

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Midterm Review:
Country 20XX-20XX

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Overview

[Do not change] In MONTH 20XX, COUNTRY submitted a four-year action plan to the Open Government Partnership. At the midpoint, COUNTRY took stock of the action plan's progress and context after two years of implementation. Based on this reflection, COUNTRY submitted a refreshed action plan in MONTH 20XX.¹ This IRM document reviews the refreshed action plan, the status of implementation at the midpoint, and alignment with the minimum requirements under the Participation & Co-Creation Standards.²

Guidance: The overview can be written last. It summarizes findings in sections I & II. It can provide additional information useful for readers to understand the context in which the first two years of implementation and the refresh process happened. Provide a brief overview (around 1 page) on:

- Briefly describe the refresh process, in particular if the process was participatory.
- Were there any contextual factors (elections, social movements, world events, legal changes, or strategies) that influenced the refreshed action plan and has or could affect implementation of the action plan?
 - If a country incorporated IRM recommendations from the Action Plan Review into the refreshed action plan, please note that here.
- What is the overall status of implementation based on Section II below?
 - To what extent is there evidence of progress of commitments identified as 'promising' in the Action Plan Review or as challenge commitments?
 - Note any significant changes in the country's alignment with the minimum requirements that apply during implementation (table 3).
- What is the scope of changes to the action plan?
 - If new commitments were added to the action plan, how many and in what policy areas? Note any new commitments with a 'substantial' potential for results.
 - If commitments were significantly amended, how many and what is the extent of the changes? Note if any amendments resulted in coding changes.
- What recommendations can stakeholders take into consideration for the remainder of the implementation period? For example, what steps can a country take to fulfill any minimum requirements they are not on track to meet? Are there opportunities for significant course correction on implementation?

¹ Link to country's refresh action plan. [Please use section end notes for citations]

² National Handbook. Open Government Partnership. 2024. <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/ogp-national-handbook-rules-and-guidance-for-participants-2024/>; OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards. Open Government Partnership. 2021. <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>.

Section I. Action Plan Refresh

Guidance: Include a brief overview of 3-5 sentences that states: how many commitments were added or amended in the refreshed action plan and what policy areas they cover; how these changes have impacted the refreshed action plan's overall level of ambition; and whether the refresh process was participatory.

If the country submitted a revised action plan within the first year of implementation, discuss with IRM staff whether the revised action plan included new or significantly amended commitments that should also be addressed in this section.

Commitments are considered 'significantly amended' if the changes led to new codings in either verifiability, open government lens, or potential for results. Examples of significant amendments could include: 1) Changes to the commitment's objective 2) Adding or eliminating milestones 3) Changes in timelines and implementing agencies and partners 4) Any changes in the language of the commitment that provides a higher level of specificity on intended outputs and results. If there were any commitments with significant amendments but no resulting coding changes, discuss with IRM staff to determine whether to include it in this table.

If there are no new or significantly amended commitments delete Table 1 and renumber Table 2. Expand on the narrative in this section to explain the reasons no new commitments were added and no significant changes made.

Table 1. Refresh Commitments Review

[Do not change] Table 1 assesses all new or significantly amended commitments in COUNTRY's refreshed action plan.¹ For information on IRM methodology see Section III 'Methodology and IRM Indicators' in the Action Plan Review.²

Commitment [#]: [Short Title—can be edited by staff to make it self-explanatory]
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verifiable: [Yes/No]*• Does it have an open government lens? [Yes/No]• Potential for results: [Unclear/Modest/Substantial] <p>* This commitment was significantly amended during the refresh process. Therefore, the IRM changed this coding from what was initially determined in the Action Plan Review. [Add this asterisk and note when the coding has changed due to amendments to the commitment.]</p> <p>Brief description of the commitment in around 200 words. If the commitment was amended, explain what changed and whether this impacted the commitment coding. If the commitment is new, briefly explain the logic behind the 'potential for results' coding. If known, explain why the commitment was amended or added to the action plan. If the country identified this as a challenge commitment, note that as well.</p>

¹ Link to country's refresh action plan

² Link to country's Action Plan Review

Section II. Implementation Update

[Do not change] This section provides an overview of the implementation status of the action plan at the midpoint, JUNE OR DECEMBER 20XX. It is based on information available online or, if necessary, on evidence provided by key stakeholders.¹ It includes commitments identified as promising in the Action Plan Review, submitted under the Open Gov Challenge, or where there is notable evidence of progress online.² This is not an assessment of completion or early results, which the IRM will carry out in the Results Report at the end of the implementation period.

Guidance: The objective of this section is to provide an informal and high-level overview of the status of implementation. This includes a status update on promising or challenge commitments, particularly those progressing well or where implementation has not gone as expected. This section is not a detailed implementation analysis as done in Results Reports. It can focus on the status of the most ambitious elements of the most ambitious commitments. This can complement the general description of implementation progress as a whole.

This section should be no more than 2 to 3 paragraphs in length. Language used in this section should make clear that this is general review based on minimal research. Do **not** use IRM indicator language (moderate results, substantial completion etc.) to avoid confusion with comprehensive IRM assessments.

The first paragraph should note whether implementation is running on schedule or not according to the available evidence – and can flag any major delays or accomplishments. Note any significant and overarching obstacles to implementation. For example, have there been any notable changes to the context (i.e., elections, global events) that have impacted implementation? State to what extent evidence of implementation is available online (ex: the country's OGP website, repository, social media, or ministry websites etc.). Address to what extent is there evidence of implementation progress across commitments. How detailed and concrete is the evidence?

The following paragraphs can highlight commitments considered 'promising' in the Action Plan Review and/or identified as 'challenge' commitments by the country. If relevant, it can also address other commitments where there is notable evidence of progress either online or as highlighted by the country's OGP Point of Contact. Based on the evidence available describe:

- What milestones/activities were completed or are underway
- The status of the most ambitious milestones/activities
- Any significant inhibiting/contributing factors to implementation progress.
- If evidence suggests little or no progress for promising or challenge commitments
- Whether highlighted commitments are indicative of progress across the action plan as a whole or are exceptional

¹ Link to country's OGP repository or website

² Link to country's Action Plan Review

Section III. Participation & 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: Use the [IRM Guidelines for Assessing the Minimum Requirements](#) to review the key elements of the minimum requirements and see examples of evidence. Note that the answer must be 'yes' to all guiding questions/key elements in for the minimum requirement to be met.

Table 2. Alignment with Minimum Requirements at the Midpoint

Minimum requirement	Met?
1.1 Space for dialogue: During the first two years of implementation, was there a space for dialogue with basic rules publicly available? Has the space for dialogue met at least once every six months? Highlight any changes since the Action Plan Review and cite evidence.	Yes/No
2.1 OGP website: During the first two years of implementation, was a public OGP website with at least the latest action plan maintained? Highlight any changes since the Action Plan Review and cite evidence.	Yes/No
2.2 Repository: During the first two years of implementation, was there a public repository with at least one piece of evidence on co-creation and one piece of evidence of implementation? Was the repository updated at least every six months? Highlight any changes since the Action Plan Review and cite evidence.	Yes/No
3.1 Advanced notice: Was a timeline and overview of opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the action plan refresh published on the country's OGP website at least two weeks before the start of the refresh process? Cite evidence.	Yes/No
4.1 Reasoned response: During the refresh process, were contributions from stakeholders documented? Did the multi-stakeholder forum or government report back or publish feedback to stakeholders on how their contributions were considered during the action plan refresh? Cite evidence.	Yes/No
5.1 Open implementation: During the first two years of implementation, were meetings held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation progress at least twice a year? Could civil society provide comments at the meetings? Cite evidence.	Yes/No

This brief was written by IRM researcher NAME in collaboration with IRM staff and reviewed by external reviewer NAME.

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

<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>; Open Government Partnership National Handbook 2024. <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/ogp-national-handbook-rules-and-guidance-for-participants-2024/>.

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.