

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:

Country 20XX-20XX

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Executive Summary2

Section I. Key Observations.....4

Section II. Early Results5

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation7

Section IV. Methodology 10

Annex I. Commitment Data 12

Executive Summary

Write a 2–3 sentence headline on the overall level of implementation and early results from the action plan. Can include a message on the quality of participation and co-creation practices important for the country. Think strategically, as this is the main message to national stakeholders.

Guidance: The executive summary should be short and easy to read. Use short sentences and plain language. Some people will only read the executive summary. It should outline the main findings and lessons from across the action plan cycle. It should provide a high-level analysis that encourages the reader to continue reading the report for further details. You can skip questions below that are not relevant to your specific country context. Guidance text in purple throughout the template can be deleted as it is completed.

Implementation *(approx. 250 words)*

- What number action plan was this for the country and what was the overall level of early results across the plan?
- What policy areas saw the most progress?
- What were the key early results achieved through this action plan? (Ex: The public can now access information on / participate in ...)
- Mention if implementation of the action plan advanced wider aims, such as operationalizing rights enshrined in the constitution, national policies, laws, strategies, or pledges made in international forums, etc.
- What was the level of completion across the action plan?
- What (if any) are the common characteristics or contributing factors across commitments that saw progress?
- To what extent were commitments identified as “promising” in the Action Plan Review or submitted for the OGP Challenge achieved early results?
- If there were promising commitments that did not achieve early results, what factors inhibited their implementation?

At a Glance

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

10/14

Complete or substantially complete commitments

EARLY RESULTS

9/14

Commitments with early results

1/14

Commitments with significant results

KEY OBSERVATIONS

- **Headline copied from Key Observations section**
- **Headline copied from Key Observations section**
- **Headline copied from Key Observations section**
- **Headline copied from Key Observations section**

Met the minimum requirements during implementation: Yes/No

- How does this level of completion and early results compare with previous action plans?¹

Participation and Co-Creation (*approx. 150 words*)

- What bodies/institutions oversee the OGP process in the country? Describe any changes in the institutional setup of OGP in the country during the action plan period.
- What were the main achievements, innovations, and/or challenges regarding participation and co-creation throughout the action plan cycle?
- How did the country's participation and co-creation practices impact the quality of stakeholder dialogue? How did it impact co-creation and implementation of commitments?
- If it is a 4-year action plan, how did the refresh process and amendments to the action plan impact implementation?
- How did participation and co-creation practices compare to previous cycles?
- If the country did not meet any of the minimum requirements under the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards, note where they fell short.

Implementation in Context (*approx. 200 words*)

What domestic or international factors positively or negatively impacted implementation? How were they addressed (or not)? For example: an increase or decrease in funding (such as grants), reorganization or conflict in the multi-stakeholder forum, change in government implementers, elections, pandemic, natural disasters or social movements or unrest, etc.

Mention if there was any further institutionalization of open government over the course of implementation. For example: development of an open government strategy, passage of a legal or regulatory instrument to institutionalize OGP, or a government branch that joined the OGP process, such as through an open parliament plan or challenge commitment, or new OGP Local members.

¹ Please cite sources as endnotes at the end of each section throughout the report. The IRM uses the Chicago Manual note style for citations. Sources can be cited as follows: First name Last name (Job title, Organization), interview by/correspondence with researcher, DD Month YYYY. Examples:

- Mia Katan (Senior IRM Research Officer, Open Government Partnership), interview by IRM researcher, 30 April 2024.
- Sarah Jacobs (IRM Research Officer, Open Government Partnership), correspondence with IRM researcher, 22 May 2024.

Documents and websites can be cited as follows: Author name (if provided), document or website title, date of publication or access for websites, weblink. Examples:

- Carina Paju, "Four Steps towards Fiscal Openness," Open Government Partnership, 5 June 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/stories/four-steps-towards-fiscal-openness>.
- "How to Tackle Corruption through the Open Gov Challenge," Open Government Partnership, 6 June 2024 <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/stories/how-to-tackle-corruption-through-the-open-gov-challenge>.
- "Freedom in the World 2024: Indonesia," Freedom House, accessed 15 July 2024, <https://freedomhouse.org/country/indonesia/freedom-world/2024>.

Section I. Key Observations

[Do not change] The key observations below offer reflections from COUNTRY'S NUMBER action plan cycle. These lessons aim to support COUNTRY'S future action plans and broader open government journey.

Guidance: Use this section to highlight 3-5 analytical takeaways from the country's entire action plan cycle. Key observations should place the action plan within the country's broader open government journey. Observations should be:

- **Concise.** Headings should be one sentence or less and use plain language. The observations should be around 200 words each.
- **Clear and direct.** Communicate for one idea per observation. Use accessible language. Explain the idea so that someone who hasn't read the rest of the report can understand.
- **Concrete.** Include concrete examples that illustrate the cross-cutting analytical point being made. Observations are not recommendations but can include one if relevant.
- **Targeted.** Consider your audience and the timing of this report's publication in the country's action plan cycle. What is useful to highlight at this moment?
- **Analytical.** Go beyond describing what happened to also explain the 'why' or 'how' behind the observation.

Consider the following questions to identify key observations. You may want to write this section last to distill lessons gathered from interviews and the analysis of implementation.

- What led to results? What were the common traits of successful commitments?
- What were the common factors across commitments that didn't achieve early results?
- What factors positively or negatively impacted implementation of the action plan (contextual, political, financial...)?
- Were there notable changes in the institutionalization of OGP in the country (Open Government Strategy, creation of an Open Government Unit, addition of new OGP Local Members, Open Parliament Plan, etc.)?
- How did the quality of participation and co-creation practices across the action plan period impact implementation? Any innovative practices to highlight?
- How is OGP contributing to the institutionalization of reforms in the country? Are there reforms continued across action plans with cumulative results to highlight?
- Are there lessons from this action plan cycle that could be helpful for other countries? Or lessons from elsewhere that could be useful for this country?
- Did the country act on previous IRM recommendations?

Observation 1: Heading as short statement (Ex: Commitments with dedicated government funding achieved greater early results)

Write the narrative here. Aim for around 200 words each.¹

¹ Please use endnotes at the end of each section for citations.

Section II. Early Results

[Do not change] This section analyzes commitments that achieved the strongest early results in the action plan. To assess early results, the IRM considers commitments’ objective, the country context, the policy area, and the evidence of changes. The IRM early results assessment is determined by the depth of change that occurred and evidence that the change is expected to be sustained in time.

Table 1. Commitments with Early Results

Commitment #: One sentence on the early results achieved through this commitment (Ex: Increased access to information through the passage of regulations to implement the Right to Information Act)
Commitments #, #, and #: Use this format for clusters
Commitment #: (Ex: Strengthened open data governance through collaborative development of an Open Data Strategy and creation of an Open Data Multi-Stakeholder Forum)
...
...

Guidance: Include all commitments with significant results in this section. If there is only one or no commitments with significant results, then feature commitments with moderate results. If there are several ‘moderate’ commitments to choose from, prioritize commitments with results on the higher end of the moderate tier and those important to the national context or reformers. Remember that your analysis must be based on the evidence collected through your research and on government, civil society, and expert interviews. This section should not just be a description of activities that took place. Instead, it should be an analysis of how these activities have contributed to early results.

Commitment #: Short Title

Implementers: Lead government body and/or CSO implementers listed in the action plan

Context and Objectives

In a few sentences, note the commitment or cluster’s overall objective and how it is significant within the national context. Draw from the Action Plan Review for this action plan, which may already explain the context and objectives. If this is a four-year action plan and this commitment was amended at the midpoint, briefly note the changes and reasons. This section should be around 5 or 6 lines long on the page.

Early Results: Add coding: Moderate Results or Significant Results

Start with a summary of the main findings on the early results. It may help to write this part last. Clearly state the reason for coding early results as moderate or significant. If the commitment was not identified in the Action Plan Review as “promising” but had strong results, explain what made the implementation meaningful and describe the unexpected results.

Explain the depth of changes that occurred due to implementation by answering the following questions in your analysis:

- What has changed compared to before the commitment was implemented?
 - To what extent has there been a change in practices, policies or institutions governing the commitment's policy area or public sector?
 - Were there changes to the enabling environment for trust between citizens and the state? Examples of this could include changes in relationships, incentives, behavior ect. not captured in the question above.
- How do the early results compare to the commitment's stated objective in the action plan? How do the early results compare to the baselines and indicators of change highlighted in the Action Plan Review?
- If the commitment achieved 'significant results,' explain how implementation changed the way an influential sector is organized and carries out its work or had significant effects on society, the economy, or the environment.
- Which milestones were completed, are ongoing, or not started? Be sure to state the commitment's coding for level of completion: no evidence available, not started, limited, substantial, or complete. Note if implementation included activities not previously stated in the action plan and how they influenced the results.
- How did the commitment's open government lens come into play (transparency, civic participation, public accountability)?
 - If the aim of the commitment was to advance open government directly, to what extent was this achieved?
 - If the commitment used open government mechanisms to advance a policy area, to what extent did these mechanisms contribute to the results?
- How did the changes happen? What were the enabling factors or constraints?
 - Did the opportunities and roadblocks foreseen in the Action Plan Review impact implementation?

State to what extent evidence suggests that the reform will be sustained after the implementation period.

- To what extent has there been formal or informal institutionalization of the changes brought about by implementation?
 - (For example, through changes in laws, regulations, decrees, institutions, incentives, budgets, relationships, behavior, processes, etc.) What do these changes suggest for the longevity of this reform?
- Note if this commitment is part of an ongoing reform within or outside of previous action plans.
- Where possible, based on the current trajectory and progress, what are the prospects for the expected longer-term outcomes of this reform?

Looking Ahead

- What is expected of the commitment in the future? For instance, is the commitment being taken forward in the next action plan? Is this policy area is being prioritized in future actions within or beyond the action plan framework?
- Include any major recommendations that the country could consider moving forward in this policy area. Recommendations can draw from OGP and external guidance or can cite lessons from other countries undertaking similar reforms. You can use bullet points

if desired. Avoid prescriptive language like 'must, needs to, or should.' Instead use language like 'can, could, can consider.'

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

2-3 sentence headline on the overall quality of participation and co-creation throughout the action plan cycle. The headline could highlight any significant innovations or challenges that impacted the quality of engagement.

Guidance: Throughout your analysis, explicitly refer to the five [Participation and Co-Creation Standards](#), particularly when a country is excelling or facing challenges. The overall narrative should not be more than two pages.

OGP in **COUNTRY**

Use this section to briefly describe OGP's location in government and institutional setup:

- What is the agency or office in charge of OGP? If OGP is led by multiple entities, explain how they are coordinated. Note if there was a change in where OGP was located or the OGP Point of Contact and any implications for engagement with civil society or implementation.
- What resources are allocated to OGP in the country? Did any resource constraints (e.g., financial, cross-governmental coordination, or human resources) effect the government's ability to work with civil society? If an OGP mini-grant was provided, note any impact.
- Is there a permanent or temporary multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) and were there any changes during the action plan cycle? (see Standard 1: Space for dialogue)
 - Were non-governmental members of the forum selected through a fair and transparent process? (check researcher questionnaire)
 - To what extent were diverse groups represented? How do they compare to previous action plans?
 - Did members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership, and governance structure? (check researcher questionnaire)
- What were the transparency or communication practices around OGP in the country? (see Standard 2: Transparency) Is communication among a targeted group or are there public communications (i.e. OGP website) that enable broader engagement or monitoring of progress?

Action Plan Co-Creation

Use this section to briefly describe to what extent and how the action plan was collaboratively developed between government and non-government actors. Refer to the country's researcher questionnaire for details on co-creation practices.

- Did the government engage in an iterative dialogue with non-government actors? (see Standard 4: reasoned response)
 - Did non-government actors help to set the co-creation agenda?
- In what ways, if any, did the government or MSF accept inputs on the action plan from civil society or stakeholders outside the forum? (see Standard 3: Public participation)
 - How did the development process and participants in the process impact the action plan or commitments?
 - How did the final commitment selection respond to the country's and consulted stakeholders' policy priorities?

Participation During Implementation

Use this section to briefly describe to what extent and how non-government actors participated in or monitored implementation of the action plan.

- What was the role of the MSF or non-governmental actors during the implementation period? To what extent was the MSF engaged in implementation? To what extent was civil society beyond the MSF engaged in implementation?
- To what extent did the MSF or government make opportunities available for civil society to comment on implementation progress, ask questions, and suggest ways forward? (see Standard 5: Participation during implementation)

You may end with some overarching observations:

- How did engagement, dialogue, or joint decision-making improve or decline compared to previous action plans?
- What were good practices or innovative approaches for decision-making or engaging non-governmental stakeholders throughout the action plan cycle?
- What were the challenges and weaknesses in engagement or decision-making throughout the action plan cycle?
- If this is a four-year action plan, note whether the country underwent a refresh process at the midpoint. Describe the refresh process and any changes made to the action plan in a couple sentences. (Draw from the country’s Midterm Review)

[Do not change] The IRM uses the OGP Participation and Co-Creations Standards to assess countries’ participatory practices throughout the action plan cycle.¹ Countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the standards and to comply with the minimum requirements under each standard.²

Table Guidance: For two-year action plans, delete the “refresh” column in the table below. Copy over the ‘yes/no’ codings from the Action Plan Review for the “co-creation” column (and from the Midterm Review for the “Refresh” column for four-year action plans.) For minimum requirements 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, and 5.1 provide an updated narrative on the status of compliance during implementation. Be sure to answer each sub question. See [IRM guidance](#) for coding the minimum requirements.

Table 2. Compliance with Minimum Requirements

Minimum requirement	Co-creation	Refresh	Implementation
1.1 Space for dialogue: In 2–3 sentences, clearly state (i) if there was a multi-stakeholder space for dialogue (ii) that met at least once every six months, (iii) with basic rules publicly available during the implementation period.	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes or No
2.1 OGP website: In 1–2 sentences, clearly state (i) whether there is a publicly accessible website that (ii) at a minimum contains the latest action plan during the implementation period.	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes or No
2.2 Repository: In 2–3 sentences, clearly state (i) whether there is a repository online, (ii) which is updated at least twice a year, (iii)	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes or No

with information on both co-creation and implementation during the implementation period.			
3.1 Advanced notice: See the Action Plan Review ³ (or Midterm Refresh for four-year action plans)	Yes or No	Yes or No	Not applicable
3.2 Outreach: See the Action Plan Review	Yes or No	Not applicable	Not applicable
3.3 Feedback mechanism: See the Action Plan Review	Yes or No	Not applicable	Not applicable
4.1 Reasoned response: See the Action Plan Review (or Midterm Refresh for four-year action plans)	Yes or No	Yes or No	Not applicable
5.1 Open implementation: In 1–2 sentences, clearly state (i) whether the government met with civil society stakeholders or whether the MSF met during implementation, and (ii) whether implementation results were presented and opportunity made for civil society to comment in these meetings.	Not applicable	Yes or No	Yes or No

¹ “OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards,” Open Government Partnership. 2021.

<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>.

² “IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements,” Independent Reporting Mechanism, 2022.

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf.

³ [Link to country’s Action Plan Review](#)

Section IV. Methodology

[Do not change] This report supports countries' accountability and learning through assessment of the action plan's level of completion and early results. The report provides in-depth analysis of commitments or clusters that achieved the strongest early results in the action plan. It also assesses the country's participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle.¹

The IRM products provided during a national action plan cycle include:

- **Co-Creation Brief:** A concise brief that highlights lessons from previous IRM reports to support a country's OGP process, action plan design, and overall learning.
- **Action Plan Review:** A technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process.
- **Midterm Review:** A review for four-year action plans after a refresh at the midpoint. The review assesses new or significantly amended commitments in the refreshed action plan, compliance with OGP rules, and provides an informal update on implementation progress.
- **Results Report:** An overall implementation assessment that focuses on policy-level results and how changes happen. It also checks compliance with OGP rules and informs accountability and longer-term learning.

In Results Reports, the IRM assesses commitments using two indicators:

Completion

The IRM assesses the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan, including commitments clustered in the Action Plan Review.² The level of completion for all commitments is assessed as one of the following:

- No Evidence Available
- Not Started
- Limited
- Substantial
- Complete

Early Results

The IRM assesses the level of early results from implementation for each commitment or cluster. To do so, the IRM considers commitments' objective, the country context, the policy area, and the evidence of changes. The Early Results indicator is determined by the depth of change that occurred and the evidence of whether the change will be sustained in time. The early results indicator establishes three levels of results:

- **No Notable Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.), the implementation of the open government commitment led to little or no positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes (if any), the IRM did not find meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector,

- enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.
- **Moderate Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.) the implementation of the open government commitment led to positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes, the IRM found meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.
- **Significant Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.) the implementation of the open government commitment led to significant positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes, the IRM found meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.

Significant positive results show clear expectations for these changes (as defined above) will be sustainable in time.

This report was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with RESEARCHER and was reviewed by EXPERT REVIEWER, IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products and review process is overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).³ For more information, refer to IRM webpage⁴ or the glossary of IRM and OGP terms.⁵

¹ For definitions of OGP terms, such as co-creation and promising commitments, see "OGP Glossary," <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>.

² The IRM clusters commitments that share a common policy objective during the Action Plan Review process. In these instances, the IRM assesses "Potential for Results" and "Early Results" at the cluster level. The level of completion is assessed at the commitment level. For more information on how the IRM clusters commitments, see Section IV on Methodology in the Action Plan Review.

³ "International Experts Panel," Open Government Partnership, Independent Reporting Mechanism, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel/>.

⁴ "IRM Overview," Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>.

⁵ "OGP Glossary," Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>.

Annex I. Commitment Data¹

Guidance: Include every commitment in the action plan in the table below. Copy the codings for verifiability, open government lens and potential for results from the Action Plan Review. If it is a four-year action plan, include any commitment coding changes made in the Midterm Review. Put an asterisk* next to the coding if it changed in the Midterm Review.

Refer to the following to determine the level of completion for each commitment:

- **No Evidence Available:** There was not sufficient evidence to determine the commitment’s level of completion.
- **Not Started:** There was no progress under any of the milestones within the commitment during the implementation period.
- **Limited:** There was some progress made under a few milestones, which did not significantly contribute towards the commitment’s overall objective.
- **Substantial:** There was notable progress made under some milestones, which significantly contributed towards the commitment’s overall objective.
- **Complete:** All activities foreseen under this commitment were completed.

Commitment 1: Commitment short title (copy from the Action Plan Review)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i> • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete • Early results: No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results
<p>If the commitment is in Section II, simply state “This commitment is assessed in Section II above.” If not, use this space to briefly (around 300 words or less) outline the level of completion. Start with a short sentence summarizing the commitment’s objective then briefly describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and incomplete milestones • Obstacles to implementation • Reasons for limited or no early results 	
Commitment 2: Commitment short title	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i> • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete • Early results: No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results
<p>Same guidance as above.</p>	

Commitment 3: Commitment short title	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i> • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete • Early results: No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results
Same guidance as above.	
Commitment 4: Commitment short title	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i> • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete • Early results: No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results
Same guidance as above.	
Commitment 5: Commitment short title	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i> • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete • Early results: No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results
Same guidance as above.	

¹ Editorial notes:

1. For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results and early results is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitment level.
2. Commitments' short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see **COUNTRY'S** action plan: [LINK](#).
3. For more information on the assessment of the commitments' design, see **COUNTRY'S** Action Plan Review: [LINK](#).