Independent Reporting Mechanism

Action Plan Review:
Country 20XX–20XX

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Section I. Overview

Write a 2-3 sentence headline highlighting key takeaways from the report, such as the action plan's overall content, ambition, quality of co-creation, and/or main opportunities/challenges.

[Guidance text in purple throughout the report can be deleted] This overview should be less than two pages. Use simple sentences and plain language. First, provide an overview of the action plan such as, whether the plan is 2 or 4 years, total number of commitments, policy areas covered, and/or any commitments highlighted as 'challenge commitments' by the government. Mention if the plan is structured per themes, aligned with broader national/subnational policies, national development plans, strategies, or Sustainable Development Goals, etc.[1]

Then cover the following:

- What are the promising commitments featured? What are their common characteristics? What do they promise to change for the public?

- Does the plan carry over policy areas or initiatives from the previous plan? If so, what is the main difference or added value?

- Note any new policy areas included for the first time. Are there new government entities participating in this action plan?

- Has the ambition or quality of the action plan improved compared to previous action plans?

- What was civil society's/government's perspective on strengths and weaknesses of this action plan development process?

- How does the action plan respond to stakeholder priorities, feedback from consultations, or recommendations in previous IRM reports?

- What are the overall shortcomings or weaknesses in the action plan? These may be factors that limit ambition, diversity, policy objectives, or design quality of commitments. Provide examples of commitments that were not identified as having high potential for change and the main constraints for these commitments.

- Note any key contextual information on the country's open government ecosystem in which the plan will be implemented. Mention if the country has an active open government strategy, if other branches of government are engaged in OGP (for example an open

At a Glance

MEMBERSHIP

20XX   **Joined OGP**

COMMITMENTS

9/14   **Open government lens**

1/14   **Substantial potential for results**

PROMISING COMMITMENTS

- Promising commitment short title
- Promising commitment short title
- Promising commitment short title
- Promising commitment short title

Met the minimum requirements during co-creation: Yes/No

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

parliament plan or standalone challenge commitment by an anticorruption institution), if there a legal instrument that institutionalizes OGP (decree, law), and/or if there are new OGP Local Program members (see here).

- If it is a four-year action plan, note any overarching recommendations or considerations for implementers to consider during the mid-point refresh.

---

[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.

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Section II. Promising Commitments

[Do not change] This section analyzes commitments with the most promise to achieve notable results, according to IRM assessment. Promising commitments address a policy area important to stakeholders or the national context. They must be verifiable, have an open government lens, and a modest or substantial potential for results. This review looks at challenges, opportunities, and recommendations to support implementation.

Table 1. Promising Commitments

Commitment # One sentence summarizing what this commitment promises to do. (Ex: Commitment 3 promises to strengthen access to information through the passage of an Access to Information Law)
Commitments #, #, and # (format for clustered commitments) (This cluster promises to support media freedom through transparent public funding for independent media and government collaboration with media organizations to strengthen protections for journalists)
List 3-5 promising commitments. You may go above or below this number if appropriate for the action plan, but consult with IRM staff to confirm.
…
…

Guidance: Use the number per the action plan and in Arabic numbering.
Commitment #: Short title
Implementers: Lead implementing agency and CSO collaborators
For a complete description, see Commitment # of the action plan. [hyperlink]

Guidance: use this format for commitment clusters

Commitments #, #, and #: Short title cluster
Implementers: Lead implementing agencies and CSO collaborators
For a complete description, see Commitments #, #, and # of the action plan. [hyperlink]

Context and objectives

Start with 5-6 sentences that cover:
- What is the commitment's overall objective?
- Where did the commitment come from (is it a government, civil society, or public priority?)
- Is it a challenge commitment or eligible to be a challenge commitment?
- Does it continue reforms from previous action plans?
- What is the open government lens? (clarify what OGP values are relevant: transparency, civic participation, and/or public accountability)

Potential for results: add coding - Substantial/Modest

2–3 paragraphs total that explain the analysis behind the potential for results coding and justifies why the commitment or cluster is promising.
- How do the proposed milestones promise to achieve commitment's objective?

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

- Clearly describe where this reform / policy area stands prior to implementation to set a baseline against which early results will be measured in the Results Report. (For example, if a commitment seeks to increase budget transparency use the Open Budget Index as a reference for where a country's budget transparency stands prior to implementation.)

- Describe the expected changes that implementation of this commitment may yield to open government. And/or how the commitment will use open government to address a policy problem. Describe the potential outcomes. What could evidence of significant results look like?

- Describe, to the extent possible, the expected depth and sustainability of the intended changes. What evidence is there, if any, that the changes will last after the implementation period? (For example, the commitment might aim to pass laws, regulations, etc. that would institutionalize the reform or include government-wide trainings that promise to change practices on a broad scale)

- Include analysis of challenges, opportunities, and contextual factors that influenced the potential for results assessment. Where possible, provide baselines and indicators for transformative results.

Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations during implementation

Briefly outline the main contributors and potential challenges to implementation and recommendations. You may use bold font or bullet points to draw the reader's attention to key recommendations. Remember to avoid prescriptive language (like must, need to, or should) instead use suggestive language (can, could, can consider).

- 2–3 sentences about the key aspects of the commitment that need to be achieved to fulfill the potential of the commitment. This may include opportunities to increase the ambition or meaningfulness of results.
- 4–5 sentences to highlight challenges that may derail implementation or curtail the ambition of the commitment. Also include recommendations on how to overcome or mitigate the challenges. If needed, use concrete examples or reference good practices in the recommendations.
- If analyzing a four-year action plan, include questions or recommendations for reformers to consider at the two-year mark, when they will have the opportunity to refresh the action plan. Keep in mind that the Action Plan Review will be a key resource for reformers during the midpoint refresh process.

Other commitments

Other commitments that the IRM did not identify as promising commitments are discussed below.

Use this space to briefly summarize overarching characteristics of commitments' design or factors that limit their potential for results. This is a summary, not an in-depth analysis of each commitment. You do not need to address all commitments in the action plan. Please be concise (2–4 lines per commitment). Group commitments with similar recommendations. For example, you can provide examples and recommendations for commitments that are not verifiable or lack an open government lens. Likewise, you can provide examples and recommendations for commitments whose ambition could be strengthened during implementation. For four-year

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

action plans, use this space to provide commitment design recommendations for reformers to consider when they refresh the action plan at the midpoint.

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Section III. Methodology

This product is a concise, independent, technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process. The IRM highlights commitments that have the highest potential for results, represent a high priority for country stakeholders, acknowledged as a priority in the national open government context, or a combination of these factors.

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 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 the Action Plan Review, the IRM reviews commitments using three indicators:

1. Verifiability: The IRM determines whether a commitment is verifiable as written in the action plan. The indicator is assessed as:
- **Yes/No:** Are the stated objectives and proposed actions sufficiently clear and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation?
- Commitments that are not verifiable are considered not reviewable, and no further assessment is carried out.

2. Open Government Lens: The IRM determines if the commitment relates to the open government values of transparency, civic participation, and/or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration and the OGP Articles of Governance. Based on a close reading of the commitment text, the indicator is assessed as:
- **Yes/No:** Does the commitment set out to make a policy area, institution, or decision-making process more transparent, participatory, or accountable to the public?

The following questions for each OGP value may be used as a reference to identify the specific open government lens in commitment analysis:
- **Transparency:** Will the government disclose more information, improve the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improve the transparency of government decision-making processes or institutions?
- **Civic Participation:** Will the government create or improve opportunities, processes, or mechanisms for the public to inform, influence or co-create policies, laws and/or decisions? Will the government create, enable, or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities, marginalized or underrepresented groups?

  Will the government improve the enabling environment for civil society (which may include NGO laws, funding mechanisms, taxation, reporting requirements, et cetera)?

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Will the government improve legal, policy, institutional or practical conditions related to civic space such as freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly that would facilitate participation in the public sphere? Will the government take measures which counter mis- and disinformation, especially online, to ensure people have access to reliable and factual information (which may include digital and media literacy campaigns, fact-checking or fostering an independent news media ecosystem)?

- **Public Accountability:** Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions? Will the government enable legal, policy, or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of public officials?

3. Potential for Results: The IRM analyzes the expected results and potential that would be verified in the IRM Results Report after implementation. Potential for results is an early indication of the commitment's possibility to yield meaningful results based on its articulation in the action plan in contrast with the state of play in the respective policy area. The indicator is assessed as:

- **Unclear:** The commitment is aimed at continuing ongoing practices in line with existing legislation, requirements, or policies without indication of the added value or enhanced open government approach in contrast with existing practice.
- **Modest:** A positive but standalone initiative or change to processes, practices, or policies. The commitment does not generate binding or institutionalized changes across government or institutions that govern a policy area. Examples are tools (e.g., websites) or data release, training, or pilot projects.
- **Substantial:** A possible game changer for practices, policies, or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector, or the relationship between citizens and state. The commitment generates binding and institutionalized changes across government.

This review focuses its analysis on promising commitments. Promising commitments are verifiable, have an open government lens, and at least a modest potential for results. Promising commitments may also be a priority for national stakeholders or for the particular context. The IRM may cluster commitments with a common policy objective or that contribute to the same reform or policy issue. The potential for results of clustered commitments is reviewed as a whole.

This review was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with name as researcher and name as external expert reviewer. During the internal review process, the IRM verifies the accuracy of findings and collects further input through peer review, OGP Support Unit feedback as needed, interviews and validation with country stakeholders, an external expert review, and oversight by IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).[1] The IRM methodology, product quality, and review process are overseen by the IEP.[2]

---

[1] "International Experts Panel," Open Government Partnership, accessed 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel.

[2] For more information, see: "Overview – Independent Reporting Mechanism," Open Government Partnership, accessed 15 July 2024, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview.

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Annex I. Commitment Data[1]

Commitment #: Short Title (note that IRM staff can edit this to make it self-explanatory)

- Verifiable: Yes/No
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes/No
- Potential for results: Unclear/Modest/Substantial

Commitment #: Short Title

- Verifiable: Yes/No
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes/No
- This commitment has been clustered with Commitments # and # as: name of cluster
  Guidance: use this format as needed for clusters.
- Potential for results: Unclear/Modest/Substantial

Commitment #: Short Title

- Verifiable: Yes/No
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes/No
- Potential for results: Unclear/Modest/Substantial

Commitment #: Short Title

- Verifiable: Yes/No
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes/No
- Potential for results: Unclear/Modest/Substantial

Commitment #: Short Title

- Verifiable: Yes/No
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes/No
- Potential for results: Unclear/Modest/Substantial

Commitment #: Short Title

- Verifiable: Yes/No
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes/No
- Potential for results: Unclear/Modest/Substantial

---

[1] Editorial note: For commitments that are clustered, the assessment of potential for results is conducted at the cluster level, not individual commitments. Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see: action plan URL on OGP website.

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Annex II. Action Plan Co-Creation

[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 meet the minimum requirements.[2]

Guidance for Table 2: A country has met the minimum requirement when all the key measures for that requirement are met. Key measures are indicated here with roman numerals (i, ii, iii.). Be sure to refer to the IRM Guidance on Assessing the Minimum Requirements and the Researcher Questionnaire for details on how to assess compliance. Cite evidence as endnotes for each piece of information presented.

Table 2. Compliance with Minimum Requirements

Minimum requirement	Met?
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 and had (iii) basic rules publicly available.	Yes/No
2.1 OGP website: In 1–2 sentences, clearly state (i) if there is a publicly accessible website that (ii) at a minimum, contains the latest action plan.	Yes/No
2.2 Repository: In 2–3 sentences, clearly state (i) if there is a repository online that is (ii) updated at least twice a year (iii) with information on both co-creation and implementation.	Yes/No
3.1 Advanced notice: In 2–3 sentences, clearly state (i) if the co-creation timeline and the overview of opportunities for stakeholders to participate was published on the OGP website (ii) at least two weeks before the start of the co-creation process.	Yes/No
3.2 Outreach: In 1–2 sentences, clearly state (i) if at least one outreach activity was carried out to provide information on OGP and opportunities to get involved.	Yes/No
3.3 Feedback mechanism: In 2–3 sentences, clearly state (i) if there was a mechanism in place to gather inputs from a range of stakeholders (ii) for an appropriate period of time.	Yes/No
4.1 Reasoned response: In 2–3 sentences, clearly state (i) if contributions from stakeholders were documented and (ii) whether the multistakeholder forum or government reported back or published written feedback to stakeholders on how their contributions were considered during development of the action plan.	Yes/No
5.1 Open implementation: [Do not change] The IRM will assess whether meetings were held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation progress and enable civil society to provide comments at least twice a year.	Not applicable

Guidance: If the country is not meeting one or more minimum requirements, use this space to briefly describe how and why the process fell short. Consider including recommendations in bullet points on how the country can improve its process and meet the minimum requirements during implementation.

Alternatively, you can also use this space to briefly describe any noteworthy or innovative participation or co-creation practices undertaken during development of the action plan. For example, describe improvements from the previous cycle or practices that could serve as an example for other countries.

Please note that adding further information is **optional** if the country is meeting the minimum requirements. Description of the co-creation process beyond completing Table 2 should be brief and reserved for exceptional circumstances.

If a country is implementing a four-year action plan, use this space to flag that the IRM will assess minimum requirements again at the midpoint, after submission of the refreshed action plan. Specifically, the IRM will assess minimum requirements 1.1, 2.2, 2.2., 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1. If a country did not meet any of these minimum requirements during co-creation and has a four-year action plan, then it is important to provide recommendations on how they can remedy compliance by the midpoint.

Example Text
The development of [Country]'s [ordinal] action plan did not meet all minimum requirements under the OGP Participation & Co-Creation Standards. [Describe how they fell short]. As this action plan undertakes a four-year implementation period, the plan will have a refresh period after two years. This is an opportunity for stakeholders to reflect on the implementation of the action plan, assess next steps, and determine a way forward to ensure strong ambition and results. The IRM will assess compliance with minimum requirements 1.1, 2.1, 2.2., 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1 at this midpoint, after submission of the refreshed action plan. IRM recommends [recommendation on how to meet the minimums not met].

---

[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.

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism