



Group of States against Corruption
Groupe d'États contre la corruption

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Adoption: 2 December 2016
Publication: 15 February 2017

Public
GrecoRC4(2016)12

FOURTH EVALUATION ROUND

Corruption prevention in respect of members of
parliament, judges and prosecutors

COMPLIANCE REPORT

NORWAY

Adopted by GRECO at its 74th Plenary Meeting
(Strasbourg, 28 November-2 December 2016)

F
O
U
R
T
H

E
V
A
L
U
A
T
I
O
N

R
O
U
N
D

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Compliance Report assesses the measures taken by the authorities of Norway to implement the recommendations issued in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Norway which was adopted at GRECO's 64th Plenary Meeting (16-20 June 2014) and made public on 25 June 2014, following authorisation by Norway ([Greco Eval IV Rep \(2013\) 10E](#)). GRECO's Fourth Evaluation Round deals with "Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors".
2. As required by GRECO's Rules of Procedure, the authorities of Norway submitted a Situation Report on measures taken to implement the recommendations. This report was received on 22 September 2016 and served, together with the information submitted subsequently, as a basis for the Compliance Report.
3. GRECO selected Liechtenstein (in respect of members of parliament) and Azerbaijan (in respect of judicial institutions) to appoint Rapporteurs for the compliance procedure. The Rapporteurs appointed were Mr Patrick Ritter, Deputy Director of the Office of Foreign Affairs, on behalf of Liechtenstein, and Mr Elnur Musayev, Senior Prosecutor, Anticorruption Directorate, Prosecutor's Office, on behalf of Azerbaijan. They were assisted by GRECO's Secretariat in drawing up the Compliance Report.
4. The Compliance Report assesses the implementation of each individual recommendation contained in the Evaluation Report and establishes an overall appraisal of the level of the member's compliance with these recommendations. The implementation of any outstanding recommendation (partially or not implemented) will be assessed on the basis of a further Situation Report to be submitted by the authorities 18 months after the adoption of the present Compliance Report.

II. ANALYSIS

5. GRECO addressed seven recommendations to Norway in its Evaluation Report. Compliance with these recommendations is dealt with below.

Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament

6. The authorities of Norway submit that the Presidium of the Storting – the Norwegian Parliament – assigned in December 2014 a special working group, headed by the Third Vice-President to which representatives of all eight parliamentary party groups were invited to participate, to review current regulations and legislation and to assess where improvements, as proposed in the Evaluation Report, would be desirable. The group reported back to the Presidium in June 2015 and pointed at possible amendments to the Ethical Guidelines and to the Regulation on the Register of Members of the Storting's Appointments and Economic Interests. In December 2015, the Presidium consulted the party groups on a new draft version of the Ethical Guidelines, which was subsequently adopted on 26 May 2016, along with a separate document entitled Guidelines on Gifts. On the same day, the Presidium also submitted to the Storting a recommendation on amendments to the Regulation on the Register of Members of the Storting's Appointments and Economic Interests (the Register), which was adopted by the Storting in plenary on 7 June 2016. The amendments entered into force on 1 October 2016.

Recommendation i.

7. *GRECO recommended that the Ethical Guidelines be (i) further developed with the participation of the members of the Storting (to cover issues such as the prevention of conflicts of interest, acceptance of gifts and other advantages and contacts with third parties, including lobbyists), (ii) and complemented by practical measures in order to provide adequate guidance and counselling to members of the Storting regarding ethical matters.*
8. In respect to the first part of the recommendation, as a preamble, the authorities stress that Norwegian tradition and political culture need to be taken into account when developing a code of conduct for members of parliament (MPs). In the Storting, the formal prescription or prohibition of actions in particular cases would not be regarded as an appropriate approach to developing ethical standards and principles. On the other hand, there is broad acceptance of the positive benefits of introducing certain ethical and transparency guidelines on how to exercise the office of member. The Ethical Guidelines, therefore, provide rules that are not legally binding, but express clear expectations that parliamentarians are to follow, both as regards formal rules and regulations, and as regards commonly accepted ethical norms and values. It is the individual responsibility of MPs to follow these Guidelines, in accordance with the trust conferred on them by the citizens in election, but the Guidelines also make it clear that integrity is not a matter for MPs themselves to define individually.
9. The authorities state that the new version of the Ethical Guidelines introduces rules on the issues detailed in the recommendation. As regards the prevention of conflicts of interest, it is stated in the introduction that MPs must not seek personal gain through their position, and that openness is of paramount importance when they are faced with a potentially problematic situation. The Regulation on the Register of Members of the Storting's Appointments and Economic Interests also contains a general rule according to which each Member must account for his/her other interests and ensure that they do not improperly influence the performance of his/her duties and responsibilities.
10. Concerning gifts, the newly adopted Guidelines on Gifts provide clear rules and examples aiming at helping MPs identify whether compensations, other forms of rewards and gifts are acceptable or not. It is stated in the introduction that Members of the Storting shall not accept a gift that may be intended to influence them to adopt a particular position on a certain matter. The text, while putting the emphasis on the personal assessment and responsibility of each MP, also lists which gifts must be rejected (gifts offered during a negotiation process, delivered to the MP's private address, given on certain conditions, and money or anything that could easily be redeemed in money).
11. The authorities state that the question of contacts with third parties is dealt with in the Ethical Guidelines' section entitled "Information and contact". There are no restrictions on contacts with third parties, but the Guidelines underline the importance of knowing which interests the lobbyists represent. The authorities reiterate the principle observed in Norway that each Member is responsible for his or her actions, and therefore that it is a matter of personal discretion for Members to decide who they meet and receive information from; at the same time, they are responsible for maintaining contacts in such a way as not to give reason to presume that their positions or decisions have come under undue influence. Finally, the authorities state that in the recent years, the Storting has considered five different proposals to introduce a registration scheme for lobbying, and that none of them has gained the support of the majority, as it is believed that the instauration

of a register would drive lobbying out of the Storting and behind closed doors, and therefore be counterproductive in terms of bringing more transparency.

12. In respect of the second part of the recommendation, the authorities report that the Ethical Guidelines call for Members who think they might have a personal interest in a matter to be deliberated in the Storting to contact the Presidium and the Storting's Administration for guidance. The human resources of relevant bodies within the Storting's Administration have been recently strengthened in order to provide more active and better guidance on ethical matters to the Members. It has also been decided to improve the advisory service to MPs regarding the Register, by offering assistance with filing information. The authorities report that a more comprehensive introduction programme for newly elected Members will be developed and should be available for the next General Election, which will take place in 2017. In addition, the Storting is currently developing an e-learning programme for its Members, and the possibility of including information on ethical issues is being discussed.
13. GRECO takes note of the information provided. It welcomes the adoption of the amendments to the Ethical Guidelines and to the Regulation on the Register of Members of the Storting's Appointments and Economic Interests (the Register), as well as the introduction of separate Guidelines on Gifts, which contain provisions on all the issues identified in the recommendation. It acknowledges that these general rules contain explicit reference to the issues at stake in the first element of the recommendation which is, therefore, to be regarded as implemented satisfactorily.
14. As regards the second part of the recommendation, GRECO notes that members of the Storting can turn to both the Presidium and the Storting's Administration for guidance and counselling regarding ethical matters. GRECO commends the authorities of Norway for having increased personnel in the relevant bodies within the Storting's Administration, as well as for the development of a more comprehensive introduction program for newly elected MPs. It is important that the latter includes information on the Ethical Guidelines, the Guidelines on Gifts, the Register and related issues of ethics and integrity. GRECO encourages the Norwegian authorities to go ahead with the development of the e-learning program and to include information on ethical issues. Meanwhile, GRECO takes the view that the second part of the recommendation is to be regarded as partly implemented.
15. GRECO concludes that recommendation i has been partly implemented.

Recommendation ii.

16. *GRECO recommended that a requirement of ad hoc disclosure be introduced when a conflict emerges between the private interests of individual members of parliament and a matter under consideration in parliamentary proceedings.*
17. The authorities state that the requirements of the recommendation are closely tied to the question of disqualification, which is neither mentioned in the Norwegian Constitution nor in the Rules of Procedure. They reiterate their position that as a main rule, MPs are able to consider all subjects, including the ones which could have an impact on them, and that it is left to the discretion of each Member to bring the matter of disclosure up. They add that the Storting does not have the power to ask its Members to withdraw from any proceedings. The authorities also report that both the working group (see paragraph 6) and the Presidium discussed the constitutionality of a requirement of *ad hoc* disclosure as described in the recommendation. Both bodies concluded that, as stated in paragraph 47 of the Evaluation Report, it is solely the MPs' responsibility to report any potential conflict between their private interests and the matter under consideration in parliamentary

proceedings. Furthermore, in 2013, an all-party committee examined the Rules of Procedure and determined that no detailed and specific rules were necessary regarding the question of disqualification. Both the Presidium and the Storting agreed with this conclusion. In addition, the authorities submit that, although not mandated by the Constitution, a system of ad hoc disclosure is de facto in place in the practice of the Storting. The mandatory and publicly available Register of interest further provides for transparency and control in case of possible conflicts of interest. An MP may also ask the Presidium to give its opinion on whether to withdraw from taking part in committee deliberations or abstain from speaking or voting on certain matters in the Storting. Furthermore, an MP may apply to the Presidium for a leave of absence if there is a potential conflict of interest. Where an MP wishes to abstain from participating in a debate or a vote, this has always been accepted. Another approach is for MPs to excuse themselves from sessions if a potential conflict of interest has emerged in a specific matter. The authorities emphasise that the constitutional principle according to which MPs are able to consider all subjects, which has been a fundamental element of the Constitution since 1814, prevents any formal requirement of abstention or disclosure. A formal requirement of disclosure would undermine this fundamental freedom of MPs to consider all subjects before the Storting if they so wish. The authorities take the view that the current *de facto ad hoc* disclosure system provides transparency, while respecting this fundamental constitutional principle.

18. GRECO notes that the Presidium, the Storting, the working group and an all-party committee have all considered the possibility to require an *ad hoc* disclosure, and that their view remains that it is solely the MPs' responsibility to assess whether or not they should withdraw from proceedings. The other measures reported, which all existed at the time of adoption of the Evaluation Report, have been explained further. The reason given by the authorities for not amending the Rules of Procedure in this matter is the constitutional principle according to which Members are supposed to be able to consider all matters to be deliberated in the Storting. GRECO understands that this principle is seen as a central aspect of the integrity system applicable to parliamentarians in Norway. However, it takes the view that a requirement to announce a conflict of interest need not necessarily entail a disqualification from further participation in parliamentary debates. The purpose of a requirement of ad hoc disclosure is transparency rather than restriction. Therefore, GRECO encourages the authorities to reflect further on this issue, including in respect of the possibility of implementing a cross-check of the information contained in the Register and the public databases, as referred to in paragraph 29.

19. GRECO concludes that recommendation ii has not been implemented.

Recommendation iii.

20. *GRECO recommended (i) that the existing declaration system be further developed, in particular by including quantitative data on the financial and economic interests of member of parliament as well as data on significant liabilities; (ii) that consideration be given to widening the scope of the declarations to also include information on spouses and dependent family members (it being understood that such information would not necessarily need to be made public).*
21. The authorities of Norway stress as a preamble that the declaration system in the Storting must be viewed in the light of the general openness regarding information on the personal finances of Norwegian citizens. This includes access to the Norwegian Tax Administration's database and register of shareholders – access to the latter being given to interested persons such as journalists – the Norwegian Mapping Authority's Land Registry and a number of other public registries.

Accordingly, the Presidium and the working group have sought to strike a balance between the volume of information and the transparency it provides. A decision was made not to include too much detailed information in the Register when this information may easily be found in other public registers.

22. The authorities report that the amendments to the Regulation on the Register of Members of the Storting's Appointments and Economic Interests referred to in paragraph 6 have introduced significant new provisions regarding the type of information to be declared in the Register. According to section 3 of the amended Regulation on the Register, independent income-producing activities (individual jobs or several jobs for the same contactor within the same calendar year) as well as the amount perceived must be registered if the remuneration exceeds 50 000 NOK (5 555 EUR). Section 5 now provides that in addition to the duty to register leave of absence agreements and agreements of a financial nature with former employers, loans from former employers are also subject to registration. Under section 7, the amount of any donation from companies, organisations, institutions or individuals exceeding 50 000 NOK (5 555 EUR) must now be declared. The amendment to section 8 imposes a duty to declare in the Register the nature of ownership of real estate owned for business purposes. Regarding business interests such as shares and stakes (section 9), all business interests owned by the MP, either directly or indirectly through an investment company, shall be stated along with their nature of liability (sole ownership, limited liability, etc) and independently of their value (as opposed to the former minimum of one percent of a company's total capital or the national Insurance basis amount, under which the interest did not have to be registered).
23. Regarding the second part of the recommendation, the working group referred the question of widening the scope of the declarations to also include information on spouses and dependent family members to the Norwegian Data Protection Authority. The latter argued in favour of transparency, stating that privacy reasons should not be crucial to a decision on including information on such family members in the Register. The Data Protection Authority, however, expressed the view that the decision to include such data should be authorised by law. On the other hand, the working group and the Presidium are of the opinion that, on the subject of the transparency of economic interests, concerns for individual family members' privacy outweigh the public interest. The authorities also refer to the already consequent amount of information on personal finances available, which in their opinion make it possible for the public to examine the financial situation of the families of MPs. They finally state that consideration has also been given to the possibility of not making information relating to spouses and family members public, but find that it would defeat the purpose of the Register if any information declared should not be made public. In their view, information which is not to be disclosed to the public need not be declared.
24. Regarding the first part of the recommendation, GRECO welcomes the adoption of amendments to the Regulation on the Register. The obligation for MPs to declare the amount of income exceeding 50 000 NOK (5 555 EUR) a year perceived from their activities outside of the Storting is a significant improvement, as is the requirement to disclose the amount of donations from companies, organisations, institutions or individuals exceeding that same amount. Regarding business interests owned by the MPs, making the disclosure of the company's name and the nature of liability mandatory regardless of their value is a step in the direction of more transparency. GRECO notes, however, that there is no obligation to disclose significant liabilities, except for loans from former employers. This part of the recommendation is therefore to be regarded as partly implemented.

25. As regards the second part of the recommendation, GRECO notes that the working group consulted the Norwegian Data Protection Authority on the possibility to widen the scope of the declarations to also include information on spouses and dependent family members. It also acknowledges that consideration was given to the possibility to register this information without making it public. GRECO, therefore, takes the view that this part of the recommendation has been implemented as the issue at stake has indeed been considered. It regrets, however, that the reflection has not resulted in any changes to the rules in this respect, especially considering the fact that the Data Protection Authority itself argued in favour of transparency.
26. GRECO concludes that recommendation iii has been partly implemented.

Recommendation iv.

27. *GRECO recommended that appropriate measures be taken to ensure supervision and enforcement of the declaration requirements and standards of conduct applicable to members of the Storting.*
28. The authorities explain that there is in fact a system of supervision of the declaration requirements. The Presidium and the Storting's administration, as appropriate, follow up on any complaints claiming that relevant rules or guidelines have not been complied with. MPs who have not complied with their obligations regarding the Register receive a written reminder. General reminders are also issued regularly. With respect to sanctions, the lists published based on the Register clearly show which MPs – if any – are not in compliance with its rules. The media follow the Register closely and non-compliance with declaration requirements would have a significant negative impact on an MP's image, in a country where transparency and accountability to the citizens are deeply enshrined in the political culture. Furthermore, in case of a violation of the declaration requirements or other standards of conduct, the parliamentary groups themselves have a disciplinary role on their members, as violations may have consequences for the MPs assignments and careers. The authorities also note that compliance with the rules on the Register is very high. After the latest election in 2013, all MPs had submitted declarations in compliance with the Register within one month of the session as required.
29. The authorities have, however, examined the issue and considered the possibility of strengthening the mechanisms of supervision and sanction. The Presidium's opinion on the matter is that violations of the duty to submit declarations must be regarded in the same way as violations of the Rules of Procedure in general, and therefore does not recommend any special sanctions. In 2013, an ad-hoc committee in the Storting took into account the possibility to include in the Rules of Procedures provisions concerning violations of the Member's duties. However, the committee did not put forward a proposal to adopt sanctions, since it considered that sanctions such as impeachment and penalties are already provided in criminal law. As a conclusion, the working group, the Presidium and the ad-hoc committee all stated that informal ways to address undesirable behaviours were preferred over formal sanctions. That said, the Storting's Administration is considering the possibility of implementing a supervision routine for the Register, which would consist in cross-checking information contained in the Register and the public databases.
30. GRECO welcomes the additional information provided regarding the current arrangements for supervision and enforcement of the declaration requirements and standards of conduct. It appreciates that, while informal, these arrangements seem sufficient to ensure a high degree of compliance. It also agrees that the publicity given to potential cases of non-compliance may have significant political consequences for the MPs concerned. GRECO also appreciates that the authorities

have further considered the issues at stake in the current recommendation and encourages them to introduce a cross-check by the Storting's Administration of the information contained in the Register and the public databases.

31. GRECO concludes that recommendation iv has been dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

Corruption prevention in respect of judges

Recommendation v.

32. *GRECO recommended (i) seeking ways to increase the transparency of the process of appointment of short-term judges and (ii) considering reducing the number of short-term judges.*
33. The authorities recall that the Judicial Appointments Board (hereinafter, JAB) is competent, according to the Courts Act to appoint temporary judges for short-term appointments and may delegate this competence to the Norwegian Courts Administration (NCA). In November 2014, the JAB adopted amendments to the procedures related to short-term appointment of judges with the aim of increasing the level of transparency, making explicit reference to the Evaluation Report and recommendations by GRECO. First, the JAB created a National Register for applicants to short-term appointments in cooperation with the NCA. The JAB also adopted new regulations, according to which all the short-term appointments are to be announced on the courts' websites. The procedure for short-term appointments and the vacancies are also available on a specific website¹. The authorities also report that the policy note of the JAB, which is available online², has been amended. It is binding on the JAB, the NCA and the courts in the context of appointments. The selection process must follow the requirements of the policy note and the court president, when submitting a proposed appointment to the NCA, must motivate this proposal.
34. As regards the second part of the recommendation, the authorities report that the principle of limiting the use of temporary appointed judges has been an integral part of the JAB's and the NCA's deliberations throughout the reform process described above. This principle is founded on section 22 third paragraph of the Norwegian Constitution. It was again reiterated in the Norwegian Official Report prepared by the law commission in relation to the judicial reform (enacted on 1 November 2002) as amendment of the Courts Act, as well as in the policy note of the JAB and mentioned by the Board of Governors of the NCA. The authorities explain that the number of deputy judges has been reduced over the course of the last years, following a decision from the Board of Governors of the NCA and the merging of four courts into two, in the context of the reform of the judicial map. The Norwegian authorities, however, explain that factors such as budgetary constraints and efficiency considerations affect further implementation of the recommendation. In the country's numerous small courts for example, the only way to avoid an increase in processing times is to balance temporary leaves of absence for judges (illness, maternity/paternity leaves) by the use of short-term or long-term temporary appointments.
35. In respect of the first part of the recommendation, GRECO welcomes the concrete steps taken to improve the transparency of the process of appointments of short-term judges, such as the creation of a national register for applicants, the publication of openings online, and the setting up of a dedicated website. As to the

¹ <http://www.domstol.no/no/Om-domstolene/Ledige-stillinger-og-embeter/Korttidskonstitusjoner/>

² http://www.domstol.no/globalassets/upload/da/internett/domstol.no/om-domstolene/innstillingsradet/pp-notat_mai-2016.pdf

second part of the recommendation, GRECO takes the view that it has been given adequate consideration.

36. GRECO concludes that recommendation v has been implemented satisfactorily.

Recommendation vi.

37. *GRECO recommended that the existing training and awareness activities for all categories of judges, including lay judges, be enhanced, in order to ensure that judges have proper guidance on ethics, expected conduct, conflicts of interest and related manners.*
38. The authorities explain that since the evaluation report, the scheme for training of all judicial posts has been updated, with an increased focus on ethical issues. As regards professional judges, the NCA established in May 2015 an *Advisory Committee for Training Development of Judges*, composed of judges from all three levels of courts and of a deputy judge. The purpose of the new scheme is to improve the specific skills inherent to the judges' position. The initial training of judges includes both increased quantitative focus on ethics and an improved qualitative approach. The training of judges emphasises "judge craft" and the judges are trained by especially trained judges, who work as mentors and moderators during workshops. More specifically, the introductory start course has been enhanced and now contains sessions dealing with judges' conduct and disciplinary reactions. Continuous training has also undergone substantial changes, with seminars to be attended by all judges over a two-year period and offered again at regular intervals, as well as workshops such as "*Handling difficult situations in court hearing and outside court hearings*". The authorities specify that the workshop is moderated by trained judges, and includes the use of films/videos and short lectures. This new scheme is more focused on ethical training and contains more compulsory elements in the continuous training in order to prepare judges to tackle ethical challenges related to conflicts of interest.
39. Regarding lay judges, the authorities explain that since the adoption of the Evaluation Report, the focus on training of lay judges has been substantially increased, with changes implemented on several levels and coordinated through a project established by the NCA in cooperation with the courts. They stress that these changes come in addition to the specific preparation of lay judges that is carried out with the courts in connection with each case. In creating this new scheme, the NCA and the courts have strived to strike the optimal balance between proper training of lay judges and maintaining the independence and integrity of the lay judges, in their specific position vis-à-vis the judiciary. The new scheme comprises a lay judge project, a specific website³, a budget allocation letter to the courts and an information video, in order to discuss impartiality and independence issues. The lay judge project, launched in January 2016, targets the newly selected lay judges for the period of 2017 until 2021. The NCA appointed pilot courts to carry out the new training scheme, which includes seminars for lay judges, information on internal routines of the courts and information to the municipal authorities who recruit lay judges. These activities are continuously made available to all courts through an info bank for best practices and several other courts are also using them to train their own lay judges. A comprehensive guideline for training lay judges is also being prepared under the new scheme. In the budget allocation letter of the NCA for 2016, all courts were asked to report to what extent they have offered training and preparation of lay judges. Finally, the NCA organises a two-day seminar about daily ethical challenges for non-judge staff at the courts, as part of the regular curricula.

³ <http://www.domstol.no/lekdommer>

40. GRECO welcomes the enhancement of training and awareness activities reported as regards professional and lay judges, with its increased focus on ethics and integrity, both quantitatively and qualitatively.
41. GRECO concludes that recommendation vi has been implemented satisfactorily.

Corruption prevention in respect of prosecutors

Recommendation vii.

42. *GRECO recommended (i) that a set of clear ethical standards/code of professional conduct – based on the general Ethical Guidelines for the Public Service and accompanied by explanatory comments and/or practical examples specifically for prosecutors, including guidance on conflicts of interest and related issues – be made applicable to all prosecutors and be made easily accessible to the public; and (ii) that complementary measures for its implementation, including dedicated training on the above issues, be taken in respect of all prosecutors.*
43. The authorities report that the Director of Public Prosecutions adopted on 11 December 2015 a Code of Ethics for members of the prosecuting authority, which complements, inter alia, the Code of Ethics for Government Service. The authorities note that the Code is in force for the higher prosecution authority, as well as prosecutors at regional level and prosecutors employed in special units. A process is on-going to also make it applicable to the prosecution authority within the police. The Code is founded on several principles, namely independence, objectivity, impartiality, integrity, quality and efficiency, diligence and professionalism, respect, discretion, information to the public and media, behaviour outside the service and compliance. The Code of Ethics provides general rules as well as explanatory comments with regard, inter alia, to the themes listed in the Evaluation Report (paragraph 183). The authorities declare that no specific training has so far been conducted in relation to the issuance of the guidelines.
44. GRECO welcomes the adoption of the Code of Ethics for members of the prosecuting authority, which fulfils the aim of the first part of the recommendation as regards prosecutors of the Director of Public Prosecutions, regional prosecutors and prosecutors in special units. Indeed, it notes with interest that the Code of Ethics provides guidance on ethical measures, enhancing the prosecutors' awareness on these issues. GRECO welcomes the on-going process to make the code applicable also to the prosecution authority within the police. It therefore takes the view that the first part of the recommendation has been partly implemented. As regards the second part of the recommendation, GRECO notes that dedicated training on ethical issues has not yet been carried out. Therefore, GRECO concludes that the second part of the recommendation has not been implemented.
45. GRECO concludes that recommendation vii has been partly implemented.

III. CONCLUSIONS

46. **In view of the foregoing, GRECO concludes that Norway has implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner three of the seven recommendations contained in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report.** Of the remaining recommendations, three have been partly implemented and one has not been implemented.
47. More specifically, recommendations v and vi have been implemented satisfactorily, recommendation iv has been dealt with in a satisfactory manner, recommendations i, iii and vii have been partly implemented and recommendation ii has not been implemented.
48. With respect to members of parliament, GRECO welcomes the adoption of the amendments to the Ethical Guidelines and to the Regulation on the Register of Members of the Storting's Appointments and Economic Interests (the Register), the introduction of Guidelines on Gifts and the additional explanations provided as regards the supervisory and enforcement mechanism for the declaration system and the rules of conduct. More progress remains to be made regarding the disclosure of data on MPs' significant liabilities, as well as the introduction of a requirement of ad hoc disclosure when a conflict emerges between the private interests of a Member and his or her parliamentary functions.
49. As far as judges are concerned, GRECO welcomes the concrete steps taken to improve the transparency of the process of appointment of short-term judges and the consideration given to reducing the number of such appointments. The enhancement of the training activities on ethics and related issues available to both professional and lay judges is also to be welcomed.
50. Finally, and as regards prosecutors, GRECO welcomes the adoption of the Code of Ethics for members of the Director of Public Prosecutions, regional prosecutors and prosecutors employed in special units. It now needs to be made applicable also to the prosecution authority within the police and to be complemented with appropriate training.
51. In view of the above, GRECO notes that measures have been taken to implement most of the recommendations and on the understanding that the authorities of Norway will further pursue their efforts, it concludes that the current level of compliance with the recommendations is not "globally unsatisfactory" in the meaning of Rule 31, paragraph 8.3 of GRECO's Rules of Procedure. GRECO invites the Head of delegation of Norway to submit additional information regarding the implementation of recommendations i to iii and vii by 30 June 2018.
52. Finally, GRECO invites the authorities of Norway to authorise, as soon as possible, the publication of the report, to translate the report into the national language and to make this translation public.