines are perceived as confusing. The main reason for that is that KOSTRA guidance happens in four ways (i.e. through various guidelines), and the comprehensive guidelines lacks a more simplified guideline. The IPLOS guideline was updated in 2014. Previously The Norwegian Directorate of Health has developed a simplified version of the guidelines. This has not been updated since 2009. Our assessment is that the cost of coordinating and developing educational guidelines are relatively small compared to saving of costs municipalities will be able to experience. A better guideline can also help to the data quality and consequently increase the benefits of the reporting regime.

Another measure will be to *pre-program* certain data from the previous year in the KOSTRA-forms, such as institutional information.

Simplification proposals for reporting requirements within physical planning, land use and environment

We have identified simplifications in both service areas. The reporting burden in municipalities is perceived as highest in the sector physical planning, land use and environment. Within this sector, we consider that the data which are reported mainly consists of data "nice to have", with the exception of reporting on air quality and reporting in the national land register.

Simplification proposals relating to physical planning, land use and environment is first and foremost about an improved guidance to KOSTRA-reporting, the coordination of new and existing data systems to reduce duplication in local government, improve questions and terminology in KOSTRA, communicating the benefits of reporting from the state authorities, in addition to cutting and tightening of the questions that have low utility value and poor data quality. We have identified a number of questions in KOSTRA that can be cut out of the reporting forms, such as question I in form 20 due to low utility value, question H in form 20plan due to low utility value and data quality and the whole of forms 34A and 34B. In every form there are also parts of questions that should be cut. We also propose a few coordination measures involving cutting reporting in favor of registry reporting. For example, we believe that reporting on auditing of building projects should be obtained from KOSTRA or from DIBK itself.

Simplification proposals for reporting requirements within the health sector

We have identified a large number of simplifications in KOSTRA and IPLOS that will help reduce the reporting burden within the health sector. Simplification proposals within the health care sector is first and foremost about firming the KOSTRA Form 1, 4 and 5, the publication of a greater proportion of the data reported in and / or cut out issues like "nice to have" or reducing bad data quality. Increased disclosure of reported data increases the usefulness of the data because more people can benefit from them. Changing the KOSTRA forms will help reduce the reporting costs without affecting the benefits and usefulness of the data. Reduced reporting costs may also contribute to an increased data quality, which will increase the utility of the data further.

In addition to simplification proposals related to KOSTRA, there are also within the health sector a need for an improved guidance to KOSTRA and IPLOS reporting, improve the question and terminology in KOSTRA and IPLOS, as well as ensuring consistent use of terminology between

KOSTRA and IPLOS, coordination and improve the functionality between data systems and to communicate the benefits of reporting from the state authorities.

A change in the interpretation of the IPLOS regulations may reduce the reporting burden
Users who currently receive individual services (security alarm, one-time help in their own homes as wound care or psychological help, etc.) must be registered in IPLOS.

The argument of collecting this data relates to health authorities and researchers wish to have overviews of services users receive. We believe that the value of the data of users who hardly receives services is limited, especially because several municipalities do not follow up the reporting on these groups. One-time users of home care in a difficult life situation may also find it particularly distressing to participate in an IPLOS mapping. A less rigid interpretation of the purpose of IPLOS in the IPLOS regulation, where there is a requirement that one-time users must be registered in IPLOS may therefore reduce the reporting and documentation burden in municipalities, without having any significant effect on what the other data can be used for.

A softening in the IPLOS regulations relating to the linking IPLOS with other pseudo-registers can contribute to cost savings for researchers and an increased use of IPLOS data in research. One would not have to wait for the processing of access application, and this can help to ensure that the research results are made public earlier than before. In policy research this could create a closer bond between researchers and authorities, as well as faster implementation of research results - which can provide increased benefits. It is emphasized that this only concerns anonymous data and that the privacy requirements are maintained.

Other simplifications related to IPLOS

In addition, we suggest a number of other possible simplifications related to IPLOS reporting. The questions of "social participation" for the IPLOS-user are considered "nice to have". The reason that the questions are incorporated is pressure from user organizations. We believe that these questions should be removed from IPLOS. The assessment is based on that the questions have no value for the health authorities and creates unnecessary "hassle and annoyance" for the municipalities.

User visits to the doctor and dentist are particularly challenging for the municipalities to map out, and it is difficult for the caregiver to know if a user has been to the dentist and / or doctor, especially in those cases when the home care givers does not have full responsibility for the patient. This should be considered removed from IPLOS.

We also documents that many users do not get a diagnosis in IPLOS. Our assessment is that one should include a description of the importance of filling out the diagnosis for each user in the guidelines to IPLOS. The guidelines should also illustrate how one can extract sum reports afterwards.

We have also revealed differing terminology in KOSTRA and IPLOS and this creates confusion for the municipalities. Our assessment is that one should take review the terminology in IPLOS and link it with KOSTRA forms. In cases where there is a need for definitions, the definitions be clearly stated in the guidelines.

The reporting deadline of January 15th for the IPLOS reporting is challenging for municipalities. Based on that, there is a value in having reporting deadline for KOSTRA and IPLOS on the same day. This means the municipalities will be able to coordinate the data collection. We believe that coordination of reporting deadlines should be considered.

In addition, some definitions and terms need to be clarified. Our assessment is that the definition of re- / habilitation should be elaborated with information that says whether physiotherapists and occupational therapists should be included as part of the terms. Increased clarity in this area will increase the data quality and reduce unnecessary time spent in municipalities.

Simplification proposals for documentation requirements within the health sector

We have identified a number of documentation requirements in the health sector, and identified additional simplification proposals. We believe that there is a need for a better coordination and design of a standardized setup of which content that should be documented in a patient medical record to observe this documentation requirement.

There is also a need to clarify which requirements must be applied in the proceedings that apply to municipalities in processing individual plans to ensure that municipalities process the individual plan more stringent than necessary. The usefulness of reporting on the number of individual plans to the county government must be considered, given that the utility of this reporting is considered low. The municipalities are not required to report on the number of individual plans through legislation.

There is a need to develop clear guidelines in respect to what kind of documentation is needed when audits are conducted. We believe that what kind of documentation, frequency, source of documentation and the level of detail should be specified. Another possible simplification could be to make an assessment about whether documentation can be obtained from any other sources. This will apply to more general information about the municipalities. Possible sources may be municipalities' own website (plans, plans, organization), SSB, Brønnøysundregistrene or similar. Another possible simplification that should be considered is to reduce the number of audits in the municipalities by assessing and reviewing the legislation regarding audits.

Our assessment is that there is a need for clearer guidelines with respect to what kind of documentations the County Governments can request in regards to appeal proceedings. The guideline should stat type of documentation, frequency, source of documentation and the level of detail of the documentation requested.

We believe it is necessary to review the internal control systems to identify whether there are double entries in various quality management systems for internal controls (such as Kvalitetslosen) between the internal control system legislation and internal control system aimed at health sector.

A simplification linked to prepare documentation / application for a resolution for the use of coercion and restraint on people with mental disabilities will be to make use of a simplified application when a resolution are to be renewed and there are no changes in the measures.

Which stakeholders must continue this work?

To ensure that this study and the measures suggested is followed up, we believe it is important that the national authorities take action. We believe it is natural that coordination of simplification measures are linked to the Governments ongoing work of "en enklere hverdag for folk flest" and in particular the work (project) "Fjerne tidstyver" in which KMD has the overarching responsibility. In addition, other important stakeholders are KS via KommIT specifically, SSB and respective sector authorities.

Better utilization of existing technology will in all probability increase the motivation for reporting in the municipalities since the current situation is perceived as a burden. This is a work that must be delegated to SSB, including extra human resources and economical resources to ensure a focus on the development and implementation of new technology.