

# Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:  
Jamaica 2021–2023

---

Open  
Government  
Partnership



Independent  
Reporting  
Mechanism

## Executive Summary

**Jamaica's first action plan shows mixed results with an overall limited level of completion and moderate early results in two out of seven commitments. Difficulties in attracting sufficient human and financial resources as well as declining stakeholder engagement during implementation will need to be addressed to advance the reforms outlined in the action plan.**

### Early results

Two of the seven commitments in Jamaica's first action plan achieved moderate early results. Commitment 3, aimed at amending the Access to Information Act, was identified as promising in the Action Plan Review and contributed to a moderate shift towards revitalizing this policy area. Commitment 6 refreshed the policy framework of climate change policy by incorporating stakeholder consultation despite not being assessed promising initially. The implementation of the other three commitments (2, 5 and 7) that had been considered promising in the Action Plan Review was generally stalled by a lack of human and financial resources and, in particular, by substantial delays experienced by the implementing agencies in hiring the external consultants needed to carry out several key activities. As a result, they did not achieve significant early results.

### Completion

The commitments in this action plan covered five priority policy areas that were jointly agreed upon by the Government of Jamaica and civil society stakeholders: justice and human rights, natural resources, environment and climate, access to information, and youth. The Action Plan also included two commitments on anti-corruption and open data based on initiatives that were already underway by the government.

Commitment 2 on strengthening Jamaica's open data system, Commitment 4 on building an open justice data portal, and Commitment 7 on improving access to information on policies targeting youth recorded some level of progress in terms of internal processes needed to achieve the foreseen milestones but did not generate tangible and publicly accessible results and were invariably reported by responsible implementing agencies as being delayed or stalled. Commitment 3 on access to information and Commitment 6 on climate change achieved a limited degree of completion but nevertheless managed to deliver moderate early results. Reliance on external consultants to provide inputs on the implementation of commitments was a common factor that stalled progress in most of the commitments. As such, future action plans would benefit from optimizing the existing capacity within government agencies.

## IMPLEMENTATION AT A GLANCE

### LEVEL OF COMPLETION

0/7

Complete or substantially complete commitments

### EARLY RESULTS

2/7

Commitments with early results

0/7

Commitments with significant results

### COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

Acting according to OGP process

### **Participation and co-creation**

Jamaica’s OGP process is overseen by the Ministry of Finance and the Public Service (MOFPS). A multistakeholder forum (MSF), established in 2021, served as the primary institution responsible for guiding and managing OGP engagement. The MSF comprised six representatives each from government and civil society and was led by government and civil society co-chairs. Despite non-governmental actors having significant influence over the co-creation agenda, in particular through the identification of priority commitment areas and involvement in the MSF, their engagement declined over time.<sup>1</sup> This uneven level of participation and collaboration had a negative impact on the overall quality of stakeholder engagement throughout implementation.

### **Implementation in context**

The implementation of this action plan was affected by difficulties most implementing agencies faced in securing sufficient human and financial resources needed to deliver the activities in time. Many of these activities faced delays in the procurement of external consultants to provide key inputs that were essential for the commitments to meet implementation schedule. This was compounded by the fact that some of the commitments included a large number of planned activities and deliverables.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lorris Jarrett (Deputy Financial Secretary) and Richard Lumsden (Director of the Economic Reform Monitoring Unit) of the Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, interview by IRM researcher, 10 October 2023; Matthew McNaughton (SlashRoots Foundation & Member of the Multistakeholder Forum), interview by IRM Researcher, 4 April 2024.

# Table of Contents

Section I: Key Observations.....	1
Section II: Implementation and Early Results .....	3
Section III. Participation and Co-Creation .....	7
Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators.....	9
Annex I. Commitment Data .....	11

## Section I: Key Observations

**Observation 1: Securing the necessary resources and relying more on in-house expertise could help boost the effectiveness of implementation.** The IRM Design Report identified 4 promising commitments out of the 7 included in this action plan. However, action plan implementation was largely ineffective, with only 2 out of the 42 milestones reported as 'completed' and the vast majority (37) reported as 'delayed'. The reasons for these delays were mostly related to agencies failing to secure the necessary human and financial resources. In particular, many commitments were stalled due to delays in the procurement processes that were required to secure consultants from outside the government agencies. While the use of consultants to provide guidance is a common practice in government agencies in most countries, heavy reliance on external expertise weakened the effectiveness of the OGP process itself during implementation. In future action plans, securing the necessary resources before implementation commenced, strengthening internal capacities, and optimizing existing resources could improve the effectiveness of implementation. This could be addressed by promoting a more resilient and self-sustaining approach by allocating resources strategically, building internal capacity, and minimizing reliance on external consultants. By doing so, implementing agencies could be more effective in overcoming challenges and sustaining progress over time.

**Observation 2: Simpler commitments with focused, time-bound milestones could be more effective without necessarily lowering their level of ambition.** Most commitments in this action plan included a large number of milestones or planned activities. In particular, these included Commitment 2 on upgrading the Jamaican Open Data System (7 milestones) and Commitment 3 on changing the access to information apparatus (10 milestones). However, these milestones were not sufficiently specific, which made it very difficult to achieve. Evidence from OGP practice and other action plans show that a large number of milestones per commitment does not necessarily reflect a higher level of ambition. Instead, including more specific, sequential milestones towards a broader goal could help commitments be more effective. The implementation of this action plan underscores the need for a more strategic approach that emphasizes simplicity and focus on achievable targets that could contribute to more successful implementation of future action plans. Moving forward, stakeholders should consider a more streamlined and pragmatic approach.

**Observation 3: Strengthening the MSF and seeking wider input and participation from civil society throughout the OGP process could help ensure a more sustained and diverse engagement.** This action plan saw a notable imbalance in participation throughout its cycle. While the co-creation phase saw strong civil society engagement, particularly through the multistakeholder forum (MSF), it did not carry over into the implementation phase, which indicates an uneven quality of participation. To foster sustained participation, there is a critical need to strengthen the MSF and seek broader civil society input throughout the OGP process. To do so, the OGP process needs to be more inclusive in its decision-making process and involve a wider range of civil society stakeholders who can bring different perspectives, expertise, and priorities to the co-creation agenda and subsequent implementation. In this vein, it is crucial to establish mechanisms for ongoing dialogue, consultation, and feedback collection from civil society throughout beyond action plan development. This can be achieved through regular consultations, open forums, and the use of digital platforms to facilitate wider participation and dynamize communications, such as by

establishing a Trello monitoring dashboard.<sup>1</sup> Stakeholders could consider assigning concrete roles for civil society in the implementation of commitments to incentivize CSO engagement throughout the action plan cycle, which could lead to more robust, inclusive, and impactful commitment results in future action plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> Matthew McNaughton (SlashRoots Foundation & Member of the Multistakeholder Forum), interview by IRM researcher, 4 April 2024. While the initial idea was to rely on the Ministry of Finance’s open government portal for all communications, this ended up causing different delays that could have been avoided and simplified with a collaborative platform or tool.

## Section II: Implementation and Early Results

The following section looks at the two commitments that the IRM identified as having the strongest results from implementation. To assess early results, the IRM referred to commitments or clusters identified as promising in the Action Plan Review as a starting point. After verification of completion evidence, the IRM also took into account commitments or clusters that were not determined as promising but that, as implemented, yielded predominantly positive or significant results.

The IRM researcher attempted to contact civil society members of the multistakeholder forum in November 2023, January 2024, and April 2024 to gather input on the implementation of the commitments but only received a response from one individual.<sup>1</sup>

### **Commitment 3: Strengthening Access to Information**

Office of the Prime Minister

#### **Context and objectives**

This commitment responded to a priority identified by civil society and aimed to amend Jamaica's 2002 Access to Information (ATI) Act.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the objective was to bolster public participation in ATI through stakeholder consultations and the reinstatement of a permanent ATI Advisory Stakeholder Committee. The commitment included the development of an online platform for tracking ATI requests. The IRM assessed its potential for results to be substantial in the Action Plan Review<sup>3</sup> as it highlighted the need for an updated law in line with the country's 2021 Open Data Policy. It would enable the ATI framework to keep pace with recent developments, such as open data reuse, civic tech, artificial intelligence, and public innovation. The envisioned platform for tracking access to information requests was anticipated to enhance government accountability. The transfer of responsibility for the commitment from the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Information to the Office of the Prime Minister in January 2022 was viewed as signaling political support for its implementation, underscoring its vital role in advancing transparency, accountability, and public engagement in Jamaica.

#### **Early results: Moderate**

Overall, this commitment achieved a limited level of completion. While certain activities progressed, in particular preliminary stakeholder consultations and public education initiatives, delays in the establishment of the parliamentary joint select committee (JSC) and the reconstitution of the ATI Advisory Stakeholder Committee highlighted challenges that need to be addressed in order for the commitment to fully achieve its intended goals.

Milestone 8 recorded a substantial level of completion with regard to the development of a communication strategy and the initiation of planned mass media components for public education on the ATI system and rights, particularly through placing advertisements at sporting events and participation in government fairs.<sup>4</sup> The review of other existing ATI reporting mechanisms for annual reports, Sustainable Development Goals, and the Lima Commitment (Milestone 9) was also reportedly completed according to the government's progress report. Meanwhile, the majority of other milestones were delayed, as was the case for the virtual workshops for capacity development and training of ATI officers (Milestone 7), the preparation of improved guidelines on ATI for public institutions and officials (Milestone 6), and the development of an online platform for tracking ATI requests (Milestone 10).

Milestone 1 achieved some progress in initiating the foreseen stakeholder and public consultations to inform the amendment of the ATI Act and regulations. A virtual stakeholder meeting with Hon. Robert Morgan, Minister without Portfolio with responsibility for Information, took place to discuss the improvement of Jamaica's ATI regime within the context of the commitment. Meanwhile, the Office of the Prime Minister proposed the establishment of a new parliamentary JSC with the role of steering the reform process by receiving and reviewing submissions for amending the Act. However, this proposal was still being reviewed by the Attorney General's Chambers by the end of the implementation period. While the establishment of this JSC should enhance wider stakeholder participation in the amendment of the Act, it also risks extending the process further beyond the timelines proposed in the action plan.<sup>5</sup>

The re-establishment of the ATI Advisory Stakeholder Committee (Milestone 2), which is intended to play a vital role in funneling public participation during the ATI Act amendment process, was also delayed.<sup>6</sup> However, once resumed, it is expected that the re-establishment of the committee will be informed by a review of expanded and more inclusive ATI stakeholder engagement committee models, which was conducted to inform future discussions and recommendations. As a consequence of the delays in these two key milestones, other subsequent activities showed no advancement to date, as is the case with the preparation of the draft amendment bill (Milestone 3), its review by the Advisory Stakeholder Committee (Milestone 4), and finalization (Milestone 5).

The limited level of implementation achieved in most of the milestones was largely attributed to circumstantial delays and to human resource challenges, in particular for recruiting or onboarding key personnel required to carry out some of the activities. These included the preparation of the improved guidelines for public bodies and ATI officers as well as the development of the proposal for the online platform for submitting and tracking ATI applications. The IRM researcher contacted all civil society members of the multistakeholder forum in November 2023 and January 2024 to gather their inputs on the implementation of this and other commitments of the action plan but received no response.<sup>7</sup>

The undertaken initiatives signal a positive shift towards revitalizing Jamaica's ATI landscape by improving policies and institutions, thus early results are coded as moderate. These early results will require close monitoring and further adjustments to the commitment as it was originally planned, in particular securing the necessary human resources to staff some of the planned activities, in order to achieve long-term results.

### **Looking ahead**

The commitment sought to articulate the necessary amendments to the ATI Act and strengthen Jamaica's ATI system. While initial results indicate a moderate shift towards revitalizing the ATI landscape, challenges remain particularly in the delayed establishment of key committees and slow progress in achieving implementation milestones. Looking ahead, the delays, which have been attributed primarily to circumstantial factors and human resource challenges, underscore the need for ongoing monitoring and adjustments to the initial implementation plan. Promptly addressing these delays, particularly under Milestones 1 and 2, will be crucial to pave the way for the subsequent stages of the ATI Law amendment. Future iteration of this commitment in subsequent action plans could include streamlining human resource processes, expediting the establishment of committees, and maintaining a focus on achievable milestones to ensure more meaningful progress. With these necessary adjustments, future efforts to deliver this commitment could yield substantial and transformative results in this critical policy area.



## **Commitment 6: Updating and Implementing the Climate Change Policy Framework**

Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation

### **Context and objectives**

This commitment aimed to improve the practices, policies, and norms that govern Jamaica's Climate Change Policy Framework by incorporating stakeholder and public consultation activities in its drafting and implementation. The initial version of the policy framework, which defined Jamaica's goals, principles, and strategies to address the impacts and challenges of climate change, was adopted in 2015.<sup>8</sup> Through this commitment, a new iteration of the framework and its implementing legislation would benefit from the adoption of a consultative and collaborative approach. This participatory approach would inform their prospective alignment with “new realities”—notably the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).<sup>9</sup>

### **Early results: Moderate**

The completion of stakeholder and public consultations and the adoption of the updated Climate Change Policy Framework was delayed, but signals a positive step towards inclusive policy development. Through this commitment, the Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation (MEGJC) was able to deliver on the crucial and highly relevant issue of climate change, which was also one of the key thematic areas identified as a priority by the multistakeholder forum (MSF) during the co-creation phase. In this sense, although it was not assessed as promising in the Action Plan Review, the commitment provided an updated policy framework that consulted those who are disproportionately affected by the impact of climate change—indicating moderate early results. In order to move beyond these initial results, the implementing authority needs to address staffing constraints in key executive areas to be able to deliver delayed activities.

This commitment achieved limited completion. Stakeholder and public consultations on the Green Paper for updating the Climate Change Policy Framework (Milestone 1) were successfully completed. Online sessions between November 2021 and February 2022 were joined by public sector agencies, civil society groups (including youth representatives), private sector actors, and the general public.<sup>10</sup> Prior to the latest session, the Green Paper was circulated to all parish libraries and municipal corporations, and was extensively posted on relevant agency websites, while notifications were sent to civil society organizations, including youth groups and community-based organizations. After that, the websites of the MEGJC and the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) posted the consultation reports to facilitate access to the general public.<sup>11</sup> Despite some delays, the preparation of the White Paper for updating the policy framework (Milestone 2) was also successfully completed. The Cabinet approved the updated Climate Change Policy Framework<sup>12</sup> at the end of March 2023 and circulated it to key stakeholders to commence implementation activities.

The remaining activities foreseen in the commitment were reported as delayed. The appointment of an Action for Climate Empowerment focal point (Milestone 3) did not commence, while the preparation of a draft legislation on climate change—stakeholder consultations under Milestone 4, submission of the draft the cabinet under Milestone 5, and preparation of drafting instructions under Milestone 6 were delayed, pending on the engagement by the MEGJC of a legal consultant to assist in the preparation of a Concept Note and of the preliminary drafting instructions. Despite this, the successful completion of the White Paper on the Climate Change Policy Framework and its subsequent approval by the Cabinet are in line with the commitment's stated objectives. The initiation of consultations, along with the dissemination of the final document to key stakeholders for implementation, reflects progress

toward the intended outcome. As outlined in the policy framework document, “the policy development process involved a number of consultations [...] and was subject to extensive review in accordance with government guidelines, before receiving the approval of the Cabinet.” The commitment effectively employed open government mechanisms, particularly through online consultations and transparency initiatives.

Although these mechanisms for public participation in policymaking represent an opportunity for change, human resource constraints impacted the ability of the implementing authority to meet the planned implementation timeline negatively. However, formal institutionalization of these changes, as seen in the consultations and subsequent approval of the policy framework, could be a positive step to set a path for future reforms.

## Looking ahead

The commitment would benefit from future initiatives that do not only address existing institutional capacity constraints, but also draw on lessons from the implementation process to improve its efficiency. The delayed activities, particularly those related to legal consultations and legislation drafting, underscore the need to address human resource constraints to ensure timely progress. Despite these challenges, the commitment has successfully applied open government mechanisms, highlighting the importance of refining these approaches to enhance citizen participation and transparency. This helped lay the groundwork for participatory climate policy reform in Jamaica to build on in future action plan cycles.

---

<sup>1</sup> Matthew McNaughton (SlashRoots Foundation & Member of the Multistakeholder Forum), interview by IRM researcher, 4 April 2024. The IRM researcher contacted Dahvia Hylton, Thoneisa Jarret, Oshane Bailey, and Tamisha Lee on 6 November 2023 and 16 January 2024 but received no response.

<sup>2</sup> “Access to Information Act (2002) – The Citizen’s Right to Know,” Ministry of Justice, accessed 20 December 2023, <https://moj.gov.jm/access-information-act-2002-citizens-right-know>.

<sup>3</sup> “IRM Action Plan Review: Jamaica 2021–2023,” Open Government Partnership, 4 November 2022, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jamaica-action-plan-review-2021-2023>.

<sup>4</sup> “Government Mobile Service Fair October 7,” Jamaica Information Service, accessed 20 December 2023, <https://jis.gov.jm/government-mobile-service-fair-october-7>.

<sup>5</sup> “Second Progress Report on Status of Implementation, January 2022–August 2023,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service. The report was not available publicly but the IRM researcher received the report via email and review it in developing this report.

<sup>6</sup> “Second Progress Report on Status of Implementation, January 2022– August 2023,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service. The report was not available publicly but the IRM researcher received the report via email and review it in developing this report.

<sup>7</sup> The IRM researcher contacted Dahvia Hylton, Thoneisa Jarret, Oshane Bailey, and Tamisha Lee on 6 November 2023 and 16 January 2024 but received no response.

<sup>8</sup> “Climate Change Policy Framework for Jamaica,” Government of Jamaica, September 2015, <https://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Jamaica-Climate-Change-Policy-fwL-2015.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> “Updated Climate Change Policy to be Aligned with New Realities,” Jamaica Information Service, accessed 20 December 2023, <https://jis.gov.jm/updated-climate-change-policy-to-be-aligned-with-new-realities>.

<sup>10</sup> “Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation to host ‘Town Hall’ consultation on the Emissions Policy Framework and the updated Climate Change Policy Framework,” Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation, accessed 20 December 2023, <https://megjc.gov.jm/ministry-of-economic-growth-and-job-creation-to-host-town-hall-consultation-on-the-emissions-policy-framework-and-the-updated-climate-change-policy-framework>.

<sup>11</sup> “Open Government,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, <https://www.mof.gov.jm/documents/open-government>.

<sup>12</sup> “Updated Climate Change Policy Framework for Jamaica,” Government of Jamaica, 16 March 2023, Jamaica, [https://www.mof.gov.jm/wp-content/uploads/Updated-Climate-Change-Policy-Framework\\_with-message-16032023.pdf](https://www.mof.gov.jm/wp-content/uploads/Updated-Climate-Change-Policy-Framework_with-message-16032023.pdf).

## Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

**The OGP process saw strong civil society engagement during the co-creation phase, particularly through the multistakeholder forum. However, the level of participation declined during the subsequent implementation phase.**

Jamaica's engagement in OGP is led by the Ministry of Finance and the Public Service (MOFPS). A multistakeholder Forum (MSF) was established in 2021 to oversee and guide action plan development, submission, implementation, and monitoring. A framework document and terms of reference establish decision-making rules, documentation, duties, roles, and responsibilities of the MSF members.<sup>1</sup> The MSF is composed of six government and civil society representatives each, and is jointly co-chaired by a government and a civil society co-chairs. Civil society representatives in the MSF were appointed through a self-selection process developed, agreed upon, and implemented by civil society organizations and government stakeholders. In terms of diversity and representation of issue, civil society members of the MSF appear to be well balanced between civic tech practitioners, climate change advocates, rural women producers, youth, and academia.

During the co-creation process, online voting by civil society stakeholders determined the priority thematic areas for inclusion in the action plan. This was conducted between 28 June and 9 July 2021. The MSF then approved the development of commitments in five thematic areas: justice and human rights, natural resources, environment and climate, access to information, and youth. The forum also approved two additional commitments based on government initiatives that were already underway or proposed by the government. In this sense, non-governmental actors played a role in setting the action plan co-creation agenda. The final selection of commitments responded well to the policy priorities of the government and consulted stakeholders. While all commitments in this action plan were led by government agencies, civil society organizations and multilateral agencies were included as involved actors. However, their responsibilities remain unclear, including whether the MSF accepted input from different civil society stakeholders beyond the forum during co-creation, as the reasoned response document mostly shows input from stakeholders mostly connected to the MSF or OGP working groups.<sup>2</sup>

The government reported that the overall level of engagement with civil society during the OGP process was “uneven”. There was a high level of engagement during the co-creation process and within the MSF before and then for the review of the Progress Report in 2022 and April 2023, with detailed meetings with stakeholders to review each commitment. However, this engagement seems to have waned over time, particularly during the implementation phase.<sup>3</sup>

### Compliance with the minimum requirements

The IRM assesses whether member countries met the minimum requirements under OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards for the purposes of procedural review.<sup>4</sup> During co-creation, Jamaica acted according to the OGP process. The two minimum requirements listed below must achieve at least the level of 'in progress' for a country to have acted according to OGP process.

Key:

- Green = Meets standard
- Yellow = In progress (steps have been taken, but standard is not met)

- Red= No evidence of action

<b>Acted according to OGP process during the implementation period?</b>	
<p><b>The government maintained an OGP repository that is online, updated at least once during the action plan cycle, and contains evidence of development and implementation of the action plan.</b> The repository was hosted on a public web page within a government website.<sup>5</sup> It was updated twice during the implementation period, and provided evidence from a primary source (i.e., government agencies implementing each commitment), which clearly accounted for the level of completion of each milestone, with an overall assessment of the level of progress of each commitment.</p>	Green
<p><b>The government provided the public with information on the action plan during the implementation period.</b> Several of the activities outlined in the Action Plan involved the dissemination of information to the public on various aspects of the OGP process. In addition to this, relevant information was mostly disseminated through the Jamaica Information Service<sup>6</sup> and, for most commitments, through the news outlets of the governmental implementing agencies.</p>	Green

<sup>1</sup> "Open Government," Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, <https://www.mof.gov.jm/documents/open-government>.

<sup>2</sup> "Jamaica Open Government Partnership (OGP) National Action Plan (NAP) 2021–2023 Matrix of Feedback on Draft OGP NAP from MSF Members, Stakeholders, and the Public," Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, 28 September 2022, <https://www.mof.gov.jm/wp-content/uploads/OGP-NAP-Feedback-Matrix-Reasoned-Response-September-28-2022.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Lorris Jarrett (Deputy Financial Secretary) and Richard Lumsden (Director of the Economic Reform Monitoring Unit) of the Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, interview by IRM researcher, 10 October 2023.

<sup>4</sup> Please note that future IRM assessment will focus on compliance with the updated OGP Co-Creation and Participation Standards that came into effect on 1 January 2022. See "OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards," Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards>.

<sup>5</sup> "Open Government," Ministry of Finance and the Public Service.

<sup>6</sup> "Draft Open Government Partnership national action plan to be completed by the end of October," Jamaica Information Service, accessed 24 December 2023, <https://jis.gov.jm/draft-open-government-partnership-national-action-plan-to-be-completed-by-the-end-of-october>.

## Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators

This report supports members' accountability and learning through assessment of (i) the level of completion for commitments' implementation, (ii) early results for commitments with a high level of completion identified as promising or that yielded significant results through implementation, and (iii) participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle. The IRM commenced the research process after the first year of implementation of the action plan with the development of a research plan, preliminary desk research, and verification of evidence provided in the country's OGP repository.<sup>1</sup>

In 2022, OGP launched a consultation process to co-create a new strategy for 2023–2028.<sup>2</sup> The IRM will revisit its products, process, and indicators once the strategy co-creation is complete. Until then, Results Reports continue to assess the same indicators as previous IRM reports.

### Completion

The IRM assesses the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan, including commitments clustered in the Action Plan Review.<sup>3</sup> 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 results achieved from the implementation of commitments that have a clear open government lens, a high level of completion or show evidence of achieving early results (as defined below). It considers the expected aim of the commitment prior to its implementation, the specific country context in which the commitment was implemented, the specific policy area and the changes reported.

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, or
  - 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 Soledad Gattoni and was reviewed by Andy McDevitt, IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products and review process is overseen by the IRM’s International Experts Panel (IEP). The current IEP membership includes:

- Snjezana Bokulic
- Maha Jweied
- Rocio Moreno Lopez

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual<sup>4</sup> and in Jamaica’s Action Plan Review 2021-2023<sup>5</sup>. For more information, refer to the “IRM Overview” section of the OGP website.<sup>6</sup> A glossary on IRM and OGP terms is available on the OGP website.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Jamaica’s OGP Repository,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, accessed 9 January 2024, <https://www.mof.gov.jm/documents/open-government>.

<sup>2</sup> See “Creating OGP’s Future Together: Strategic Planning 2023–2028,” Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/creating-ogps-future-together>.

<sup>3</sup> 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 and IRM Indicators of the Action Plan Review.

<sup>4</sup> “IRM Procedures Manual, v.3,” Open Government Partnership, 16 September 2017, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>.

<sup>5</sup> “IRM Action Plan Review: Jamaica 2021–2023,” Open Government Partnership, 4 November 2022, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jamaica-action-plan-review-2021-2023>.

<sup>6</sup> “IRM Overview,” Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview>.

<sup>7</sup> “OGP Glossary,” Open Government Partnership, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary>.



## Annex I. Commitment Data<sup>1</sup>

### Commitment 1: Completing the National Anti-Corruption Strategy

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b><br/>Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Modest</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Limited</li> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> No Notable Results</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

This commitment aimed to engage relevant stakeholders in the prospective implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of Jamaica’s National Anti-Corruption Strategy (NAS). While there is evidence of stakeholder consultations in the form of a kick-off meeting held in April 2023, there is no evidence of final outcomes or a pending/adopted draft. The government attributed this delay to the failure in securing a consultant to assist in developing the strategy. The Integrity Commission had to rely on its in-house staff and recorded no notable results to date.

### Commitment 2: Strengthening Open Data System

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b><br/>Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Substantial</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Not started</li> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> No Notable Results</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

This commitment was intended to support the implementation of Jamaica's open data policy<sup>2</sup> by relaunching the national open data portal<sup>3</sup> and increasing the involvement of civil society and public officials to make the portal more relevant and user-friendly. While the implementing authorities reported that most of the internal preparatory activities had been initiated and even completed, these mostly consisted of procurement processes to hire the necessary consultants to carry out the planned activities without the activities actually commencing. These included surveying public demands for data, mapping of relevant datasets, and improvement of the open data portal.<sup>4</sup> There were no significant early results vis-à-vis the commitment’s initial objectives that could be linked to the activities foreseen in this commitment.

### Commitment 3: Strengthening Access to Information

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b><br/>Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Substantial</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Limited</li> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> Moderate Results</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

This commitment is assessed in Section II.

### Commitment 4: Increasing Access to Information on the Justice System and Human Rights

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Limited</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Modest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> No Notable Results</li> </ul>
<p>This commitment aimed to create the Jamaica Legal Information Portal (JLIP)—an online repository of legal and judicial information—and an initiative to promote access to justice through the Human Rights Education Program (HREDP) alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. While internal processes (e.g., completing procurement process to hire external consultants and scanning documents to populate the portal), the portal had not gone online. Budgetary constraints prevented this commitment from generating early results.</p>	
<p><b>Commitment 5: Completing Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Substantial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Not Started</li> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> No Notable Results</li> </ul>
<p>In Jamaica, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required for the approval of projects and activities that could potentially harm the environment. The intention of this commitment was to make the EIA process more open, transparent, and inclusive for relevant stakeholders. However, there was no notable results beyond some preliminary exchanges between the implementing authorities due to staffing constraints.<sup>5</sup></p>	
<p><b>Commitment 6: Updating and Implementing the Climate Change Policy Framework</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Modest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Limited</li> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> Moderate Results</li> </ul>
<p>This commitment is assessed in Section II.</p>	
<p><b>Commitment 7: Strengthening Youth Participation and Access to Services</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Does it have an open government lens?</b> Yes</li> <li>• <b>Potential for results:</b> Modest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Limited</li> <li>• <b>Early results:</b> No Notable Results</li> </ul>
<p>This commitment aimed to oversee and coordinate the implementation and monitoring of Jamaica's National Youth Policy<sup>6</sup> as well as to raise awareness of youth programs and services through the creation of an online National Youth Programmatic Inventory. Some initial steps had been taken with regard to the recruitment of a Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation Manager for the Youth and Adolescent Policy Division and the discussions to review the draft implementation plan. No substantive milestones were completed as the implementing agency reported several delays due to staffing constraints.</p>	



---

<sup>1</sup> **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 “Jamaica OGP National Action Plan 2021–2023,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, 4 January 2022, <https://www.mof.gov.jm/wp-content/uploads/Jamaica-OGP-National-Action-Plan-2021-2023-Revised.pdf>.
3. For more information on the assessment of the commitments’ design, see “IRM Action Plan Review: Jamaica 2021–2023,” Open Government Partnership, 4 November 2022, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jamaica-action-plan-review-2021-2023>.

<sup>2</sup> “The Government of Jamaica Open Data Policy,” Ministry of Science, Energy, and Technology, accessed 24 December 2023, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1AcDwwmNFAoPFJGInJxshmpRmEifT0iWK/view?usp=sharing>.

<sup>3</sup> “Jamaica Open Data,” Ministry of Science, Energy, and Technology, accessed 24 December 2023, <https://data.gov.jm>.

<sup>4</sup> Lorris Jarrett (Deputy Financial Secretary) and Richard Lumsden (Director of the Economic Reform Monitoring Unit) of the Ministry of Finance and the Public Service, interview by IRM researcher, 10 October 2023; “Second Progress Report on Status of Implementation, January 2022–August 2023,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service. The report was not available publicly but the IRM researcher received the report via email and review it in developing this report.

<sup>5</sup> “Second Progress Report on Status of Implementation, January 2022–August 2023,” Ministry of Finance and the Public Service. The report was not available publicly but the IRM researcher received the report via email and review it in developing this report.

<sup>6</sup> “Revised National Youth Policy 2017–2030,” Ministry of Education, Youth, and Information, accessed 24 December 2023, <https://moey.gov.jm/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/2017-2030-NYP-Popular-Version.pdf>.