Introduction
This study focuses on the openness of judiciary branch data and its impact in Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay. It is also oriented to address how the information is used by key stakeholders.

Even though judiciaries provide information related to rulings, statistics and budget, they still do not use open formats. Openness has created more transparent judicial environments but has not led to judicial accountability yet.

Evidence and findings
- Judicial officers in Uruguay and Argentina did not know about the concept of open data. In Chile some of them did. Users had more information about open data.
- All three countries got the highest scores in the non-discrimination standard. One flaw was the need for licenses for the use of software.
- The three countries have high results on accessibility. The information was available as a whole, without cost, and ready for downloading.
- Argentina ranked on top for reusability, followed by Uruguay and then Chile. The three countries use data formats that do not allow it to be easily exported.
- The three countries provide updated information, indicating a trend towards the sustainability of this policy.
- Users and officials interviewed agreed that the quantity of information should increase. They also agreed that the information is not systematically used to design public policy and to promote accountability. They said that the public at-large does not know how to use the information.

Conclusions
- Judicial information does not yet comply with all requirements for being considered as open data.
- Proactive data publication took place because of a belief in the obligation to make the justice service more transparent, rather than for reasons of efficiency.
- Despite the efforts made, there is still a lack of balance between the supply and demand of judicial data.
- The will of judicial branches to implement open data is crucial, notwithstanding the openness at other levels of government. While Uruguay shows a more enabling country context, it ranks at the bottom in judicial open data. On the contrary, Argentina’s judicial branch has a wider information policy compared to its country context.