



CANADA
 **2019**

OGP Global Summit
Sommet mondial du PGO

OGP Steering Committee Meeting

29 May 2019 – Ottawa, Canada

Pre-Meeting Briefing Packet

Open
Government
Partnership



Table of Contents

Agenda.....	1
Draft List of Attendees	5
Logistical Note	8
Participation Protocol	8
Voting Protocol	9
Pre-Decisional Items for Steering Committee Approval	
OGP Local Engagement Strategy	12
Steering Committee Resolution on the OGP Local Strategy.....	40
OGP Steering Committee Call to Action: Collective Leadership to Protect Participation, Advance Inclusion, and Create Impact for Digital Democracy	42
2019-2020 Independent Reporting Mechanism Refresh Overview.....	44
Background and Reference Materials	
2019 OGP Support Unit-IRM Implementation Plan.....	49
2019 Steering Committee Grid	58
Menu of Suggested Actions for a More Inclusive Open Government Partnership	70
Menu of Suggested Actions to Strengthen Democracy and Protecting Civic Rights in the Digital Era	75
Key Programmatic Updates for the Steering Committee	
OGP's Country Contribution Policy	82
Criteria and Standards Cases	85
OGP Multi Donor Trust Fund.....	90
Overview of OGP Research and Publications	93
Break the Roles Campaign Overview.....	96



Open Government Partnership Steering Committee

Working Level & Ministerial Meetings
29 May 2019 | Ottawa, Canada

Working-Level Steering Committee Agenda 10:00 - 12:00 | Room 205/207

10:00 - 10:10 **Welcome and Introductions**

10:10 - 10:30 **Session 1: Mid-Year Implementation Update**

Overview: *This session will include a mid-year update on the 2019 Implementation Plan and an overview of the actions identified by Steering Committee members to support its implementation. This session will identify areas where additional Steering Committee engagement will be necessary to deliver on the 2019 Implementation Plan's collective deliverables.*

Suggested outcome: *non-decisional*

Reference materials:

- 2019 OGP-IRM Implementation Plan
 - 2019 Steering Committee Grid
-

10:30 - 11:30 **Session 2: OGP Local Strategy**

Overview: *This session will present a proposed strategy for engagement of local governments and civil society in OGP. The strategy reflects the lessons learnt from the OGP Local pilot program, as well as other existing models of local engagement being piloted by several OGP countries. It has been developed in coordination with a Steering Committee Local Task Force and with inputs from over 90 stakeholders within and outside OGP.*

The Local Task Force is now seeking Steering Committee endorsement of the strategy and will table a resolution for high-level approval at the Ministerial Steering Committee session in the afternoon.

Suggested outcome: *Working-level consensus to table the proposed resolution for Ministerial Steering Committee decision*

Reference materials:

- *Strategy for the Engagement of Local Governments in OGP*
- *Draft Resolution on OGP Local Strategy (for approval in Ministerial session)*



11:30 - 11:55 Session 3: Overview of the IRM Refresh

This session will present an overview of the scope of the 2019 Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Refresh, which includes a revision of the IRM Charter. The Steering Committee will be asked to give feedback on the process to move forward with IRM Charter revisions. Based on these inputs, the IRM, in coordination with the International Experts Panel (IEP), the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee and other interested Steering Committee members, will present a revised IRM Charter for Steering Committee approval at the 2019 Q4 meeting.

Suggested outcome: *The Steering Committee provides feedback and endorses process to review IRM Charter*

Reference materials:

- *2019-2020 IRM Refresh Overview*
-

11:55 Closing

Ministerial-Level Steering Committee Lunch
Hosted by the Honorable Joyce Murray
President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government
Government of Canada
12:00 - 13:15 | Room 208

OGP Co-Chairs will provide brief remarks on the importance of this gathering and suggest areas of discussion for the informal lunch conversations

Ministerial-Level Steering Committee Agenda
13:30 - 16:00 | Room 205/207

13:30 - 13:45 Welcome and introductions

**13:45 - 15:15 Session 1: Mobilizing Collective Leadership of the Steering Committee
(Session moderated by Rakesh Rajani, OGP Envoy)**

Overview: *Rakesh Rajani, OGP Envoy and founding member of OGP, will moderate a collective conversation focused on OGP's vital role of high-level Steering Committee engagement to fulfill OGP's great potential.*

This session will include a presentation by Sanjay Pradhan, OGP CEO, highlighting the vital role of OGP, and the Steering Committee leadership role, in tackling emerging governance challenges facing the world.



Ministers and Civil Society principals will have the opportunity to share their proposed actions to advance the priorities identified by the OGP Co-Chairs within their own governments or organizations, and collectively.

1. *Advance gender and inclusion within OGP (20 minutes)*
 - a. *How can members of the Steering Committee build on each other's actions to co-create a shared forward agenda on gender and inclusion in OGP?*
2. *Ensure more meaningful participation (20 minutes)*
 - a. *What proactive actions can the Steering Committee take to lead on meaningful participation, and encourage other members, including through strengthening OGP multi-stakeholder forums or through OGP action plans?*
3. *Create impact for digital democracy (20 minutes)*
 - a. *What is the Steering Committee role - both as a collective and that of individual members - in developing global norms and coalitions to help position OGP as a mechanism to deliver on these priorities?*

Suggested outcome: *The Steering Committee endorses a resolution that reaffirms the importance of collective leadership to advance these priorities across OGP by leading by example; calls for all OGP members to take an action to foster more inclusive OGP processes, strengthen democracy and protect civic rights in the digital era; and mandates the Support Unit to develop a plan of action to ensure these priorities are reflected throughout OGP guidance and governance materials.*

Reference materials:

- *Draft call to action: Collective Leadership to Protect Participation, Advance Inclusion, and Create Impact for Digital Democracy*
- *Menu of Actions for a More Inclusive Open Government Partnership*
- *Menu of Actions to Strengthen Democracy and Protect Civic Rights*
- *2019 OGP-IRM Implementation Plan*

15:15 - 15:45

Session 2: Future Strategic Direction of OGP Local Engagement

Overview: *During this session the Steering Committee will be asked to endorse OGP's new local strategy that has been discussed in the morning working-level session.*

The strategy reflects the lessons learnt from the OGP Local pilot program, as well as other existing models of local engagement being piloted by several OGP countries. It has been developed in coordination with a Steering Committee Local Task Force and with inputs from over 90 stakeholders within and outside OGP. The strategy comprises the following pillars:



1. *Strategic national-local vertical integration;*
2. *Enhanced OGP local program, and*
3. *Platform to scale knowledge, learning, innovation and capacity building on open local government across local (and national) governments & civil society.*

Suggested outcome: *Endorsement of the proposed resolution on the OGP Local Strategy*

Reference materials:

- *Draft Resolution on OGP Local Strategy*
- *Strategy for the Engagement of Local Governments in OGP*

15:45 - 16:00 Session 3: Future Leadership of OGP

Overview: *This session will include a presentation of the emerging priorities of the incoming co-chairs, the Government of Argentina and Robin Hodess and overview of the next steps to select the new incoming co-chairs to follow them.*

Suggested outcome: *non-decisional*

16:00 Closing



Draft List of Attendees

Government Steering Committee Members

Government of Argentina (Incoming Steering Committee Co-Chair)

Andrés Horacio Ibarra	Deputy Chief of Cabinet and Secretary of Modernization
Rudi Borrmann	Undersecretary of Public Innovation and Open Government
Carolina Cornejo	Director of Open Government

Government of Canada (Lead Steering Committee Co-Chair)

Joyce Murray	President of the Treasury Board and Minister of Digital Government
Francis Bilodeau	Assistant Deputy Minister, Digital Policy and Service
Mélanie Robert	Executive Director, Open Government and Service
Jaimie Boyd	Director, Open Government

Government of Croatia

Helena Beus	Head of Office for Cooperation with NGOs
Darija Marić	Government Advisor, Government Point of Contact

Government of France

Henri Verdier	Ambassador for Digital Affairs
Amelie Banzet	Open Government Office, Etalab, Prime Minister Office

Government of Georgia

Elena Beradze	Deputy Head of Administration
Ketevan Tsanova	Senior Policy Adviser, Policy Planning Unit

Government of Germany (Incoming Steering Committee Member - Observer)

Dorothee Bär	State Minister at the Federal Chancellery and Federal Government Commissioner for Digitalization
Sebastian Haselbeck	Policy Advisor, Division for Digital State, Federal Chancellery

Government of Indonesia (Incoming Steering Committee Member - Observer)

Bambang Brodjonegoro	Minister of National Development Planning
Slamet Soedarsono	Deputy Minister of National Development and Planning
Yanuar Nugroho	Deputy Chief of Staff, The Executive Office of the President

Government of Italy

Marco de Giorgi	Director General, Department for Public Administration
-----------------	--



Government of Mexico

Tania de la Paz Pérez Farca	Undersecretary of Administrative Responsibilities and Public Procurement
Gregorio Gonzalez	General Director Transparency, Ministry of Public Administration

Government of Nigeria

Adio Waziri Onibiyo	Executive Secretary of Nigeria Extractives Industries Transparency Initiative
Okolo Benjamin	OGP National Coordinator
Chidinma Ilechukwu	Team Lead, Program and Admin

Government of Romania

Ana Birchall	Vice Prime Minister for Romania's Strategic Partnerships' Implementation
Mădălina Mitroi	Director, Secretariat General of the Government
Larisa Panait	Advisor and OGP Point of Contact, Secretariat-General of the Government

Government of South Africa

Qinisile Delwa	Executive Director for the Centre for Public Service Innovation
Kgothatso Semela	Chief Director Public Participation and Social Dialogue, Department of Public Service and Administration
Mesuli Macozoma	Assistant Director, Department of Public Service and Administration

Government of South Korea

Jae-young Lee	Deputy Minister of the Interior and Safety
Ilkwon Bae	Director, Ministry of the Interior and Safety
Yujin Lee	Deputy Director, Ministry of the Interior and Safety
Minju Koo, Deputy Director	Ministry of the Interior and Safety

Civil Society Steering Committee Members

María Baron	Directorio Legislativo
Helen Darbshire	Access Info Europe
Aidan Eyakuze (<i>remote</i>)	Twaweza
Delia Ferreira Rubio	Transparency International
Nathaniel Heller (Lead Co-Chair)	Results for Development
Robin Hodess (Incoming Co-Chair)	The B Team



Suneeta Kaimal	Natural Resource Governance Institute
Giorgi Kldiashvili	Institute for Development of Freedom of Information
Tur-Od Lkhagvajav	Asia Democracy Network
Lucy McTernan	University of York
Zuzana Wienk	Fair Play Alliance
Elisa Peter (Incoming Steering Committee member - Observer)	Publish What You Pay
Asma Cherifi (Additional Steering Committee member - Observer)	Coordination of Francophone African Open Data Community
Glynnis Cummings-John (Additional Steering Committee member - Observer)	Restless Development

For any changes to this list, please send to jaime.mercado@opengovpartnership.org



Logistical Note

Working-Level Meeting

- 10:00 - 12:00; Shaw Center, Room 205/207
- Two seats per government delegation at the table; One seat per Civil Society member.
- Additional limited seating around the room will be available on a first-come, first-serve basis.

Ministerial Steering Committee Lunch

- 12:00 - 13:15; Shaw Center, Room 206
- One seat per government (Minister level or Head of Delegation); One seat per Civil Society member.

Ministerial-Level Meeting

- 13:30 - 16:00; Shaw Center, Room 205/207
- Two seats per government delegation at the table; One seat per Civil Society member
- Additional limited seating around the room will be available on a first-come, first-serve basis.

A draft list of attendees for the SC meetings is included on page 7 of the pre-meeting packet. For any changes, please send to jaimemercado@opengovpartnership.org

The Shaw Centre is located at 55 Colonel By Dr, Ottawa, ON K1N 9J2, Canada (Phone: +1 613-563-1984 or 1-800-450-0077)

Participation Protocol

Overview

The Steering Committee agreed on a list of protocols for meetings in September 2014. The document specifically addresses participation at SC meetings as follows:

“Members are strongly encouraged to attend all official Steering Committee meetings at the appropriate level. Each member should have one designated principal who sits at the table and casts a vote as needed. Each principal may also designate a ‘plus one’ to sit next to (or behind) the principal. The plus one may be asked to speak on certain issues in place of the principal but does not have a vote. As space allows, members may also be invited to bring one or two additional observers to the meetings. Observers will sit around the perimeter of the room.”

OGP Observers

Representatives from relevant international organizations and intergovernmental bodies may be invited by the SC to attend the OGP Global Summit and related SC events as observers, when this can be accommodated practically. In addition, a representative of each OGP’s multilateral partner organizations will be invited to participate in the relevant sessions of at least one SC meeting per year. Observers have no role in SC voting, but may be invited to share their views, particularly those related to country support and peer exchange.



Voting Protocol

Overview

The OGP Articles of Governance make provision for the members of the Steering Committee to cast a vote on decisions where consensus cannot be established. This note establishes the protocol for a vote being called in a Steering Committee meeting, and the process that will be followed.

OGP Articles of Governance, page 8:

Decision Making: Major policy decisions are to be made by the full SC, in its meetings or by circular, when meetings are not practical. In making decisions, SC members are to seek to develop consensus; failing consensus, decisions are to be made by simple majority (except in the case of a vote on continued eligibility, as detailed under Section II). In the case of tied votes, the lead chair casts a second and determining vote. A quorum is established when at least 50 percent of each constituency (governments and civil society organizations) are present. The Governance and Leadership Subcommittee is empowered to make logistical decisions between meetings such as, for example, specific details related to the Biannual Summit.*

SC members may not vote by proxy if they are unable to attend voting sessions. Members may elect to bring guest observers to SC meetings, with prior approval from the Governance and Leadership Subcommittee. Such guest observers cannot participate in voting.

*'Lead chair' in the Articles of Governance historically refers to the 'lead government chair'.

Process

A vote can be called in a Steering Committee meeting either where consensus cannot be easily achieved on a particular decision, or where there is a definitive decision to be made between a number of options (for example voting on the next OGP co-chair where there are multiple candidates). In those events this process will be followed:

1. The lead co-chairs will agree on the need for a vote and propose that to the Steering Committee.
2. The Steering Committee will be invited to make comments on the decision that is being voted on, which will be subject to the usual Chatham House Rule, unless a Steering Committee member requests otherwise.
3. The lead co-chairs will set out the resolution that is being voted on and the options available.
4. The Support Unit will be responsible for providing ballot papers that clearly list the resolution being voted on, and the options available, and ask Steering Committee members to mark their decision. Ballot papers will remain anonymous.
5. Steering Committee members will be invited to post ballot papers in a box. All Steering Committee members are entitled to one vote per resolution. The Support Unit will count papers -with one of the lead co-chairs observing- to determine the result of the vote and



will communicate the decision to the full Steering Committee. In the case of tied votes, the lead government chair casts a second and determining vote.

Voting principles

- A vote can only be called in a Steering Committee meeting that is quorate (50 percent of each constituency government and civil society members are present).
- Each Steering Committee member has one vote. For government members that vote can be cast by any member of the official delegation in attendance in person at the meeting. For civil society members that vote can be cast only by them -or their previously designated second- in person at the meeting.
- Steering Committee members can choose to abstain from a vote after it has been called and the options have been presented. The number of abstained votes will be noted in the results.
- The results of votes taken by the OGP Steering Committee will be recorded in the minutes of that meeting but a member's individual decision will not be noted, unless they request otherwise.
- The majority decision, after a vote has been taken, is binding and the resolution will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.



Pre-Decisional Documents

The following items will be tabled for Steering Committee approval at the May 29, 2019 meetings



OGP Local Engagement Strategy

Presented by the Local Task Force for Approval of the OGP Steering Committee

29 May 2019

Background on Local Engagement in OGP

OGP launched its Subnational Program (later renamed OGP Local) in 2016, as an initial pilot of local jurisdictions co-creating and implementing action plans similar to those of national members of OGP. Fifteen “pioneer” local members were selected through a competitive entry process, signed onto the [Open Government Subnational Declaration](#), and developed action plans that were implemented in 2017. The program was expanded to include 5 additional members in 2018, also selected through competitive entry. In addition to the “pioneers” tier, it was envisaged that the pilot would include a “leaders” tier – a larger network of open government leaders at the local level were further encouraged to engage in peer learning and foster closer involvement with national action plans in their respective countries. This leader tier largely failed to materialize in any formal way for a host of reasons, including lack of clear design, and mandate from the OGP Steering Committee, and limited bandwidth on the part of the OGP Support Unit.

While the Local program offered a limited number of local governments and civil society champions an opportunity to participate independently in OGP, efforts to use OGP to promote open government at the local level have existed since the very early days of OGP. Since 2011, 332 commitments relevant at the local have been made in 60 countries’ National Action Plans. These include local government-owned commitments as well commitments related to integration of local governments to broader national government strategies; they account for approximately 10% of the total commitments made. Local commitments in both the official OGP Local Action Plans and in the National Action Plans have shown positive results. Of the 226 IRM assessed local commitments included in national action plans, 12% were found to have transformative potential impact while 46% were assessed as having moderate potential impact. Of the 67 IRM assessed commitments in the official Local Action Plans, 16% had transformative impact while, 60% had moderate transformative impact.

At the December 2018 OGP Steering Committee meeting a proposal to proceed with expanding the Local program by an additional 10 members (as had been previously agreed) and evaluate different OGP franchise models in the course of 2019 was tabled for decision. There was recognition of the successes of the Local program. There was also a strong consensus around the importance of open government at the local level and the value OGP could bring with an ambitious strategy for a more inclusive and scalable model for local. However, there were concerns about the proposal under consideration not adequately addressing limitations around scalability, inclusivity, and sustainability. The Steering Committee decided to delay the proposed expansion of the OGP Local cohort by 10 additional members (as previously agreed to by the SC in September 2017), and requested a Task Force to work with the OGP Support Unit to present a revised strategy for approval at the next meeting of the Steering Committee in May 2019.



Vision

OGP's vision is that more governments become more transparent, more accountable, and more responsive to their own citizens, with the ultimate goal of improving the quality of governance, as well as the quality of services that citizens receive. Consequently, over the next five years, OGP's success will be measured not only by the increase in the number of countries or commitments but by the extent to which ordinary citizens benefit from governments becoming more transparent, participatory, responsive and accountable.

OGP Strategic Refresh December 2016

To achieve its overarching vision, OGP seeks to empower citizens to shape and oversee government, so it serves citizens' interests. And this is particularly conducive and impactful at the local government level, where governments are closest to their citizens. The vision underpinning OGP's new local engagement strategy is to scale, integrate and support both nationally and locally-led innovations to promote open, local government, in line with the Partnership's overall vision that "more governments become more transparent, more accountable, and more responsive to their own citizens." By investing in open government at the local level, OGP aims to deepen citizen-centred governance and ensure that we can deliver real change on the ground to benefit citizens in OGP countries.

Strategic Objectives

Opening up local governments is an integral part of ensuring that OGP's original vision and the goals set out in the 2016 Strategic Refresh and subsequent Implementation Plans can be realized. The open government agenda cannot be advanced by the actions of national governments and civil society alone. This will take work by all parts of an expanded partnership – leadership and innovation by new OGP Local members, creativity and commitment by national governments and civil society, and new approaches to peer learning and support for the OGP Support Unit. Sustained, collective work to promote, enable and learn from local open government will benefit the partnership in a number of ways:

Supporting OGP's vision for improving citizen-centred governance and public service delivery:

Citizens interface more directly with their government at the local level. Local governments are often the first (and frequently the only) point of direct engagement between citizens and governments. It is at the local level where many crucial public services are delivered, in most countries, particularly in decentralized, devolved or federalized systems; giving citizens a voice in shaping and monitoring public services can contribute to improving outcomes as various studies have found. Given that the local level is where citizens and government more naturally meet, connecting citizens 'lived realities' with open government principles - especially around participation and inclusion of those traditionally left behind- can be more easily realized at this level. By expanding the reach of open government initiatives to more citizens and connecting it to issues they most deeply care about, champions of open government can tap into broader public support for the agenda.

Allowing innovation to spread horizontally and vertically: Pioneering efforts around open government have often emerged from the local level (e.g. participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil; open data at the provincial level in Canada, social audits in the Indian states). OGP can offer a powerful platform for incubating and supporting these open government innovations at the local level, which can then be adapted by others, including at the national level, both in the

countries in which these innovations originate and beyond. For example: Madrid, Spain's DecideMadrid Platform is now being adopted nationwide by local governments within Spain, and internationally by national OGP governments such as Uruguay. OGP can also provide a platform for supporting the localizing and/or harmonizing of national open government initiatives. For example, The Philippines, Nigeria, and Croatia are using the OGP process and platform for localizing national initiatives on access to information, fiscal openness and e-consultations.

Localizing emerging global norms on open government and preserving open government values during challenging times: Local governments and civil society are playing an increasingly important role in localizing global agendas such as the Sustainable Development Goals and the Climate Accord as well as embracing open government norms, such as around open contracting, environmental openness, and governance of extractives industries. In contexts where closed government and authoritarianism are on the rise, local governments and civil society can help to preserve and further advance open government efforts when political support wanes nationally, acting as a strategic hedge. Providing a platform for reformers within and outside government in such contexts to connect and learn from peers can help strengthen their resilience, providing a lifeline through which the next generation of national leaders on open government can emerge.

Leveraging OGP's strengths as a platform: Open government at local (and national) levels would exist even in the absence of OGP. OGP adds value to these efforts because of its approach of co-creation between government and civil society, ambitious action, accountability for delivery, and peer learning between participants. This uniquely positions OGP to ensure that the open government reforms are *co-created* between government and citizens through civil society or citizens' groups, and the reformers driving innovation and ambition benefit from visibility and exposure to other reformers that they might not otherwise have access to.

In sum, investing in open local government through OGP yields benefits for national and local governments and civil society actors alike, perhaps most importantly by enabling the Partnership to bring more tangible benefits to citizens. The return on investment from investing in OGP Local is material and significant for the Partnership.

OGP Local Engagement Strategy

Process

The development of this proposed strategy has been overseen by a Steering Committee Local Task Force comprising the current OGP co-chairs - the Government of Canada, Nathaniel Heller, the Government of Argentina, Robin Hodess - and Lucy McTernan. May Miller-Dawkins, external researcher and strategist, worked with the Support Unit on research and strategy development. The strategy is now being presented by the Local Taskforce for approval by the full Steering Committee. The process has involved interviews with over 90 individuals from 27 countries including local governments and civil society (from those involved and not involved with OGP's current work), national governments and civil society, and international initiatives working with local governments. The process also included an open call (survey) for examples of open, local government and positive initiatives to support it, and significant document review.



Research Findings

The research confirmed that open government at the local level is seen as critical to realising OGP's vision that governments become more transparent, accountable and responsive to citizens, due to the direct relevance of local governance to peoples' lives and the potential to build open government leadership at all levels of government, for the present and the future. Local open government is spreading organically and through diverse initiatives of national governments, civil society and international networks. Varied efforts to encourage open, local government could benefit from cross-pollination, learning, exchange and guidance, particularly on co-creation into NAPs.

Open government at the local level is motivated by improving service delivery and trust, implementing national policies and legal frameworks, attracting resources and revitalising communities, and seeking visibility and legitimacy on national and international platforms. Access to limited international platforms is a particularly strong incentive for leadership. Vital enablers of effective open, local government are committed leaders across executive and legislative branches of government, vibrant civil society or community engagement, access to technical and financial resources, and inspiration and learning from peers and examples. Financial or compliance driven programs to encourage local open government do not seem to produce sustained results.

Most national and international initiatives focus on local governments and are weaker on civil society engagement and co-creation. Interviews with a range of equivalent international initiatives highlighted important lessons in how to support local governments – to ground the work in local priorities and outcomes, set a standard to aspire to, and the need for skillful facilitation of international connections and peer learning, including offline and online channels.

The distinctive contribution of OGP is that it brings together two champions of citizen interests - reformers in government and civil society - to co-create concrete commitments that amplify citizen voice and oversight in local governance. OGP's approach centred on co-creation of open government commitments, monitoring of dialogue and delivery, and facilitating peer exchange, is seen as valuable by all stakeholders. OGP can also uniquely connect local, national and international conversations and action, with each level inspiring and supporting each other.

Proposed Strategy

The proposed Local strategy is **anchored in OGP's vision and values, and consistent with the Partnership's overall goals and priorities** as outlined in the 2016 Strategic Refresh and implementation plans. The strategy has the following **three complementary pillars** that seek to encourage the bottom up energy of open government leadership and innovation at the local level, and strengthen nationally-led initiatives of governments and civil society, as well as integrate local open government across OGP.

1. **Strategic national-local vertical integration:** Recognizing that open government reforms can have more impact and be made more sustainable when national open government reforms are localized and when local innovations are scaled, support the further development of effective national government and/or civil society strategies to enable and foster local open government. This would include supporting national government and civil efforts to promote open local government within OGP National Action Plan processes or through separate national initiatives.
2. **Enhanced OGP Local program:** Building on the successes and lessons learnt from the pilot program, develop a new "OGP Local" program that incentivises local ambition and innovation;



supports more local governments and civil society actors to co-create and implement open government commitments that respond to citizens’ interests; and creates cohorts of local participants that can support each other and inspire others. The new program will retain some of the core features that drove the success of the Local program - co-created action plans, monitoring, opportunities for peer learning - but will be made less resource intensive by redesigning the approach to monitoring and support provided to individual participants.

3. **Platform for knowledge, learning, innovation and capacity building:** A core part of OGP’s medium-term vision is for it to become a platform for sharing knowledge, learning and innovation on open government, and to be a source of capacity building tools and resources for governments and civil society working on open government reforms within and outside OGP. The expansion of OGP local has this vision at its core. OGP will use a combination of online and offline tools to create opportunities for local level reformers to share knowledge, access expertise from partner organisations, and to receive trainings at a much larger scale than has been possible so far. In this way OGP’s local community will be at the forefront of a partnership-wide vision for a more collaborative platform for learning.

Taken together, this presents an approach in which the partnership as a whole – national governments, civil society, thematic partners, the OGP Steering Committee, and the Support Unit – can support open, local government in a strategic and holistic way and collectively make significant contributions to OGP’s long term vision.

National-Local Vertical Integration	Enhanced OGP Local Program	Knowledge, Learning & Innovation Platform
<p>Builds on the contribution of national governments and civil society to local, open government through their own initiatives.</p> <p>Meets demand for greater guidance and support to those efforts (for e.g. as countries such as Argentina, Georgia, Indonesia, Italy and others are moving from inclusion of select locals as ‘pilots’ to targeting locals at scale, common challenges around structuring co-creation processes, balancing priorities of broadening the base with restricting action plans to a manageable number of commitments, engaging local government associations are emerging).</p> <p>Seeks to recognize the important role of national governments and civil society in promoting open local government <i>at scale</i> in their countries and support them in their ongoing and future initiatives through guidance and support from OGP particularly focused on co-creation, peer learning, and facilitated cross-pollination.</p>	<p>Builds on the dynamism and spread of open government at the local level and its importance to long term cultural change in governance at all levels to be more responsive and accountable to citizens.</p> <p>A redesigned support and monitoring model allows OGP to add more OGP Locals at an accelerated pace without the same resource intensity as national OGP membership. This will be achieved by recruitment done in cohorts (with capped intake per cohort; but no overall total cap on OGP Local members); a lighter-touch approach to monitoring focused more on adherence to principles of OGP compared to current approach; a shift to cohort-based support from individualised support; and a self-serve/DIY model supported by accessible guides and demand-driven assistance.</p> <p>Seeks to encourage and celebrate innovation and ambition amongst champions of open local government, and to provide inspiration for others.</p>	<p>Builds on ongoing work of the Support Unit to provide knowledge, structured and peer learning opportunities, examples of innovations and success stories for the partnership to increase its reach and offer support to open government reformers at scale over time.</p> <p>Recognizes the need to promote synergies and cross-fertilization of innovations between pillars 1 and 2 where desirable, and disseminate lessons learnt from the two pillars to a wider audience.</p> <p>Seeks to meet the demand of local (and national) governments and civil society organisations interested in starting or improving their work on open government to have easy access to knowledge and learning resources, peer support and an online community of peers and practitioners.</p>



All three pillars are equally important to the strategy, and will be pursued in parallel by the Support Unit in collaboration with the Steering Committee, OGP partners and interested stakeholders from OGP’s local community.

The strategy is:

- **Scalable**, reaching many more local governments and civil society by combining the reach of national initiatives, with an expanded group of OGP members, and a platform for knowledge, learning, innovation, capacity building and peer support freely available for a wider, interested local open government community
- **Sustainable**, using existing resources with further fundraising as necessary, taking better advantage of the efforts and contributions across the partnership through the focus on national initiatives as well as OGP-led work, and drawing on the experience and insight of the open government community as partners, leaders and mentors; and
- **More inclusive**, reaching many more local governments, civil society and citizens through the three strategies than with previous version of OGP Local, with diversity of types of governments, contexts and size built into selection for OGP Local and diversity of approaches to promoting open local government taken into account.

This strategy envisages the following **key shifts from the previous approach to local open government**:

Strategic Pillar	From...	To...
National-local vertical integration (new)	Ad hoc engagement with national governments and civil society on their local open government work	Strategic and sustained engagement with national governments and civil society on their local open government work; development of guidance and resources to support national initiatives
Enhanced OGP Local Program (revised)	Limited cohort of 20 members in the OGP Local program replicating the national OGP process	A bigger community of OGP Local Members with potential to be at least ten-times the size of the current cohort within a few years (contingent on resources); and support to efforts for promoting open local government, beyond the Local program
	One-on-one, individualized support to Local members	Cohort-based, one-to-many, support, including structured onboarding, and learning sessions delivered through partners. Accompanied by easily accessible self-serve guides and demand-driven assistance from Support Unit. Limited high intensity support for priority locals through Country Support Team.
	Application of the same OGP detailed rules of the game for national and local on co-creation and monitoring	Application of the same high-level principles of OGP on co-creation and monitoring, with differentiated approach to make program requirements manageable. Will include a light touch approach with self-assessment at its core. Current IRM method will not apply and need for any tweaks to co-creation requirements will be assessed. Focus less on compliance more on adherence to principles. Oversight role of OGP (IRM) on quality assurance of the program, and designing a fit-for-purpose monitoring approach.



	No defined avenues for engaging unsuccessful applicants	Unsuccessful applicants for each cohort will have access to resources and networks through the third strategy of the pillar and applications will be automatically considered for subsequent intakes, with the option provided to update applications.
Platform for Knowledge, Learning and Innovation (new)	No concerted effort towards the development of tools and services for Locals outside of OGP Local	Resource development for <u>nationals and locals</u> on promoting open government. Open platform for all interested stakeholders to learn about open government approaches and topics and connect with each other.

Note: For resourcing implications of the proposed strategy and how it compares to the resourcing of the current OGP Local program, please see page 14 in the Annex.

Guiding Principles for the New Local Strategy

Promoting OGP core values and principles OGP prioritizes protecting core principles at the heart of the approach - partnership between civil society and government, co-creation of open government commitments and actions, and progress monitoring, but will identify ways in which those principles can be applied in a fit-for-purpose manner for promoting open government at scale at the local level.

Respecting both local and national needs OGP understands that local and national contexts vary significantly and needs of local and national actors can often be different

Diverse local participation OGP will continue to strive for balanced diversity of program participants across the Global North and the Global South, regional distribution, types of subnational government, development patterns, etc.

Seeking synergies OGP will expand its local engagement in an integrated way across the partnership, seeking and supporting cross fertilization, inspiration, and, where appropriate, allowing innovations to spread horizontally and vertically, supporting integration where possible

Recognizing the value-added of OGP, and leveraging the strength of partners OGP recognizes the importance of humility for OGP to not try to take responsibility for all local open government everywhere, but instead to contribute where it is best placed and rely on partners in doing so.

Recognizing the need for a differentiated approach to co-creation and monitoring for the OGP Local track: OGP recognizes that in order to accelerate the reach and pace of growth of the OGP Local program, the current IRM process and methodology cannot be applied as is, and that while the core components of the co-creation standards need to be retained, they can adapted to be fit-for-purpose.

Transparency and inclusion: OGP recognizes that selection of OGP Local members needs to be transparent and impartial, while being guided by principles of diversity. With an uncapped overall total of OGP Local members, and new resources created for any interested local open government actors, this strategy will follow a much more inclusive approach.

Note: Principles and design elements underpinning the operationalization of each pillar of the strategy are provided in the Proposed Operational Framework included in the Annex on page 9.



Strategy Endorsement and Implementation Plan

The Steering Committee Local Task Force and the OGP Support Unit are seeking approval of the full Steering Committee on the overall strategic direction, vision, guiding principles and pillars of the proposed local program at the May 2019 Steering Committee meeting in Ottawa, Canada.

If approved, a detailed design and development phase will follow from June to November 2019 to:

- Further sharpen the principles underpinning each pillar of the strategy to ensure they are consistent with the overall guiding principles for the program and fit for purpose in meeting the objectives defined earlier.
- Design processes for the application, selection, ensuring transparency of assessments, intake and orientation for the new OGP Local members program
- Begin producing the first round of materials, tools and learning resources for each of the three strategic pillars
- Draft detailed rules of the game, including any changes to the Articles of Governance and way forward for ensuring that the interests of OGP local strategy and program are reflected in the Steering Committee (which will be included for discussion in the December 2019 Steering Committee meeting)
- Secure partnerships to support the delivery of the strategy

The design and development of the program will be led by the Support Unit in collaboration with Steering Committee Local Task Force and interested members of the Steering Committee, champions from the current OGP Local program, partners working on spreading good governance or open government practices at local level, and other local government networks.

An outreach and engagement plan will be developed to keep the wider OGP community informed on the new strategy and provide them an opportunity to feed into the design phase. This will also include communications to existing Local participants on the timeline and process for transitioning to the new model.

Note that the OGP Local side event at the Global Summit in Ottawa will also be an opportunity to inform, engage and build a coalition on the proposed new strategy. Feedback received will be used to inform the design phase.

Program Review

In addition to periodically assessing and adapting activities to ensure they are as effective as they can be in meeting the goals of the program, a review of this strategy will take place after year two of implementation. The scope of the review, and or a revised timeline of the same, will be coordinated with Steering Committee to:

- Support the improvement of the program going forward based on initial implementation experiences
- Seek feedback from partners – governments, civil society and others – involved in all three pillars of the strategy to test the relevance, effectiveness and value of it for their work.
- Ensure that there is capacity to meet the demands from the Program, and that the services and staff support being offered by OGP, directly and through partners, are sufficient to support the three pillars of the strategy.



- Ensure that the program reflects as much as possible the needs of the OGP community, while also protecting the core principles, priorities and guidelines of the OGP model
- Assess changes required, if any, to guidance and guidelines issued during the initial implementation period.

The full scope of the review and its mechanism will be discussed with the Steering Committee, as will the timeline for a third-party evaluation when a more comprehensive, and independent assessment of the program is appropriate to commission.

Annexes

The following items are included below:

1. Proposed Operational Framework
2. Resourcing Plan
3. Consultation Process
4. What We Heard from the Consultations
5. List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Proposed Operational Framework

Initial design considerations and principles underpinning the development of detailed rules of the game, guidance, support offerings in provided below. These will be open to further refinement during the design phase.

Design element	National-local vertical integration	Enhanced OGP Local Program
Eligibility	All interested OGP national members and civil society organisations initiating national programs (could be integrated into NAPs or broader open government initiatives).	Local government area covering 100,000+ population in an OGP member country at the time of application, making joint proposal with civil society and or other local actors, and demonstrating a track record of performance.
Selection process	<p>Within national initiatives, selection process is determined by the respective OGP government and/or civil society organisations.</p> <p><u>Additional guidance and advice to be developed in design stage by OGP especially on inclusion</u></p>	<p>Bring in <u>new Local members in batches/cohorts (e.g. annually or semi-annually), and cap intake per cohort</u>. No overall cap on the size of Local program subject to strong governance and resource allocation over time.</p> <p>The cohort size, frequency of intake, and steps involved in the selection process will be determined during the design phase, based on capacity and the options for onboarding/support. Cohort sizes envisioned currently are between 25- 40 per cohort. Considerations on minimum and maximum intakes per region or type of government will also be determined during the design phase. Information on both</p>



	<p>of locals in NAP (for example, how many local commitments in a NAP, different models of co-creation of local commitments in NAPs, inclusion of local reps or association into national MSFs, options for monitoring locals) and using OGP branding in local initiatives.</p>	<p>cohort size and any additional considerations will be included in the call for applications.</p> <p>Principles to guide selection process design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transparent selection process and criteria for selection. Note: given that there may be an argument both for and against making all applications and all scores public, the decision on this will be made in the design stage to ensure that decision is well informed by stakeholder input and experiences. 2. Robust selection process overseen by combination of SC, Local 'mentors', Partners (e.g. UCLG, CIVICUS) and SU 3. Impartiality/No conflict of interest of selection committee (those with conflicts to recuse from decisions e.g. national reps for decisions regarding local applicants from their country) 4. Due diligence process involving a) checking individuals named on sanctions and other lists, b) Selection committee shares shortlist with SC, national governments and civil society of relevant countries and key partners to raise verifiable concerns about any applicants to be considered by selection committee in final selection 5. Diversity of cohort (size, type, region) 6. Cohort fit for peer learning and exchange 7. Reserve lists: appropriate strategy for providing access to resources and support for those who meet criteria but do not get in due to cap. Unsuccessful applicants will also automatically be considered for future intakes, contingent on their continued interest and eligibility, with an opportunity to revise their applications. A decision on whether it is desirable (or counterproductive) for the results of the selection process and feedback on applications to be made public, or if it might be better to provide this to applicants directly so they know how they fared will be made at design stage <p>Effectiveness and sustainability of the approach can be reviewed 12-24 months after launch.</p>
<p>Selection criteria</p>	<p>Within national initiatives, selection criteria are determined by OGP government and/or civil society organisation leading the effort.</p> <p>Additional guidance and advice to be developed in the design stage by OGP</p>	<p><u>Proposed criteria</u> (to be finalised in design)</p> <p>Eligibility:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From current active OGP country 2. Jurisdiction covers population of at least: 100,000. Note that this is a lower threshold than the pilot program (250,000) and considerations on whether this threshold should be removed, lowered, or increased will be made during the review of the strategy at the end of year 2. 3. Joint application from government and civil society <p>Qualitative criteria:</p>



		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commitment of political leader(s) and civil society leaders 2. Track record on open government or co-creation with civil society (at least one open government reform or successful example of co-creation in past 3 years) This could include track record from participation in national open government initiative. 3. Jointly agreed (between government and civil society) priorities for local open government 4. Ambition of future directions OR alignment with OGP strategic objectives 5. Necessary capacity/resourcing (Identified staff in government and civil society, allocated resources for the co-creation and implementation of commitments, identification of support required and potential sources of support) <p>Parameters informing the selection criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with strategic objective of pillar 2: Capacity, some proven ability in implementing open government reforms, and existence of political support to ensure that the objective of maintaining pillar 2 of the strategy as a source for inspiration can be ensured to the extent possible • Protection of the principle of co-creation: Existence and availability of civil society or citizen groups to participate in co-creation processes • OGP's ability to provide added value: the ability of the partnership and the wider OGP community to support the directions and ambitions of the applicants
<p>Requirements for members</p>	<p>If local commitments are integrated into OGP NAPs, co-creation and other standards apply including IRM.</p> <p>If local action plans or commitments take place outside NAP processes and plans, countries and locals will need to adhere to guidelines to use the OGP brand.</p>	<p><u>During membership</u> need to make structured commitments (e-filed) and self report on a 2-year cycle</p> <p>Structured MSF encouraged but not required – emphasis instead on ongoing mechanism(s) to co-create with civil society or community groups/citizens where professional civil society is absent and OGP can provide information on options.</p>



<p>Monitoring and role of IRM</p>	<p>If part of NAP, IRM processes and methodology will apply.</p> <p>If not part of NAP, no formal monitoring by IRM or OGP SU (Individual national strategies could create their own monitoring systems if they wish e.g. Mexican model).</p>	<p>A light touch approach with self-assessment at its core. Oversight role of OGP(/IRM) to ensure overall quality control of the programme, to design monitoring approach and to conduct potential spot checks of a subset of the membership each year.</p> <p><u>Principles for Monitoring</u> (to be basis for the design of monitoring during design phase)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple self-assessment and reporting with the aim of enabling domestic accountability 2. Monitoring mechanism reflective of both government and civil society/public views on progress of commitments and health of relationship between government and civil society/citizens/residents (this could take the form of surveys; send to both governments and civil society/citizen groups and/or (shadow) civil society assessments in addition to government self-assessments). 3. Sustainability (of financial and human resources dedicated by OGP): no local researcher hired for each local member; no commitment-by-commitment assessment or detailed process assessment as in the current IRM model 4. Option for centralized OGP monitoring to enable learning. This would be based on some light-touch validation of information provided as part of regular reporting/progress monitoring by governments and civil society (e.g. looking at co-creation processes across all members of a cohort; thematic papers on how Locals are progressing on popular or priority topics like open contracting, participatory budgeting, inclusion etc.). Methodological approach advised by OGP's IRM. Transparent methodology for monitoring methods selected. 5. Consistency, while allowing for diversity of context 6. No rankings
--	---	--



<p>Support offering</p>	<p>Curate and disseminate resources on approaches and methodologies used in different countries and with a focus on how to encourage co-creation at the local level; and how to incentivize progress</p> <p>Learning and resources on open government reforms that can act as broader enablers for local open government (e.g. forms of FOI reform that enable FOI at the local level, depending on the political system)</p> <p>Facilitate peer exchange and structured learning for national governments and civil society working on local open government on good practices and lessons learned on models for encouraging local open government (peer exchange will use existing OGP platforms and events wherever possible)</p>	<p>Cohort and group based structured onboarding system that introduces government and civil society representatives to the OGP principles, co-creation, action plan process (SU codified and packaged), and builds relationships. Potential for offline (using partner fora, and existing OGP fora) and online engagement.</p> <p>Less individual support provided to all members and use the current SU prioritization system to provide high touch support to a very small number of locals where needed for impact or strategy.</p> <p>Connections to a relevant mentor in the OGP community. Learning and thematic engagement potentially with thematic partners (global, regional or national).</p> <p>Consideration for resources including mini grants, special rounds of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund for local, subject to eligibility. Likely need to create limited travel opportunities for participation in in-person events (similar to national level). <u>Will need to be defined in design stage and will need discussion with Trust Fund Council.</u></p> <p>Potential for online platform for peer exchange and structured learning (tbd in design phase).</p>
<p>Partners and mentoring</p>	<p>Work with key partners such as UCLG, LOGIN to draw on lessons and research to inform work with national initiatives/strategies.</p>	<p>Partners (including international, national, thematic) built into recruitment, selection, on-boarding, thematic and other support.</p>
<p>Use of OGP brand by local participants</p>	<p><u>To be determined in design stage.</u> A potential approach is that if a national government has an initiative that is explicitly part of its</p>	<p>OGP Local participants can say that they are members of OGP and use the OGP brand.</p>



	<p>NAP, participating locals can be branded as “OGP-COUNTRYNAME-LOCAL” member.</p> <p>Use of OGP brand for efforts outside NAP processes <u>will be defined in design stage</u></p>	
Governance implications	<p>None. Program’s interest represented through current Steering Committee representation.</p> <p>Additional guidance and support may encourage adoption of national context-specific rules of the game if needed (e.g. to define participation in a model like Nigeria’s or Mexico’s)</p>	<p>Alignment with current OGP rules of game where possible for simplicity and consistency across OGP National and Local.</p> <p>OGP Local <u>specific rules in the following areas will be determined in the design phase</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary exit • Mandatory exit • Rotation or graduation • Steering Committee Representation <p>At this point, we do not envisage a membership contribution, although there is potential for either a nominal fee or fees for advanced services (such as if a local did want a full IRM report or specific technical assistance outside the scope of cohort-based support).</p> <p>As potential applicants would be interested in knowing the duration of membership before committing to such a program, duration of each cycle and graduation/rotation options will be made clear before launching the program.</p>
Status of current OGP Local members	<p>Current OGP Local members can be resources for national initiatives to draw on for advice, or as mentors or playing other roles (for example, in Nigeria, Kaduna plays a role in selection for their national initiative and is a mentor to other provinces).</p>	<p>Current OGP Local members could stay on as members, with the opportunity to exit given to those who do not wish to continue beyond their current cycles (until 2020 or 2021 depending on when they completed their action plan).</p> <p>They would be invited to play a mentoring role with future OGP Local members (as would new OGP Locals after completing at least one successful cycle). They could participate in learning exercises or as advisors to national initiatives, as invited by national governments or organisations.</p>
Platform for knowledge, learning and innovation	<p>Initial period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and curate introductory webinars, repository of knowledge resources and open government experts and practitioner, case studies and tools on OGP co-creation processes and open government themes identified as priorities for the partnership. 	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source and disseminate stories about leading local open government efforts surfaced through pillars 1 and 2, and provide access to self-serve resources to facilitating consultation and co-creation processes. • Consider and start developing both online and offline options for connecting stakeholders interested in open (local) government for networking, self-organized peer-peer exchange, and securing easier access to knowledge resources. <p>Medium-long term (2-5 year horizon)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to develop online and offline tools to create opportunities for local level reformers to share knowledge, access expertise from partner organisations, and receive training at a much larger scale <p>Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid replication of materials to the extent possible and curate existing resources developed by OGP and partners • Strive for integration of local across OGP narrative, activities and service offer, and anchor within broader ongoing work on providing enhanced basic and advanced services to OGP stakeholders • Accessibility of platform to all interested stakeholders from government and civil society
--	---

Resourcing Plan

The resourcing model for the new Local strategy is based on the current budget for the local work (below). Additional fundraising will be needed from 2020 onwards to meet the expected demand and interest in the strategy. This would come from a mix of private foundations and development partners, some of whom have an explicit interest in supporting local open government efforts.

OGP overall budget	US\$11,902,953 (55% from four private foundations - of which some are explicitly interested in a local expansion; 20% from bilateral agencies; 25% from member contributions)
Current Local budget	<p>US\$ 600,000 (~5% of the overall budget). This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing costs for 5.5 FT (2 dedicated Local FTE or consultant equivalents; and 3.5 FTE equivalent from across the country support, IRM, KLIC, and Comms Teams) • US\$ 80,000 on average for IRM report production for the 20 current Local members • US \$30,000 consultancies • US \$33,000 staff travel to support Local co-creation processes (12-15 trips) • US \$30,000 travel to support peer exchange between current OGP Local members (including at the Global Summit) • US\$ 13,000 for small co-creation grants to current OGP Local processes <p>This does not include:</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from OGP MDTF grants going to Local in the form of co-creation, implementation or thematic support as the final selection processes for these are still underway • IRM staff time
--	--

OGP is developing a medium-term implementation plan and fundraising strategy that will focus on raising approximately \$2m per year in additional income from country contributions, bilateral agencies and private foundations in 2020 and beyond. If this effort is successful it would allow for a rapid increase in the quality and quantity of resources provided to national-local dialogues (pillar one) and the number of OGP Local members (pillar two) and a faster scale up of the knowledge sharing and peer exchange platform (pillar 3), without removing resources for current priorities in the OGP implementation plan for 2019 approved by the Steering Committee. The strategy will be reviewed after Year 2 to ensure that there is capacity to meet the demands from the Program, and that the services and staff support being offered by OGP directly, and through partners, are sufficient to support the three pillars of the strategy. If new resources are not forthcoming, then this area of work will be reviewed to match ambition to resources.

Initial resourcing anticipated for the design phase, and years 1 and 2 of the strategy are summarized below. This excludes costs associated with further developing OGP's other programs that would also end up benefiting the Local program.

Item	Design phase (Jun - Dec 2019)	Year 1 - 2020	Year 2 - 2021
Staffing	~5.5 FTE (2 full time local staff or equivalent)	~6.5 FTE (2 full time local staff)	~7.5 FTE (3 full time local staff)
Knowledge, learning and peer exchange support (including publications and travel support)	65,000 (15,000 professional services for program design and onboarding program development; 40,000 for design workshop; 10,000 publications)	65,000	100,000
Small scale co-creation and facilitation support grants	N/A	20,000	30,000
Online platform development (e-filing system + potential slack community)	N/A	21,500	6,500
Monitoring and quality assurance		50,000	100,000
IRM monitoring of current Locals through to end of their current cycles (on average)	~80,000	~80,000	~80,000



Miscellaneous	5,000	10,000	10,000
Total programmatic spend (not including salary costs)	150,000	246, 500	326,000
Status	Within current budget	~\$250k increase on current budget allocation for local work (including staffing)	~\$350k increase on current budget allocation for local work (including staffing)

Consultation process

A Steering Committee Local Task Force comprising GL and Lucy McTernan was convened in order to provide inputs into and then endorse the new strategy to the rest of the Steering Committee. Their work has been informed by research and strategy development supported by external researcher and strategist, May Miller-Dawkins.

The process has focused on better understanding a) the conditions under which effective open, local government emerges and produces outcomes for people, b) the different approaches that national governments, civil society and international networks have taken to enable and support local efforts and their effects, and c) the relevant lessons for OGP from equivalent international initiatives that work with provincial/state, municipal and city based governments and civil society such as C40, UCLG, LOGIN, 100RC, and movements like open contracting and participatory budgeting.

To build this understanding we have interviewed over 91 individuals from 27 countries including:

- 21 local government officials and 15 local civil society representatives (from 8 OGP Local governments, 5 unsuccessful OGP Local applicant jurisdictions, and 12 local government areas without formal connection to OGP)
- 18 national government officials and 13 national civil society representatives (including 11 Steering Committee members)
- 12 international civil society organisations and 5 international institutions or funders
- 7 OGP staff across teams
- In total, 40 men and 51 women were interviewed.

A full list of interviewees is available at the end of this document.

We have also collected other examples through a survey, and reviewed documentation.

Draft findings and strategy directions were shared with the Local Taskforce and discussed in a call. A draft strategy paper was developed for Local Taskforce input before finalising for Steering Committee consideration at its May meeting at the Global Summit.

After a decision on key elements of the strategy is made by the Steering Committee, we will design and launch the implementation plan for the strategy. The specifics of the rules and



regulations for the model(s) opted for and the governance arrangements will be determined in the design phase which will run from June- November 2019.

What we heard from the consultations

Below is a summary of our findings from the research to inform this strategy.

There is consensus on the importance of open, local government and that OGP has a role to play

"I would like us to struggle hard to make it work and not orphan it." – National CSO representative, Africa

There is a common desire to encourage, support and celebrate local, open government due to its relevance to peoples' lives, importance of diverse leadership for action and cultural change at all levels of governance, and providing a potential "seed vault" for open government when political support wanes nationally.

There is no constituency for not doing local but a variety of thoughts on what the OGP's role should be and why it is important.

Design implication: OGP has deep support in the opengov community for continuing work in this area. OGP should continue with a clearer stated purpose, linked to the OGP Vision and Strategy and with a role that acknowledges the roles and contributions of other actors.

Open government is spreading and being encouraged by multiple actors at the local level

"At the local level, the potential of open government is unlimited... there are hundreds of cities that are talking about open government without being part of OGP." – Local government representative, Americas

Open government – especially practices around participatory budgeting, resident/citizen input into decision-making, open data, and collaboration between civil society and governments – is spreading in many places, even in some contexts where national civic space may be becoming more limited.

In some places, open government at the local level preceded the national efforts such as the development of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre or the first open data work at the provincial level in Canada. At the local level, those driving open government practices may be doing it to solve particular problems (e.g. to address environmental issues in collaboration with civil society) without labeling it as "open government".

Beyond specific open government reforms, there are provinces and cities that are independently developing open government action plans that are separate to the OGP and/or separate to national or other efforts (for example, Murcia in Spain, Quebec in Canada). These efforts have varied levels of co-creation with civil society.

National governments are experimenting with approaches to encourage local government participation in open government on the basis of their own political systems, cultural and political dynamics and inter-government mechanisms. Interestingly, a number of countries have already moved into a second-generation approach to local, open government having learnt from their first attempts (for example, Indonesia, Italy). (More on these approaches below)



National civil society is working to encourage and support some local governments to become more transparent, accountable and responsive. For example, TI Ukraine's Transparent Cities has seen 32 cities improve their scores in 18 months, Estonia's e-governance academy has directly supported facilitated open government planning processes between local governments and civil society and Colombia's Somos Mas has supported 6 provinces in an open government planning process with civil society to mixed results.

Government, civil society and international donors are, in many cases, working with municipal associations or representative bodies of regions or municipalities. However, these groups can also be highly political and highly politicised depending on the political system and their relationship to the national government.

Internationally, the United Cities and Local Governments has an 18-month-old Community of Practice on Open Government with 400 members, focused on local government representation in open government processes and sharing learning. Networks and initiatives such as C40 and 100 Resilient Cities have also found themselves supporting cities to change how they engage residents, make decisions and share information as critical enablers of transformational processes around resilience and climate action. Thematic partners are starting to work with local governments and partners on opengov, including applying to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund for support in that work.

Since OGP's inception, in addition to commitments made by OGP Local participants, 332 local level commitments in 60 countries have been made either in the form of locally owned commitments or integration into national programs and policies. OGP's distinctive contribution amongst a broad field of contributors is that it is unique in putting the relationship between governments and civil society at the heart of its processes, and an international platform that can facilitate leadership, learning and exchange internationally, across levels of government and civil society.

Design implication: OGP has a role to play and has a variety of partners to work with in seeking to spread open government across all levels of government. OGP will be in a strong position if it can clearly define its role and contribution, and solidify its approach to partnering within this strategy.

Municipalities, cities and regions/provinces have multiple potential motives to be more open

"Which ...the beautiful thing - we're using means of open government to yield better impact. It's not about moralistic drum of thou shalt be transparent and accountable but you will be more effective, you will have more trust with residents, you'll be more successful if you do it in this way." – Local government representative, Americas

The drivers of open government at the local level can be multiple and contradictory, and sensitive to the actions of civil society and government. They include:

- A strong drive, linked to ongoing electability, to improve service delivery and increase trust with residents/citizens. Reformers within local governments lean on the potential for greater impact or the potential to reduce pressure. Larger cities are animated by the idea of what a modern city is and does. Leaders recognize that they need shared responsibility and collaboration with others to govern well.



- Changing expectations by citizens about access to information and responsiveness and a greater push from civil society for openness. This can be accelerated by new generations of political leaders, political shifts and crises (for example, Madrid, Ukraine).
- Changing responsibilities of municipalities and provinces, especially through greater decentralization, devolution and/or amalgamation in many contexts.
- Cultures and histories that can drive open government building on the past and feeding into and off narratives about the kind of place that a city or nation is (for example, Narinjo, Scotland).
- In some countries, real competition between cities or provinces to attract people and/or investment (for example, Finland, Estonia, Ukraine, The Philippines, Nigeria). Opengov can be a modernisation tool for cities doing well, and a survival/revival tool for struggling cities. Examples of provinces that have implemented opengov and are attracting greater international development assistance can act as a motivator for others to follow their lead (e.g. Kaduna and South Cotabato).
- Legal requirements and frameworks that require opengov practices such as participatory governance (The Philippines), or planned open government laws that would shift municipal responsibilities (The Netherlands), and significant gaps in implementation and/or capacity to meet them.
- Financial incentives offered by national governments and/or international donors to institute new standards or practices, for example additional budget (Jakarta), access to World Bank funding after doing an open government action plan (Nigeria), access to additional government funding if they meet the standard of the Seal of Local Government including opengov elements (The Philippines).
- Examples and stories can provide inspiration from elsewhere, especially cities or governments that people look up to and/or relate to.
- In relation to the OGP specifically, a major motivator is access to an international platform, including one which includes national governments. This provides opportunities for visibility, validation, legitimacy and has the potential to provide access to new resources including knowledge, support and financial support, that would otherwise not be easily available to local actors. This can spur and sustain leadership, in part because it is limited and significant.

Design implication: OGP can pay attention to the drivers and motives that it can contribute to, rather than those that are out of its sphere of influence. For example, inspiration from elsewhere, and providing access to an international platform as a motivator for leadership, rather than an open platform for all.

There are some common enablers of open, local government that sustain and produce results

“We’ve found that engaging political leadership - Mayors/councils and technical operational city staff is key - where there’s alignment, that’s where we find the best engagement.” – Cities network operating in Asia Pacific

Based on the experiences of interviewees, we could identify some common enablers that contributed to Opengov at the local level that was able to stick and make progress:

- Resilient and committed leadership, particularly where it was present across the Executive, legislative organs (if relevant), bureaucracy and civil society. As with National OGP, political, bureaucratic and civil society commitment and ability to see and focus on the potential for real outcomes for people. Building broad leadership works better than individual (especially



chief executive) leadership as it makes it more likely to become embedded and survive political transitions.

- Vibrant civil society who are engaged in the process and leading the way on transparency and accountability themselves. One challenge is that “opengov” or transparency focused civil society may not be active at local levels in all contexts, however, there is emerging practice in engaging with sectoral or community based organisations at the local level on specific commitments that enact opengov in particular areas (e.g. Waste in Madrid, Justice in Santa Fe, resilience in Austin, access to sexual and reproductive health services in Buenos Aires). In some cases, governments are also doing direct citizen engagement, however this often requires support from civil society.
- Access to relevant support which may include support to facilitating co-creation in some cases (e.g. in Kigoma by Twaweza or in Estonia by e-gov academy), or may include advice or technical support including new technology (such as the 100+ governments now using Consul), or training for both government and civil society actors (e.g. in Kenya). Financial resources can be critical, including for shifting the dynamics if civil society is resourced to engage fully in the process. However, resources as an incentive can encourage reaching minimum standards but not necessarily leading practice.
- Finding ways to shift culture within local governments – Opengov can provide a label and permission for public servants to behave differently and with pride (e.g. in Scotland), reformers can capitalise on the short memories of cities to have success with new approaches and have them accepted as the way the city does things, public action plans mean that civil servants can engage departments that may be recalcitrant on the issues (e.g. in Quebec), new kinds of relationships with civil society can shift perceptions and culture and how government and civil society relate.

Design implication: OGP can design for local support that recognises, requires, and seeks to enhance these enablers by making the partnership between civil society and government and the leadership at political, bureaucratic and civil society levels explicit, by requiring and supporting the identification of support locally or through the international opengov community, and by providing access to resources, including OGP’s Multi Donor Trust Fund.

National approaches are diverse, could benefit from cross pollination and are varied on co-creation with civil society

Some of the models that have emerged so far for national governments to support local opengov include:

- Subnational pilots with locally identified and owned commitments: Inviting selected local governments to include their own commitments into national action plans (often) based on loosely-set criteria (for e.g. first-generation local commitments in Indonesia, Italy, Georgia, Philippines, UK). These locals are then used to serve as inspiration or competition for others.
- Integrating locals into NAP co-creation and commitments: having municipal associations or local governments sit on the national multi-stakeholder forum (e.g. Spain), travelling around to consult and engage regionally around priorities and co-creation, often supported or driven by civil society (e.g. UK), or inviting all states, provinces or devolved nations to co-create commitments with civil society and submit as part of the action plan (for e.g. Argentina, UK, Germany [new in 2019]). In some instances, this approach comes with a commitment cap (e.g. Argentina with one commitment per province allowed in the 3rd NAP - 11 of 24 participated)



- Initiatives to localise (and/or standardize) opengov policies and practices: for example, Nigeria which has a pathway for all states to sign up to implement NAP commitments at state level and identify additional priorities, the Philippines where national OGP commitments such as FOI and EITI are being mainstreamed locally beyond the OGP NAP process, or Italy where local governments can commit to actions and milestones under national commitments in the NAP. Similarly, there are many initiatives to share common platforms and practices for example, e-consultation portals in Croatia, participatory budgeting and applying open government principles in local policy-making in Estonia, open decision-making and political party financing in the Netherlands, open data in Canada.
- Promoting leadership and independent local action plans: emergence of a national initiative to support demand-driven, independent local opengov action plans, not associated with OGP. For e.g. INAI in Mexico; creating pioneers' networks for municipal reformers to meet every 3 months in The Netherlands, awards in Indonesia and Finland.

These approaches have different kinds of purposes (raise minimum standards or achieve compliance with national law and policy across the board, encourage leadership and inspire others) and use different kinds of incentives (financial, recognition, access to benchmarks and support) to achieve them. Approaches driven by only by compliance and financial incentives that attempt to use an OGP-esque process of action planning can become mere formalism if there is no leadership or sincerity behind it.

These approaches are not mutually exclusive with several countries using a combination: for example, Croatia is pursuing common standards at local level, while encouraging locals to develop their own plans. Similarly, Nigeria encourages locally identified and owned commitments, in addition to supporting local governments in implementing NAP commitments. In some instances, there's also been an evolution in approach in more recent cycles. For e.g. Indonesia is moving from a subnational pilot approach to an approach of mainstreaming national initiatives at local level (primarily for capacity and sustainability issues), while Italy is moving towards engaging local/regional government associations for commitments to be coordinated and monitored by the latter, while also including some commitments from local level leaders for inspiration (Milan, Rome etc.).

Nationally initiated approaches are primarily focused on support to governments (or inter-governmental relations) and are not all strong on co-creation with civil society or support to civil society. Co-creation with civil society mandatory (or strongly recommended) explicitly in some cases: e.g. Mexico, Germany, Argentina, Nigeria, however incentives for civil society are not always clear in cases where commitments are entirely derived from national programs and policies. Local MSFs also part of the approach in Nigeria and Mexico. Moreover, as above, requiring a process without necessarily having the understanding, leadership or will behind it may lead to formalistic approaches to co-creation that do not shift relationships, culture or enable change.

While national governments may be uncomfortable, at times, with local governments being selected to engage in an international platform that they share, a number noted that the locals involved with OGP that were progressing further, faster than others in their broad-based programs provided a critical example of leadership and what it could produce for other local governments (e.g. The Philippines, Nigeria). Nigeria is drawing on Kaduna as part of their selection panel for their national program and as a mentor to others.



Monitoring efforts within national approaches are in very nascent stages with some interesting emerging practice: INAI assesses local plans for completion and end outcomes and has developed an open government metric (the latter does not directly assess local open gov commitments); Argentina has invited subnational governments to participate in the OECD peer review on open government; Ukraine has the civil society-led Transparent Cities program; third party indices on open data and budgets are used where available/applicable. Some countries are considering the role of the National Multi-Stakeholder Forum in monitoring local progress.

Design implications: Nationally-led and bottom-up local leadership-based approaches are both important and can be complementary. For both, OGP can provide an international platform for peer learning, benchmarking, recognition and inspiration. OGP can play a more active and strategic role in learning from and supporting national government approaches on local open gov. OGP's role and contribution working directly with locals can focus more centrally on the relationship between government and civil society as its most significant niche.

International initiatives provide lessons and potential partnerships for OGP's local work

"That's the hard part - not forcing too much on them - little less karate, a little more aikido - leveraging their energy. Let city define the outcome for themselves and then they are responding to the opportunity - don't show up and say this is the way you have to do it - but rather this is your priority and you can use these resources." – International initiative

Interviews with C40, United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), Local Governance Initiative and Network Asia (LOGIN), 100 Resilient Cities (100RC), What Works Cities, Hivos, GIFT, and the WRI Ross Center for Sustainable Cities highlighted some significant lessons for OGP's future work in this area, as well as reinforcing the potential for greater partnership to support this strategy.

The most significant common lesson was about grounding the work in outcomes/goals that matter to local governments and people as a way to focus on significant outcomes, draw on existing leadership and broaden coalitions of support that could sustain the work through and beyond political transitions. This meant practically, in the case of 100RC, C40, The Ross Center and LOGIN, that governments defined the agendas and were propositional or applying/requesting entry or partnership or peer support, not that the initiative was knocking on the door proposing that they do something a specific way. This resonates with the lessons above in terms of the leadership at all levels required to sustain local open gov. The major shift in an OGP approach would be to explicitly incentivise co-creation of those agendas something between government and civil society and to engage civil society leaders alongside government leaders in the program.

At the same time, initiatives have set a standard to aspire to and work towards as part of joining their platforms – for example, the participation standard of C40 and the assessment and certification of What Works Cities. This can provide incentives and momentum for cities to work through the process of change, albeit framed by their own agendas.

Most initiatives try to create connections, peer learning and support within their networks. The main, common lessons include the need for some centralised support to facilitate face to face connection to make relationships that can then continue online and over distance, the need for structured and skilled facilitation to support peer learning - for example, C40 have thematic

networks that are skillfully facilitated by thematic experts, and LOGIN invests time in facilitating a deep reflection on what governments and civil society really need to define the parameters of bilateral peer exchange and learning exercises.

Design implications: OGP can incentivise co-creation by instituting joint applications between civil society and government for entry as an OGP Local member where they identify jointly key areas or outcomes to work towards that are grounded in government and community aims and interests. OGP can do better peer learning and exchange by structuring and facilitating it more consciously – for example, through structured onboarding and potential for thematic learning with cohorts of government and civil society leaders from OGP Local members. OGP will need to consciously balance the relationship building and potential for exchange through face-to-face and online engagement and platforms.

There is convergence on the role for OGP

“The OGP should focus almost exclusively on getting local government to the table internationally and should double down on it because [the local level is] where the diversity is...Don’t need an enormous program - could do 10-15 organisations each year” – National government representative, Europe

While there is not consensus in the opengov community about the role of OGP in encouraging and supporting local opengov, there is convergence around key points.

There is strong agreement that OGP can have a stronger narrative on the role of local governments and local civil society, do better communications, storytelling and knowledge sharing, and more proactively orchestrate mentoring and peer support across the community (many are keen to play a role in this).

There is significant interest from governments and civil society for OGP to work with national governments on how they enable, incentivise and support local, open government.

There is also significant support for having locals in the international platform particularly if it is done in a way that incentivises leadership to provide an example to others, contributes to setting new benchmarks over time, engages with government and civil society leaders and maintains the spirit and purpose of OGP processes while making minor adaptations to suit the local context.

This builds off the results and lessons of the OGP Local pilot which included 20 governments and produced limited action plans of no more than 5 commitments which the IRM deemed to have 16% potentially transformative impact and 60% moderate potential impact. Locals tended to have relatively strong engagement around their process with 67% having a multistakeholder forum, 67% providing feedback on how inputs were taken into account in the development of the plan and 92% having consultation during implementation. Completion at the end of the one-year action plan was at levels similar to early NAPs.

This research found that OGP Local participants benefited most from being part of a defined cohort, having access to a selective international platform that they could use to sustain and accelerate political commitment, being able to access support from OGP and their peers, including ongoing collaboration that seems to outstrip levels of collaboration being national governments on specific open government areas or projects.



Governments that did not gain access to OGP Local were disappointed and concerned about trying to reapply in the future considering the political capital involved if the benchmark for entry was not clear to them. At the same time, some governments who did not get in continued with their plans regardless and even produced public action plans that helped them deliver opengov projects across their governments (for example, Quebec, who used a public action plan to engage with the last 5 Departments to not have open data portals with the stronger backing of a public policy). On the other hand, transitions in executive leadership has led to the process being stalled indefinitely in a few OGP Local participants.

The adaptations to the OGP process – particularly the limit on number of commitments was a useful constraint and should be continued (and is in line with the direction of travel in OGP generally to reduce the number of NAP commitments).

Other adaptations could respond to challenges faced by locals and by OGP in supporting a wider number of locals, for example, requiring co-created commitments but not necessarily applying all the requirements of the Co-creation Standards, IRM oversight and learning role through a differentiated monitoring approach for Local (no member-by-member detailed assessment), which will be developed as part of IRM refresh. This would mean keeping the principles of co-creation, concrete action, and monitoring for accountability intact but tweaking their application in line with the broader objectives of the strategy.

Design implications: OGP Local membership is likely to be most effective if it remains selective yet raises the bar of entry around the partnership between civil society and governments. OGP can improve the onboarding of governments and civil society into the OGP process, particularly around co-creation, better connect a range of potential mentors and supporters to locals (including past OGP Locals, partner organisations, and members of national multi-stakeholder forums), and find more fit for purpose ways of monitoring OGP Locals overseen by IRM and proactive learning across cohorts.

List of Stakeholders Interviewed

List as of 10 May 2019

Stanley Achonu, OGP Nigeria Secretariat, Nigeria
Pia Andrews, NSW Government, Australia
Victoria Anderica, Madrid City Government, Spain
Yusuf Auta, Kaduna State Government, Nigeria
Shreya Basu, Lead, Asia Pacific, OGP, Singapore
Jaimie Boyd, Government of Canada
Paul Bradley, SCVO, Scotland, UK
Tonu Basu, OGP Thematic Lead, UK
Betiana Caceres, Fundación Huesped, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Denis Carr, City of Toronto, Canada
Joaquín Caprarulo, ACIJ, Argentina
Asma Cherifi, TACID Network, Tunisia
Francisco Álvarez Córdova and Ricardo Valencia Lara, INAI, Mexico
Carolina Cornejo, Government of Argentina
Helen Darbishire, Access Info, Spain
Ani Dasgupta, WRI Ross Center for Sustainable Cities, USA



Aidan Eyakuze and Anastasia, Twaweza, Tanzania
Marianne Fabian, Government of The Philippines
Maria Alejandra Rico Falla, UCLG Open Government Community of Practice, FEMP, Spain
Juan Ferreiro, Secretario de Fortalecimiento Institucional del Gobierno de la Provincia de Córdoba, Argentina
Daniely Votto Fontoura, São Paulo, Brazil (previously part of the Porto Alegre Government)
Agustin Frizzera, Democracia en Red (DER), Argentina
Janett García and José Carlos León Vargas, SIKANDA, Oaxaca, Mexico
Odile Gaset, Directora General del Instituto de Transparencia y Acceso a la Información Pública del Gobierno de la Ciudad de La Rioja, Argentina
Steve Gauthier and Christiane Langlois, Government of Quebec, Canada
Soumya Ghosh, Government of Edmonton, Canada
Diego Gismondi, Subsecretario de Innovación Pública del Gobierno de la Provincia de Santa Fe, Argentina
Doreen Grove, Government of Scotland
Juan Pablo Guerrero, GIFT, USA
Munyema Hasan, OGP KLIC Senior Manager, USA
Sebastian Hasselbeck, Federal Republic of Germany
Nathaniel Heller, R4D, USA
Alvaro Herrero, City of Buenos Aires, Argentina
Luis Felipe Hevia, CIESAS Golfo, Veracruz, Mexico
Agung Hikmat and Tities, Government of Indonesia
Katju Holkeri, Government of Finland
Moses Iziomon, Government of Canada
Lysa John, CIVICUS Secretary General, Kenya
Milag San Jose-Ballesteros, C40, Singapore
Nina Khatiskatsi, Tbilisi, Georgia (ex-Deputy Mayor, now with civil society)
Giorgi Kldiashvili, Institute for Development of Freedom of Information, Georgia
Anastasiya Kozlovtseva, Transparency International Ukraine
Preeta Lall, LOGIN, India
Jean-Noé Landry, Open North, Canada
Brittany Giroux Lane, What Works Cities, USA
Paul Maassen, OGP, Head of Country Support, Belgium
Darija Maric, Government of Croatia
Nicolas Martin, Somos Más, Colombia
Arbjan Mazniku, City of Tirana, Albania
Lucy McTernan, Scotland
Czarina Medina-Guce, previously lead of Local Government Association, The Philippines
Sergio Meza, Plan Estratégico Juárez (Chihuahua), Mexico
Lina Montoya, Government of Argentina
Denisse Miranda, OGP IRM
Kelly O'Connor and Sabine Romero, Austin City Government, USA
Ivy Ong, OGP Asia-Pacific, The Philippines
Laura Ortiz, Department of Nariño, Colombia
Andreas Pavlou, Involve, UK
Esteban Peláez, Fundación Corona, Colombia
Stefano Pizzicannella, Government of Italy
Joe Powell, Deputy CEO, OGP, USA



Daniela Puca Directora de Administración de Base de Datos y Gobierno Abierto del Gobierno de la Ciudad de la Plata, Argentina
Carmen Pulido, Jackie Goodman, and Andrea Casares GAVA, Austin, USA
Sabine Romon, City of Paris, France
Eric Reese, GovEx, USA
Kristina Reinsalu, e-Governance Academy, Estonia
Edwin Ronoh, DC / Kenya (civil society involved in Elgeyo process)
Francisco Saija and Giuseppe, Parliament Watch Italia, Messina, Italy
Andrew Salkin, 100 Resilient Cities
David Sasaki, Hewlett Foundation
Claire Schouten and Brendan Halloran, International Budget Partnership, USA
Pak Setiaji, Jakarta / West Java, Indonesia
Vivien Suerte-Cortez, Hivos, The Philippines
Thom Townsend, UK Government, UK
Kety Tsanova, Government of Georgia
Olena Ursu, UNDP, The Ukraine
Jorieke van Leeuwen, Government of The Netherlands
Kitty von Bertele, Luminare, UK
Richard Villacorte, Government of The Philippines
Kelly Villeneuve, Ontario Provincial Government, Canada
Sabina Wirsky, Directora General de Modernización del Gobierno de la Ciudad de Bahía Blanca, Argentina



Steering Committee Resolution on the OGP Local Strategy

For Approval of the OGP Steering Committee

29 May 2019

The OGP Steering Committee recognizes the importance and value of open local government in achieving OGP's vision of improving citizen-centered governance and public service delivery and making governments more responsive and accountable.

The Steering Committee also recognizes the need to support collective efforts of national and local governments and civil society in promoting open government for reforms to be sustained and scaled over time, building on the successes and lessons learned from the OGP Local program and other initiatives to support open local government.

Recognizing these opportunities, the Steering Committee hereby resolves to endorse the OGP Local Strategy, which comprises the following pillars:

1. Strategic national-local vertical integration to support the further development of effective national government and civil society strategies to enable and foster local open government within OGP National Action Plan processes or through separate national initiatives, by providing guidance on effective approaches, collecting and disseminating best practices, and facilitating peer exchange and learning
2. Enhanced OGP Local program to incentivize local ambition and innovation for more local governments and civil society, creating cohorts of local participants that can support and inspire each other, by redesigning the current program to be more flexible, scalable and inclusive
3. Platform for knowledge, learning, innovation and capacity building to provide easy access to knowledge resources, learning opportunities, self-serve guides, peer and expert networks, as part of a partnership-wide medium-terms vision for building a more collaborative platform for learning

In addition, the Steering Committee hereby calls on the OGP Support Unit to commence the program design phase for the implementation of this strategy, with engagement from the Steering Committee, and continued input from the wider OGP community of reformers and partners.

The implementation of this strategy will be closely monitored by the Steering Committee to ensure sustainability and alignment with the partnership's evolving needs, priorities, and resources. A review of the program will also be undertaken at a timeline agreed with the Steering Committee at a later date.

END RESOLUTION



OGP Steering Committee Call to Action: Collective Leadership to Protect Participation, Advance Inclusion, and Create Impact for Digital Democracy

For Approval of the OGP Steering Committee
29 May 2019

In the current global environment where democracy is being undermined by restricted space for civil society, erosion of citizens' trust, rising populism and polarization of communities, collective action is key to counter these threats. OGP needs to be at the cutting edge of policy solutions to deliver on its vision to promote open, inclusive, and responsive governments that deliver for all citizens.

In this era of **closing civic space**, we call on all OGP members to co-create actions with civil society such as to:

- Promote inclusive co-creation models by strengthening the OGP Multi Stakeholder Forum structure and deliberations in line with the Participation and Co-creation Standards; consider commitments in their OGP action plans that focus on defending democratic institutions and rights, especially the fundamental freedoms of association, assembly and expression.

In this era of **continued exclusion and gender disparity**, we call on all OGP members to co-create actions with civil society such as to:

- Invite participants such as women's groups and networks to join the multi-stakeholder forum or participate in the co-creation process; consider commitments in their OGP action plans that use open government to address a specific gap in women and girl's services or policy needs; and work with experts to conduct gender-based, or other similar analysis, to assess how the commitments will affect groups differently.

In this era of **digital opportunities to deepen democratic engagement and protect against online harms**, we call on all OGP members to co-create actions with civil society such as to:

- Consider new commitments in their OGP action plans that promote democratic rights and protect dialogue in the digital realm, including on data rights and privacy, internet access and control, and developing of open, ethical algorithms and AI.

We call on the OGP Support Unit to review all Partnership-wide recommendations and policy documents to ensure that they create an enabling framework to promote collective leadership on these issues.

ENDS



2019-2020 Independent Reporting Mechanism Refresh Overview

Background

In 2017, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM), with the guidance of the Steering Committee (SC), commissioned an independent review by Blomeyer and Sanz, a consulting firm based in Spain. The review sought to identify the IRM's key areas for improvement vis-a-vis its mandate, efficiency of operations, and effectiveness as an accountability and learning tool.

During the June 2017 in-person SC meeting in Washington DC, SC members helped shape the terms of reference for the reviewers and design of review approach. Early results were presented later that year during the September Steering Committee meeting in New York. The IRM Review Report was based on interviews with more than 50 OGP stakeholders and a survey of more than 100 civil society and government actors from the OGP community. The interviews also included OGP Support Unit staff, IRM staff, and IEP members. Almost every sitting SC member at the time was interviewed as part of this process, and many of their voices are reflected in the final report. The final report was published in January 2018. As a result of the review, in 2018 the IRM began a refresh process to act on the findings and recommendations of the report.

In the July 2018 Steering Committee meeting in Tbilisi, the SC endorsed the IRM Refresh and approved initial changes to the IRM Charter to support the uptake of the IRM Review findings and recommendations.

Key Findings from the IRM Review

The IRM Review Report found that with current reporting model the IRM is under severe pressure and requires a strategic overhaul of the mechanism. The main areas where the review found opportunities for improvement are:

1. Outreach
2. Uptake
3. Timeliness and alignment with action plan cycle
4. Sustainability

Objective of the IRM Refresh 2.0

The second phase of the IRM Refresh will focus on a strategic rethinking of the IRM. Currently, the IRM's time and resources are allocated 80% on production of reports, and only 20% on outreach and dissemination efforts. This hinders opportunities for IRM to have more impact in OGP.

During 2018 the IRM introduced initial changes in response to the IRM Review Report. The shift from "mid-term" and "end-of-term" reports to "Design" and "Implementation" reports, aimed to improve timing of IRM reports with regard to action plan cycles and reduce length in reports. Although positive, we still need to address bigger issues of sustainability, outreach and uptake.

Scope of IRM Refresh

Two-fold process led in parallel:

- Refine the IRM value proposition - this will aim to improve alignment of IRM purpose to OGP strategic aims, it will set principles for the redesigned IRM reporting framework, and it will clarify IRM governance structures and relationships with other parts of OGP.
 - This implies revisions to IRM Charter that require SC approval. Charter revisions will be developed jointly between IEP/IRM and the Criteria and Standards (C&S) sub-committee. C&S sub-committee makes a recommendation for approval to full SC.
- Rethink IRM reporting framework- this pertains to the content specific and technical aspects of *how* IRM will implement principles and the value proposition through IRM products and reporting.
 - This implies revisions to the IRM Procedures Manual. It will require engagement, consultation and feedback from SC and OGP community. It is approved by IEP.

Process and Timeline

ACTIONS	TIMELINE								IMPLICATIONS
	2019				2020				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Internal (IRM/IEP) brainstorming and preparation of approach to IRM Refresh.									Included internal consultations with IRM staff, blue-sky thinking and strategic discussion about Refresh process with IEP. Defined guiding principles for IRM Refresh.
Engagement with C&S, planning for IRM Charter Revisions and initial feedback on IRM Refresh.									Initial discussions with C&S chairs and sub-committee to agree on approach, principles and process for IRM Refresh. Particularly, seeking alignment with AoG.
Engagement with Steering Committee for feedback and input on IRM Refresh.									Includes 1:1 calls with government and civil society representatives (as possible), engagement with GL sub-committee. This engagement will be ongoing.
Summit opportunity to scope feedback from POCs and civil society stakeholders.									Coordinate bilateral meetings with key stakeholders (POCs, MSF civil society members, other users of IRM reports like journalists, academic, practitioners). Coordinating a session with country support staff to gather IRM researchers, IEP and POCs to discuss and seek input on Refresh (TBC).



Collaborate with C&S and other interested SC members on Charter Revisions									Work on IRM Charter revision drafts through C&S monthly calls, email exchange, conference calls or other channels as needed.
SC engagement for endorsement and approval of IRM Charter revisions									Circulate, discuss and request feedback on IRM Charter revision drafts per recommendations from C&S. Aim toward discussion and approval of revisions on last SC meeting of 2019.
Targeted engagement on reporting framework informed by progress on IRM value proposition and input from SC and broader OGP community.									Post-summit, a second phase of engagement for input will seek feedback from interested SC members, OGP governments, CSOs, and other IRM potential users like open government experts/academics, practitioners, journalists.
Finalize re-design of reporting framework									Shape design per feedback received through engagement process. Final approval pending IRM Charter revisions endorsed by SC.
Roll-out new reporting framework									If refresh reforms adopted by end of Q1 in 2020, changes will apply to action plans that are submitted from August to December for 2020-22 cycle. Action plans submitted under cycles 2019-21 and 2018-20 will continue with current IRM model. The transition period will be gradual and run through 2022.

Reference Documents

- Full IRM Review Report available [here](http://bit.ly/2VWPKO7) (<http://bit.ly/2VWPKO7>)
- Current IRM Charter available [here](#) (pg. 33) (<http://bit.ly/2Jdw3vC>)
- SC resolution on IRM Refresh in July 2018 meeting available [here](#) (pg. 6) (<http://bit.ly/2VbnxPb>)



Background and Reference Materials

Non-decisional documents to guide the meetings



2019 OGP Support Unit-IRM Implementation Plan

Overview

The 2019 OGP workplan seeks to continue the implementation of the Strategic Refresh endorsed by the Steering Committee in December 2016. Building upon the 2017 and 2018 OGP implementation plans, the 2019 workplan is organized around five overall organizational priorities.

1. Provide world-class support to OGP national and local participants to support better and more inclusive co-creation, more ambitious Action Plans - especially on thematic priorities - and better implementation;
2. Advocate globally for openness and democracy, including through OGP's first major campaign on gender and inclusion, and position OGP as a pivotal implementation platform to translate global promises into country action;
3. Support targeted learning, facilitate collective action, and strengthen partnerships to demonstrate greater ambition on OGP's thematic priorities;
4. Enhance OGP's research, learning and capacity building program and become a widely accessible resource for stakeholders across the partnership for knowledge and innovation;
5. Strengthen OGP's core institutional functions to sustain and support the Support Unit and IRM in the areas of governance, finance/accounting, human resources, fundraising and technological infrastructure.

2019 Collective Deliverables & Steering committee Role

I. Country and Local

The core objective of OGP at the country and local level is to support reformers - primarily domestic government and civil society - to co-create and implement ambitious open government reforms. This support over the years has become more advanced, political and strategic. It is also a collective effort, involving thematic and multilateral partners, bilateral and foundation funders, ambassadors and envoys, and Steering Committee members working alongside the Support Unit. Further expanding the engagement with the European institutions will be a priority. Increasingly, parliaments, oversight institutions and the private sector are also the target of this support work. In 2019, 49 OGP participants will develop new Action Plans and more than 100 IRM reports will be published. This will be a crucial test of political engagement, and a major opportunity for OGP participants to advance open government themes that tackle problems citizens care about.

In 2018, OGP brought together the national and local government and civil society support under one umbrella, allowing us to broker the most appropriate approaches for supporting a specific country or local entity. This path will be continued in 2019 with a closer cooperation with the IRM and the Trust Fund team, as well as further growth and strengthening of the regional teams.



2019 will see a further expansion of the provision of enhanced support services for priority countries/locals ‘the OGP way.’ The Trust Fund will be a critical component, providing a new round of co-creation grants as well as the first thematic and implementation grants. OGP will also continue to be more deliberate in designing customized political and strategic regional approaches, especially around political transitions. The thematic coalitions will be deepened, with the ambition of more thematic traction, especially around priority topics. The gender campaign and the 6th OGP Global Summit will be pivotal in creating momentum thematically and politically.

The IRM and the Country Support Team will work even more closely together to ensure that the IRM reports and insights are used to inform our support strategies and enhance learning and accountability at the country level, leading to better co-creation and implementation.

OGP will also use 2019 to take a strategic deep dive into scalable expansion models for the work around local open government, while continuing to work with the strong cohort of current OGP Local members and strengthening its network and community of practice.

Main Deliverables for 2019:

1. Provide support to all 79 national and 20 local government members; with special emphasis on the 49 members that will be developing a new Action Plan in 2019.
2. Provide deeper strategic advice and support to government, civil society actors and other actors in 10-15 selected priority countries and local members. The criteria for selecting these priority countries/local entities includes the political context, the strategic importance for OGP, the stage in the Action Plan cycle and where there is potential traction for ground-breaking open government reforms through OGP. All new members will be prioritized to ensure they have a strong start in OGP.
3. Improve the quality and depth of the OGP process at national/local level demonstrably with an emphasis on more countries following the OGP participation and co-creation standards, including a well-functioning multi-stakeholder forum, high level political support, repositories in place for ongoing self-assessment of action plans and implementing IRM recommendations. Exploring the opportunities of direct citizen engagement in OGP will be a way to strengthen the OGP dialogues.
4. Broker and provide advanced co-creation and implementation services. The Trust Fund will be a critical component, providing a new round of co-creation grants as well as the first thematic and implementation grants. Together with thematic partners, OGP will provide co-creation and implementation support on selected priority themes. Additionally, provide and/or broker mini-grants for civil society advocacy, consultation or coordination in selected new and priority national and local entities.
5. Take a strategic deep dive into scalable expansion models for the work around local open government, by carefully assessing existing practices and exploring various models, while continuing to work with the strong cohort of full OGP Local members and strengthening its network and community of practice.
6. Increase dissemination and outreach efforts by the IRM to yield accountability and learnings at the country level and across countries. In 2019 the IRM will also improve recommendations in the 110 reports scheduled to be published. Following on the 2017 IRM review, the IRM will continue its refresh process in 2019 with a review of the IRM Charter. An in-depth look at the IRM’s reporting framework, approach to dissemination and coordination with other Support Unit teams will allow the IRM to support OGP’s



continued expansion and strategic goals, while doing so in a sustainable manner and according to its mandate. The IRM Charter review will be conducted in close collaboration with the Criteria and Standards subcommittee of OGP.

7. Use the 6th Global Summit to promote greater ambition in the 49 new OGP action plans and to continue building high level political buy-in and support for OGP from governments and civil society, including in a set of priority countries and on a set of thematic priorities.

Steering Committee Role:

One of the most powerful things the Steering Committee can do in 2019 is ensure every member engages in at least one activity to directly support an OGP country in its national or local work, and to lead by example in your own OGP process. This includes:

1. Leading by example by ensuring that the Action Plan co-creation and implementation processes in your countries are as inclusive, participative, broad and ambitious as possible, including meeting all of OGP's participation and co-creation standards and engaging with IRM reports.
2. Visiting at least one of the 49 countries developing a new action plan to help facilitate and guide an ambitious co-creation process, including reinforcing findings from the IRM reports.
3. Leading advocacy and peer exchange activities around OGP's thematic priorities.
4. Using high-level political and diplomatic outreach to support OGP countries undergoing political transitions, and help bring faltering participants back on track and ensure full participation where inactivity is a risk.
5. Mentoring government and civil society reformers in new OGP countries to improve their understanding of OGP and how it can be leveraged to deliver domestic reform to ensure strong initial OGP engagement.
6. Being champions of the IRM, and encouraging uptake of IRM findings to ensure learning and accountability for OGP commitments.

II. Global and Regional

The rise of populism, the increasing popularity of illiberal democracy, and attacks on civic space all continue to be a major threat to open government in 2019. The need for strong voices standing up for openness and democracy continues, and OGP is well placed to be part of the response to the worrying trends in many parts of the world. In 2019 OGP will have its sixth Global Summit, hosted by Canada, which should make the case for why more inclusive and participatory governance delivers better impact for governments and citizens.

In 2019 OGP will launch its first full campaign - Break the Roles - to focus on the intersection of gender, inclusion and open government. This will be the organizing theme for the second global Open Gov Week, a major track in the Summit and the subject of a big research project. Our target is to see 30% of OGP participants take an action on gender and inclusion by the end of the year. In addition we want to position OGP as an implementation, monitoring and accountability partner to the SDGs process, as well as continuing our work to strategically position OGP at partners' summits/events as a platform for action on thematic priorities.



Main Deliverables for 2019:

1. Work with the Canadian government and civil society organizations to organize an action-forcing 6th Global OGP Summit, that attracts strong leader and ministerial participation, and advances OGP's thematic priorities.
2. Along with parallel research and country support, launch a major global campaign - *Break the Roles* - to advance gender and inclusion in OGP. The goal for 2019 is for 30 percent of OGP's participants to take an action that advances the use of open government as a tool to advance gender equality and inclusion.
3. Organize the 2nd global Open Gov Week to take place during the week of March 11th, themed around gender and inclusion, during which OGP participants will be encouraged to expand the open government conversation to communities who historically have not had a voice in supporting open government conversations
4. Expand the stories featured on CitizEngage, with a particular focus on gender and inclusion in support of the global campaign.
5. Building on the concept and success of the 2018 Bellagio convening, explore the option of organizing similar regional gatherings of open government champions to build political support for open government and inspire the next generation of OGP leadership.
6. Support the Dutch government in organizing a European Leaders Forum in October 2019.
7. Explore the possibility of organizing a regional event in Africa in late 2019 or early 2020.
8. Deploy OGP's network of Ambassadors and Envoys effectively to raise OGP's profile in global and regional fora, and to provide targeted country support.
9. Position OGP at the UN High-Level Political Forum in July and the UNGA in September as an important partner for implementing the SDGs, especially Goal 16 which is under review in 2019. OGP will organize an event and publication that highlights how OGP countries are using their OGP membership to advance on SDG 16 Plus.
10. Participate in the gatherings and major milestones of our partners and community, including playing a visible role at conferences and in global fora such as EITI's global summit, the Access to Justice Forum, G7, Paris Peace Forum, Women Deliver, and others to build coalitions and foster a stronger group of open gov leaders.
11. Launch a new OGP website and create OGP content stressing the impact and potential of open government reforms.

Steering Committee Role:

The Steering Committee has a critical role in supporting OGP's global work. Heads of State and Ministers speaking out on open government and committing to ambitious reforms is central to OGP's theory of change of tackling vested political interests. In 2019, the Steering Committee can continue to lead by example across our activities, including through communications and campaigns by promoting OGP's work to their own organizations and networks, and providing high-level guidance on execution. It is vital the stories of why open government matters are told more effectively - and the Steering Committee is well placed to help OGP do that.

1. Maintain an up-to-date grid of strategic activities in support of the broader OGP deliverables, and report on progress made at Steering Committee meetings.
2. Participate and support the deliverables identified for the OGP Global Summit and other events as requested, with governments committing to attend at a senior political level.



Steering Committee members should also consider proposing sessions, speakers or political deliverables for the Summit.

3. Commit to organize and/or join Open Gov Week activities in week of March 11th, including by inviting a new partner or organization to participate. Promote Open Gov Week with other OGP participants.
4. Ensure that all branding, communications and messaging from the Steering Committee reinforces the larger narrative.
5. Play an active role in amplifying OGP messages by participating in events, interviews or social media activities.
6. Provide information on stories and impacts to be shared by OGP, particularly through *Citizenengage*.
7. Provide introductions to thought leaders and key media figures relevant to OGP's work.
8. For government members, ensure your representatives in the global decision-making system (UN missions, regional bodies, G20/G7 sherpas, multilateral agencies) are fully aware of OGP's role as a platform for translating international agreements into real action and reform at the national/local level (e.g. SDGs). For 2019 a priority will be the HLPF events at the UN.
9. For civil society members, ensure partners, country offices, grantees and local civil society organizations are engaged and incentivized to participate in national OGP processes and leverage OGP as a platform for advocacy and domestic reform on priority issues.

III. Thematic

OGP's thematic work focuses on promoting ambition and uptake of commitments across four priority areas: anti-corruption, citizens shaping/monitoring public services, civic space, and inclusion. In 2019, OGP will continue building and strengthening strategic partnerships with organizations to provide timely technical support, connections, inspiration and knowledge to OGP members to co-create and implement commitments on these themes. There will also be a strong focus on supporting and brokering coalitions of government on thematic issues where this is potential for action-forcing leadership through OGP, working with civil society and other relevant actors. A key priority will be the effective delivery of the thematic grants of the OGP Trust Fund, including by working directly with the grantees to ensure that they support the strategic objectives of OGP. Finally, the Support Unit will ensure that key OGP events such as the 6th Global Summit and partner events help strengthen OGP's positioning to advance concrete progress on thematic sectors.

Main Deliverables for 2019:

1. Create links across the Support Unit, Steering Committee and thematic partners to facilitate timely technical support and resources for OGP members, especially OGP priority countries and locals, to increase ambition and uptake of commitments on thematic priorities. Areas of focus will include, anti-corruption (beneficial ownership, open contracting, money in politics), citizen participation to shape and monitor public services, civic space, and inclusion.
2. Build thematic partnerships with new actors and strengthen existing organizational partnerships at the country, regional and global levels.



3. Ensure that the agenda and objectives of the 6th OGP Global Summit support the strategic advancement of OGP's thematic priorities.
4. Broker targeted thematic coalitions for action with governments and other relevant actors, especially on issues where collective action may be weaker, to use OGP to advance these reforms.
5. Map the strategic role that OGP can play (including identifying potential commitments in action plans) to further policy innovation and learning related to emerging priorities such as digital governance and algorithmic transparency.
6. Work across the IRM, KLIC, and communication teams to ensure timely analysis of data and dissemination of stories related to thematic priorities, especially for key OGP events (Open Gov Week, 6th OGP Global Summit) and partner events.
7. Support the strategic and timely execution of programming supported by thematic window of the OGP Trust Fund and ensure that it is coordinated with OGP's strategic focus.
8. Develop a comprehensive strategy for OGP on civic space, in coordination with the Steering Committee and partners.

Steering Committee Role:

Steering Committee members have a crucial role - leading by example by raising thematic ambition in their own action plans, including by bringing in relevant thematic ministries from government to engage with OGP action plan processes. As seen in previous years on issues like open contracting, a coalition of OGP Steering Committee leaders have been key to driving the global agenda as early adopters. Similarly, the Steering Committee are well positioned to lead coalitions for action on ongoing priority areas like beneficial ownership and civic space, and emerging priority areas like digital governance. Finally, an important part of the Steering Committee mandate is to promote collective action and peer learning, including through the Thematic Leadership Subcommittee (TLS).

1. Lead by example - support the development and implementation of ambitious commitments on thematic priority areas through action plans.
2. Support and host at least one peer exchange activity for other OGP members to advance commitments in priority thematic areas.
3. Broker new, or join existing, coalitions related to priority themes to promote peer learning and innovation among early adopter countries. (E.g. a new beneficial ownership, gender, or access to justice coalition).
4. Initiate meetings with key government and civil society leaders working on these priority themes to introduce OGP and how they can engage.
5. Lead discussions on how OGP can promote innovation in government on frontier issues like digital governance, and focusing on subset areas discussed in previous meetings such as AI ethics and algorithmic transparency, especially those used by governments in decision-making.
6. Use the Thematic Leadership Subcommittee as a point of strategic exchange and stock-taking on what different Steering Committee members are doing to promote thematic priorities.



IV. Research, Learning & Capacity Building

Through a combination of high-quality, evidence-based products and skills development programs: (i) enhance the OGP Support Unit and leadership's ability to adapt their approaches and meet the demands of OGP stakeholders; (ii) enhance OGP stakeholders' ability to design and implement commitments with greater national relevance, ambition and impact; and (iii) strengthen uptake and dissemination of OGP's resources among targeted audiences.

Main Deliverables for 2019:

- A. Research: OGP will produce strategic, high-quality publications that reach their audience
 - 1. *Flagship Report*: Generate insights and analysis to inform OGP's leadership, international policy area leaders, and OGP country actors on major areas where we need to improve.
 - 2. *Evidence-building*: Execute key research and evaluation on the impact of open government and of OGP.
 - 3. *Strategic Partnerships and Communications*: Build high-impact partnerships with knowledge producers (e.g. Carnegie Endowment) to improve the uptake and discourse on open government and OGP among academics.

- B. Learning: OGP will have a reflective, agile culture where management and staff are able to adapt their strategy and tactics to meet stakeholder needs
 - 1. *Review of OGP's Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning (MEL) system*: Assess how effectively OGP gathers, analyses and feeds back data on OGP's performance, into strategy and work planning.
 - 2. *Scaling up good practice*: Document and disseminate across the partnership how Trust Fund recipients leveraged political, technical and financial support to achieve better outcomes in co-creation and implementation.

- C. Capacity Building: Arm reformers with the tools, skills, and learning needed to create more problem and solution-oriented action plans and strengthened coalitions within countries.
 - 1. *Multi-donor trust fund*: Manage and execute one round of co-creation and thematic support and 2 rounds of implementation support in 2019 for up to 20 countries.
 - 2. *Enhanced menu of services*: Pilot and scale enhanced support in targeted countries, for example building capacity to forge more resilient coalitions, or in improving intra-governmental ownership and coordination.

Steering Committee Role:

- 1. Generate country and partnership wide discussion using findings of OGP knowledge products such as State of Open Government Report (SoGR). For example, the Thematic Leadership Subcommittee can use the findings of the thematic section of the SoGR to host webinars around specific gaps and challenges highlighted by SoGR.
- 2. Strategically promote existing OGP knowledge products more widely to amplify open government and OGP to global audiences. For example, OGP's Star Reforms publication

and Skeptics' Guide are both designed to be ready for quick dissemination particularly on specific policy areas.

3. Engage Steering Committee members upstream in shaping knowledge products on OGP's priority thematic areas. For example, multiple streams of work on open government and OGP's impact will launch this year where the Steering Committee's strategic input will be required.

V. Operations and Fundraising

In 2019, OGP's Operations team will continue to strengthen OGP's core institutional functions as it completes its first year of operating as an independent public charity. The overarching goal of OGP's 2019 activities is to ensure that the OGP Support Unit and the IRM, Board of Directors, donors and other stakeholders are well supported by an infrastructure (financial, contractual, technological, human resources, etc.) and resource base that meets their needs as we work together to further OGP's mission.

Main Deliverables for 2019:

1. Capacity building work with the Board, to include a review of OGP's organizational policy framework.
2. Opening of at least one hub office, in Belgium, and development of an approach for other hub offices.
3. "Organizational Development" work with SU teams to envision strategic development of OGP's global presence.
4. Launch of internal training program to respond to external requirements and expectations and stated staff needs.
5. Creation/implementation of a multi-year fundraising plan to assist us in our work to identify, cultivate and secure funding from additional sources.

Steering Committee Role:

1. Support the OGP Secretariat Board as it provides appropriate oversight for the new non-profit organization.
2. Provide political leadership on country contributions, through both leading by example through the timely payment of contributions, and presenting the value proposition for payment to other participants through high level meetings and correspondence.
3. Explore the possibility of additional funding through their country's bilateral aid agency, if they have one.
4. Connect the fundraising team, particularly the CEO and Deputy CEO, with contacts at private foundations that have strong alignment with OGP's work and values.

2019 Steering Committee Grid

Overview

The [OGP's Strategic Refresh](#) launched and endorsed by the OGP Steering Committee in December 2016 outlines six priorities to achieve the vision for deepening OGP's impact over the next five years. To deliver on these priorities, the OGP Support Unit develops yearly implementation plans that outline a set of deliverables and the proposed roles for the Support Unit and the Steering Committee to achieve them.

In 2018, the Governance and Leadership Subcommittee piloted the “Steering Committee Grid” mechanism to engage the whole Steering Committee in support of OGP’s strategic priorities by identifying **concrete, strategic, and achievable** actions that each member commits to undertake at the country, global and thematic levels. These actions are captured in a “Steering Committee grid”, which also serves as a tool for mutual accountability and collaboration within the Steering Committee.

Upon endorsement of the 2019 new implementation plan, all Steering Committee members were kindly requested to submit a set of actions to be part of the 2019 Steering Committee grid, using the implementation plan and collective deliverables as guidance.

2019 Steering Committee Grid Actions

Steering Committee Member	Cross-Country	Global and Regional Fora	Thematic Leadership
Argentina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support OGP countries in engaging subnational governments in advancing open government practices. Support new OGP members or new governments in office in developing action plans or creating multi-stakeholder forums. Engage governments in joining the OGP Steering Committee and also for incoming chairs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking advantage of the MESICIC presidency to include OGP priorities. Use the OECD Network on Open and Innovative Government and the annual meeting of the OPSI to promote further synergies between countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote cross strategies to align NAPs with the MESICIC agenda ensuring they can contribute to advance on the implementation of the OAS Convention and MESICIC recommendations. Develop pilot initiative to engage Schools of Government in the OGP agenda and share this approach in 2019 CLAD Conference in Argentina. Build an Open Justice Coalition fostering



			<p>access to justice, legal empowerment and transparency, participation and accountability in the justice sector, as well as the adoption of OGP commitments on this regard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw upon Argentina’s co-chair position in the Task Force on Justice (a broad international initiative from Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies that brings together experts and justice leaders with a focus on SDG 16+) to push forward the adoption of more justice-related commitments aimed at fostering OGP values in the judiciary.
<p>Canada</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement collaborative activities outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding with Argentina on Cooperation on Open Government • Provide peer mentorship to a new OGP member in support of NAP implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage the 2019 OGP Global Summit to strengthen senior-level leadership across OGP member countries. • Participate in the Organisation of American States Inter-American Open Data Program. • Work with international partners to advance Canada’s OGP leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with advocacy partners to update the Open Government Guide with new section on protecting civic space that would include illustrative commitments for governments to adopt. • Encourage countries to expand their OGP co-creation processes to incorporate entities working on gender equality. • Host D9 activities on the margins of the OGP Global Summit to



		priorities of inclusion, participation and impact.	promote the synergies between open and digital government
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support engagement of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro in the Initiative. • Engage new OGP governments developing APs to share experience regarding public consultations. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilateral outreach to 2 OGP governments to support commitment development on access to information and public consultations.
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAGOF programme: Support Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast and Tunisia in the implementation of their action plan and in the promotion of OGP and open gov through administration and civil society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the OGP Summit in Ottawa to gather the Open Government network of African Francophone countries • Organize a regional francophone African Summit in Abidjan in October to exchange best practices on OGP and try to help non-OGP countries to address the criteria for the adhesion • Contribute to the OGP MDTF and participate in Council - supporting countries and subnational entities that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in the thematic leadership subcommittee as co-chair • Support the development of the digital and democracy thematic in Open government



		participate in the OGP or intend to become eligible to participate in the OGP	
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-level diplomatic outreach to country in Eastern Europe (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Azerbaijan and Montenegro) and the Middle East and North Africa to re-activate OGP process and finalize draft action plan. Support the re-engagement of countries at risk of becoming inactive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the OECD in its work on Open Government Indicators and actively contribute to the dedicated working group on Open Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the development of sectorial leadership networks on Beneficial Ownership. Organize a regional event in early 2020 (during the Open Government Week in March) dedicated to participation and to the impact of Open Government Favour exchange of best practices in the use of participation platforms.
Romania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the OGP process in the Balkan region countries by taking part at both ministerial and working level in the regional annual OGP meeting, providing peer learning opportunities and best practices on topics such as open data; High and working level outreach to Bulgaria to support the submission and implementation of the new NAP; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging the OGP in events of the Presidency of the EU Council. 	<p>Digital Governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Join and contribute to emerging coalition of EU member states on digital governance <p>Gender and inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate the participation of representatives in the “Women in Tech” initiative at the Ottawa global summit to present best practices. Leverage good practices to achieve an inclusive MSF <p>Open Contracting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives of the implementing agency, in charge with the



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the re-engagement of Bosnia and Herzegovina (diplomatic outreach, especially to Republika Srpska). 		<p>national public procurement platform, to participate in OGP Summit and other topic-specific meeting for peer exchange and present their OCDS story.</p>
South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen civic engagement through platforms such as GovChat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build OGP-African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) partnership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share experience of Vulekamali open budget platform with other OGP countries in the region.
South Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share co-creation experiences of government and civil society with countries designing a national action plan or a multi-stakeholder forum. Collaborate with the Government of Indonesia, Peru and Kenya to improve digital governance through an e-Government Cooperation Center in each country and consulting programs for capacity building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use biannual sessions of Public Governance Committee as an OECD member country to raise collective ambition for open government and promote OGP as a key implementation and accountability platform to advance open government reforms at local, national and international levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Open Government Forum Korea to develop networks on youth and inclusion, and identify key areas of the next national action plan under the themes. Engage legislative and legal branches to expand the scope of open government activities and collaborate toward the Open State.
Maria Baron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support OGP engagement in Latin America and the Caribbean. Reactivate the dialogue between civil society and governments in Mexico Guatemala 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the OPEN network to work on ambitious open parliament roadmaps in the global South. Promote best practices in OGP commitments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advance private sector engagement with OGP in international events such as OGP Global Summit in Ottawa. Include human rights agenda in OGP: human trafficking from a rights restitution perspective.



	<p>and Peru to re-legitimate the OGP process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the delivery of an open parliament plan in Argentina, Ecuador and Costa Rica 	<p>concerning risk evaluation and budgetary planning - such as EITI's.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead a research of OGP commitments requiring regulatory processes in 14 countries of Latin America. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage legislators and parliamentary officials in OGP thematic agendas.
<p>Helen Darbshire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote participation of all European countries in OGP • Promote EU engagement with OGP • Promote access to information commitments in the Action Plans (reference key elements in Paris declaration action on Access to Information; focus on Europe but not exclusively). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve and facilitate greater OGP engagement by RTI community, including CSOs and Information Commissioners and improved coordination, with overall goal of securing more Action Plan commitments that promote stronger, better implemented access to information laws and increased proactive publication of information. • Promote measuring of right of access to information (including with UNESCO and link to SDG 16.10.2, also WB, OECD). • Explore how best subnational / local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote Paris Declaration commitments on beneficial ownership and lobby transparency.



		engagement in OGP can function, with a focus on transparency, as part of defence of democracy at multiple levels of government.	
Aidan Eyakuze	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Chair the Criteria & Standards sub-committee of the OGP Steering Committee • Promote CS priorities on the OGP MDTF Council and its funding windows/envelopes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote OGP within the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data (GPSDD) where I am a Board Member • Participate in the International Open Data Conference (IODC) schedule for Nairobi in 2020 • Promote OGP at the Mo Ibrahim Forum in April (Ivory Coast) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote, protect and defend civic space in Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda • Promote participation by enabling citizens' voices to be heard and taken seriously in decision-making in Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda. Specifically work with the CSO coalition engaging with Kenya's new NAP. • Support OGP Local participants in Kenya (Elgeyo Marakwet) and Tanzania (Kigoma-Ujiji) and amplify their achievements and lessons to other sub-national governments in the region.
Delia M. Ferreira Rubio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in advocacy and peer exchange activities around OGP's thematic priorities, particularly on gender inclusion and gender and corruption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Play an active role in amplifying OGP messages by participating in events, interviews or social media activities. • Promote existing OGP knowledge products more widely to amplify open government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use meetings with key government and civil society leaders to introduce OGP and how they can engage. • Encourage discussions on how OGP can promote AI ethics and algorithmic transparency, especially when ITCs tools are



		and OGP to global audiences.	used by governments in decision-making. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review, comment and inform thematic knowledge and learning materials in coordination with the Support Unit.
Nathaniel Heller		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-lead strategic planning for CSO Day at the Ottawa summit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue leading and delivering on OGP's gender and inclusion agenda
Robin Hodess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in GL subcommittee on all issues relating to the overall governance of OGP. Support to Canada and the Partnership more broadly on issues of business engagement in open government reform 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in IACC and OECD events on behalf of OGP. Collaboration with OGP at the IACC, Mo Ibrahim Foundation Governance Weekend, and RightsCon. Pursuit of OGP links to United Nations Global Compact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring The B Team leadership on Beneficial Ownership Transparency to OGP and more widely with regards to establishing a global norm on BOT, to developing a partnership with OpenOwnership, and to promoting BOT and open contracting from the B20. Driving the agenda forward on civic rights and civil society space, featuring new evidence and approaches to tackling the shutdowns and legislation that hamper governance reform, transparency and participation.
Suneeta Kaimal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in the civil society steering committee selection process. Country engagement in Ghana, Indonesia, Kyrgyz Republic, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Host sessions at international events such as the Ottawa summit and the EITI global conference to encourage commitments and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverage NRGI to deliver on open government in the extractives (see MOU between NRGI and OGP). Include supporting the development and



	Mongolia, Nigeria, Tunisia and Ukraine.	<p>reform in the extractive sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement and support on Feminist Open agenda and on civic space. 	<p>implementation of commitments in the extractive sector, in particular around beneficial ownership, contract disclosure, gender and civic space.</p>
Giorgi Kldiashvili	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Engagement in Eastern Partnership Countries and Asia and Pacific Region. Support the civil society champions in the above mentioned regions to be engaged with OGP with a specific focus on freedom of information, open contracting and public procurement, independent judiciary and SDGs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocating OGP at global level, host and participate in sessions on Public Procurement Transparency, SDGs, Freedom of Information and Open Data at international events. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work on further development of Public Procurement Transparency Standard and Rating and make it as OGP initiative at global level. Work on Freedom of Information, SDGs at regional and global levels.
Tur-Od Lkhagvajav	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage actively the government of Mongolia for co-creating 3rd NAP and implementing jointly with CSOs and other key national stakeholders (focus on operationalizing a true multi-stakeholder platform for OGP in the country). Engage Mongolia with Kyrgyz Republic and Afghanistan (+ Bhutan, if it were to join OGP, based on the National Parliament and GNH Commission contacts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverage OGP-based reform agenda into AEPF - Asia-Europe People's Forum (as a civil society pillar of ASEM – Asia-Europe Meeting process), and through the ADN - Asia Democracy Network (including at the Busan, Ulaanbaatar, Tokyo and Kathmandu International Democracy Forums). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TLS sub-committee active participation and outreach to a larger OGP community in Asia and the Pacific. Political Party Financing Reform initiatives in Asia (partnering with the Transparency International national chapters, and the International IDEA in the region) Beneficial Ownership Disclosure and Contract Transparency initiatives in Asia (including through the EITI/PWYP national platforms,



	<p>through a peer exchange and country experience sharing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach to the Central Asian CSOs through on the ground advocacy for Open Government (including through platforms such as TAP Network for SDG16, EITI/PWYP, LOGIN Association – Local Governance Initiative & Network in Asia). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate the State of Open Government flagship report findings with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDGs) voluntary national reporting, especially on the SDG 16 (including through ADA – Asia Development Alliance, and APSD – Asia Civil Society Partnership for Sustainable Development). 	<p>based on incorporated commitments in the 3rd NAP for Mongolia)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Championing for OGP and SDG16+ thematic cross-linkages for promoting the OGP policy priorities in Asia – Pacific region and beyond.
Lucy McTernan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development and implementation of an OGP commitment on multi-level open governance within the UK National action plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in the task force leading the development of the OGP Local strategy. • Support the European Leaders Forum organized by the Dutch government in October 2019. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the work on the SDG 16 review and the strategic positioning of OGP at the UN High-Level Political Forum and UNGA.
Zuzana Wienk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support CEE regional champions to connect to OGP campaigns and partners around priority areas (with special focus on judiciary, open contracting, BO transparency and the Czech Republic). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to deepen cooperation with the European Commission through concrete actions and events (focus on BO transparency) • Support BO transparency tracks at the Ottawa Summit in terms of impact, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair TLS - (focus on kicking-off its oversight role and support members in leading on at least 3 thematic priorities with tangible goals)



		framing and coalition building	
--	--	--------------------------------	--



Menu of Suggested Actions for a More Inclusive Open Government Partnership

“We value public participation of all people, equally and without discrimination, in decision making and policy formulation. Public engagement, including the full participation of women, increases the effectiveness of governments, which benefit from people’s knowledge, ideas and ability to provide oversight.”

- The Open Government Declaration

Opening up government is an underexplored method for accelerating gender equality and closing critical gaps in information, access, and participation. After all, women use public services, access loans for businesses, pay taxes, walk on city roads – shouldn’t they have an equal say in how governments provide those services? When women and girls are absent from open government, so is the information, knowledge, and skills that limit the potential of ambitious reforms impacting daily lives.

Open Government Partnership (OGP) has made great strides in the past years, but women’s participation and gender perspectives in OGP remains uneven around the world. As of the end of 2018, only [54 OGP commitments include women or gender](#) – representing less than [2% of the 3,000 commitments](#) made by national and local governments. Where we do have gender commitments, they often suffer from below-average completion rates and can lack ambition. In 2019, we call on the partnership to be intentional, strategic, and ambitious in how it brings women and girls into the co-creation process and implementation of commitments.

Gender and inclusion play a pivotal role in our co-chairs’ vision for the OGP Global Summit in Canada, which we intend to be an action-forcing moment for open government partners to seriously consider how they support inclusion throughout their open government reform efforts. This is part of an OGP-wide effort to broaden the base of participation and expand open government efforts across government ministries, including meaningfully engaging women and gender equality advocates.

In advance of the Summit, we ask your government or organization to commit to taking a concrete action to advance women’s participation and gender-sensitive commitments. This action could take one of many forms, including:

- Proactively invite and positively encourage women’s organizations, networks, and leaders to participate in your multi-stakeholder forum;
- Work with gender advocates to conduct an analysis of your action plan to identify where women, men, girls, boys and other groups have different levels of access or potential benefit, and then use that analysis to mainstream gender considerations into specific OGP commitments; and
- Consider a new commitment that uses open government to address a specific gap in women and girl’s services or policy needs.

The following document suggests recommended actions to make co-creation more inclusive, mainstream gender into action plans, or introduce gender-specific commitments. While the actions listed are not exhaustive, we hope they will serve as inspiration.

The OGP Support Unit and partners are available to support these efforts and look forward to engaging with your government or organization as you consider your gender action.

Make Co-Creation More Inclusive

Ensure that co-creation and consultation processes are more inclusive by including civil society groups working on gender equality and inviting key gender and inclusion ministries to OGP discussions.

- **Open Gov Week** - This year, the Open Government community will focus on increasing the number and diversity of partners taking part in events and conversations. All OGP members are asked to consider how to bring new voices into their OGP forum, for example, by inviting at least one new ministry and organization to join them in their Open Gov Week plans or to proactively engage communities who have not traditionally been involved in your forum, such as gender organizations, rural communities or indigenous groups. As part of your outreach, consider a focus on women and gender groups.
- Expand governmental consultations to other ministries. For example, engage counterparts in **gender and women's ministries** to participate in OGP co-creation and implementation conversations. Governmental gender advisors in other ministries may also be valuable resources on key policy issues.
- Invite **gender organizations and women's networks** to participate in multi-stakeholder forums and consult with them on specific commitments that may affect and support their communities' priorities. Remember that one woman does not represent all women, so consider including a diverse group of women and gender advocates across age, race, ethnicity, education, region, and experience. Other actions to make forums and consultations more inclusive may include taking into account hidden costs like childcare, as well as the time, day and location of the forum so that is accessible for all.

Mainstream Gender into Commitments

Gender analysis of Action Plans

Commit to conducting a gender analysis of your entire action plan to help identify where and how policies, practices, or actions may differently impact men, women, boys, girls and other gender groups. This can be done for action plans that are currently being drafted as well as those that are being implemented to assess what gaps exist and identify steps to make the action plans more gender-responsive. Gender analyses can be conducted in partnership with local, national, or international organizations; women's ministries or governmental gender advisors; or independent consultants.

For example:

- Prior to finalizing their action plan, the Government of **Canada** conducted a [GBA+ review](#) of all draft commitments to ensure the full plan took into consideration the needs of women and other equity-seeking groups. Interested in conducting your own GBA+ analysis? OGP and the Government of Canada will host a webinar in March and for a forthcoming tool to support your analysis.



Include a gender perspective within a specific commitment

Public procurement. Budgeting and fiscal transparency. Natural resources governance. Justice. Access to information. Many core OGP themes can be enhanced by considering how they affect men, women, boys, and girls differently and then building specific outreach and support efforts around those communities. OGP partners have started to look at how these policy issues and practices can better include women and gender throughout, and there is considerable room to partner with national and international organizations to determine which of your action plans commitments may particularly benefit from a gender perspective.

For example:

- Public service delivery commitments, including health and education-focused policies, can be improved by considering gender impacts. In **Nigeria**, civil society organizations are using OGP to monitor whether both young boys and girls are receiving school feeding programs. For other examples of bringing a gender perspective to service delivery, consider those from outside of OGP such as the government of [Sweden](#) who assessed its education policy to understand gender imbalance in teacher recruitment and retention.
- As part of a participatory budgeting commitment, **Côte d'Ivoire** committed through OGP to engage women's groups as a target community for participatory budgeting to help set priorities and fund public services that better respond to their needs. This is one of many ways to incorporate a gender perspective in budgeting processes, from conducting gender-responsive budget analyses to address inequality in specific budgets to using gender costing exercises to ensure equity and appropriate resourcing during budget creation.
- OGP has a number of extractive and natural resources commitments, but none of those currently include a specific effort to engage women and girls in the creation or implementation of the commitment. To build on other national interventions, consider those such as the government of **Mongolia** who created a gender equality strategy for the mining sector beginning with review of laws and policies, or **Malawi** who committed in their [EITI](#) workplan to submit reports with gender-disaggregated data.

Gender-disaggregated data

Governments and organizations can identify opportunities to collect gender-specific data from OGP commitments, and analyze that data to inform and improve policies and practices.

- Through its OGP commitment, **Bojonegoro, Indonesia** committed to training women in communities to monitor gender-disaggregated data on services. To address the absence of basic social, economic, and demographic data available to support local public services and development programs, Bojonegoro developed the Dasa Wisma open data application, building on a women-led community movement to collect previously under-collected village-level demographic and service data.

Design Commitments that Advance Gender-Focused Priorities

The Open Government Partnership offers an action platform to advance national and local gender equality and women's empowerment objectives, whether those are focused on reducing



gender-based violence, increasing access to reproductive health services, or improving the political voice and agency of women and girls. OGP also provides an opportunity to showcase global leadership by creating concrete national commitments around global agreements such as the Convention to End Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as international pledges like those in the [Charlevoix G7 Summit Communique](#) on women and girls education and economic participation, the [W20 policy recommendations](#), or the joint [civil society G20 Statement](#) on gender and corruption. In partnership with government actors responsible for women and gender-centered policies, consider co-creating a commitment that uses transparency to address systemic gender issues and policy gaps.

- **Germany** used its action plan to conduct regular monitoring on the status of women and men in leadership positions in private sector bodies and the public service. This will serve as a framework for implementing the national Act on Equal Participation of Women and Men in Leadership Positions in the Private and the Public Sector.
- **Buenos Aires** has championed the inclusion of women and other gender minorities' needs through its action plans. In one commitment, the city of Buenos Aires created an online platform called #DÓNDE that details locations and services of local clinics and health centers to help close the gap in access to reproductive health services. Importantly, the platform also provides feedback opportunities for citizens to report back on the quality of the services received at those centers.
- In **Sri Lanka**, the government used the OGP process as the implementing body for targets under CEDAW, including a targeted effort to increase women's political participation through enacting a 25% mandatory quota for women in public office within local governments.
- **Brazil** developed a unified information system for data on violence against women based on the 2006 Maria da Penha Law on Domestic and Family Violence. This led to the launch of the "Woman, to Live without Violence" program, which used the Dial 180 system to route complaints about domestic violence to the public-security authorities and inform the public prosecutor's office in each state.

If your government or organization would like to speak further about a gender action you can take, please contact Allison Merchant, OGP's Senior Gender Advisor, at gender@opengovpartnership.org or your OGP Support Unit regional representative. This document is also available on the [OGP website](#) for your convenience.



Menu of Suggested Actions to Strengthen Democracy and Protecting Civic Rights in the Digital Era

For government to be responsive, and inclusive, a robust enabling environment that protects fundamental rights and democratic institutions is critical. However, there are various factors that are changing and challenging democratic processes. One of them is the evolving role of digital media, which has profoundly impacted the relationship between governments and the citizens they serve. In many ways it has empowered citizens with more information and enabled governments to improve transparency and accountability. Yet, challenges including fake news, biased systems and the growing assaults on privacy are gradually contributing to the erosion of democratic spaces, in addition to persisting threats to democracy such as attacks on civil society and media. As a result, countries need to identify policy tools that can help protect against these complex challenges. This note identifies some approaches that OGP members can adopt to address threats to democratic rights and institutions, including from misuse of digital technologies. The OGP Steering Committee, led by Co-Chairs the Government of Canada and Nathaniel Heller, are committed to delivering and supporting others to deliver on this collective agenda.

The OGP Global Summit as an Action-Forcing Moment

OGP and the upcoming global summit will provide a platform to inspire collective action to protect democratic participation and create meaningful impact. The Summit will bring together a group of governments and stakeholders keen to drive forward both international and domestic action to strengthen democratic institutions, and protect against digital threats to democratic institutions. Actions could include:

- **Lead by example on inclusive co-creation models**
OGP members, especially those on the Steering Committee, have the responsibility to lead by example by institutionalizing OGP multistakeholder forums that protect the space for civil society to participate in policy making. At the end of 2018, 63 OGP members had Multistakeholder Forums that anchor their domestic OGP processes. OGP members are also encouraged to make progress on the [OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards](#), which provide a set of milestones to deepen government-civil society engagement in OGP.
- **Advance OGP commitments that protect democratic institutions and rights**
OGP action plans provide a unique platform for governments to work closely with civil society to translate policy ideas into concrete action that strengthens democratic institutions and protects citizens' rights in the face of digital transformation. OGP could also complement efforts made at other multilateral forums like the OECD, the Community of Democracies, the Freedom Online Coalition, the G7, and more, by linking these to the domestic co-creation process and informing follow up action. Civic space commitments in action plans can ensure that conversations around protecting democracy are not just limited to tweets and treaties but address the gap between commitment and delivery, and involve civil society. Please refer to the menu of commitments in the appendix below for commitment ideas that you could adapt to your country context.

By taking these actions you could be part of an **emerging coalition of OGP members leading a global conversation** to promote democratic rights and protect dialogue in this evolving digital era. Signal an action you would like to announce and join a group of OGP countries who will meet at



the Summit to discuss how to advance these issues through global diplomacy, policy innovation and financial support.

Menu of Suggested Commitments for Your OGP Action Plan

Several OGP countries have had to tackle emerging issues around misuse of digital media and the related adverse impacts on democratic participation, including, surveillance, disinformation, misinformation (“fake news”), privacy invasion, hate speech, targeted attacks. At the same time, civic rights and the space for dialogue need to be defended against threats. Some areas that could benefit from commitments include:

- **Data rights and privacy:** There are important standards that are emerging to inform national and regional policies around data rights, use, storage and broader implications on privacy (e.g., the European Union’s [General Data Protection Regulation](#) or the Council of Europe’s [Convention 108+](#), recently updated to include guidelines on data protection). In OGP, Australia, Denmark and Portugal are among the countries that have made commitments related to this issue.
 - *OGP example:* Australia committed to “build and maintain public trust to address concerns about data sharing and release,” including to “improve privacy and personal information protections in using and sharing data.”
 - *Sample commitment:* Harmonize data privacy laws across levels of government in your country (regional treaties where applicable, federal, provincial/state). Develop data protection legal frameworks that take into account specific conditions for data processing and disclosure of personal data, in addition to giving rights to the individual to control what is accessed, stored and shared, applicable to both businesses and public bodies.
- **Internet access and control:** Making internet access inclusive (addressing barriers to affordability and accessibility for disadvantaged communities and geographically isolated regions), but also setting up robust frameworks to prevent manipulation, digital government surveillance, preserve net neutrality (e.g., [EU net neutrality rules](#)), as well as safeguard against internet censorship and arbitrary shutdowns. With regard to “internet censorship,” any commitment needs to ensure that content-based restrictions meet international standards for freedom of expression. Countries that have OGP commitments related to these topics include Côte d’Ivoire, Italy, Latvia, among others.
 - *OGP example:* Latvia committed to take forward the development of e-services and open public internet access points to promote the use of e-services thus reducing costs and administrative burdens for citizens, companies and public administration. Italy adopted a commitment on spreading its Charter of Internet Rights. These measures, approved by its legislature in 2015, included efforts such as encouraging the public and officials to recognise the links between on and offline rights, including basic civil liberties such as assembly.
 - *Sample commitment:* In accordance with international standards for the freedom of expression, establish legal frameworks that specify rights of users to access/use/receive content over the internet, and safeguard or specify conditions under which internet service providers or other private actors can control or price internet content/ applications/protocol.



- **Responsible and ethical AI and open algorithms:** While this is an emerging topic, it is one that a lot of OGP countries have begun initiating policy conversations on, especially around ethics of AI, how AI can be made more open and human-centric, how to manage impact. Discussions among the Digital 9 countries (membership of OGP is one of the core criteria of the D9 charter), G7 discussions, and bilateral agreements such as between [Canada and France](#) provide a good starting point for this discussion. In OGP, countries that have similar commitments include France, the Netherlands, and New Zealand.

 - *OGP example:* France committed to “improving transparency of public algorithms and source codes,” more specifically to “develop a methodology in collaboration with administrations for opening algorithms and codes contained in their information systems.” Canada committed to develop a government directive “to set rules on how departments can use AI ethically to make decisions.”
 - *Sample commitment:* Proactively design consultation mechanisms for public feedback into design and implementation of AI strategies. Implementation of these strategies should not violate any human rights principles or international conventions.

- **Tackling challenges of disinformation and “fake news”:** Various jurisdictions have begun exploring policy measures that could help tackle disinformation and misuse of social media platforms online. For example, the UK parliamentary committee’s [report](#) on disinformation and ‘fake news’ calls for policy measures such as mandating social media companies take down known sources of harmful content, including proven sources of disinformation. That said, experts on civic rights frameworks such as ICNL emphasize that while disinformation / fake news is a problem, the legal framework must ensure that the government is not the arbiter of what is the “truth.” Content should be independently reviewed and should not be taken down unless the government meets the three requirements for restrictions on the freedom of expression.

 - *Sample commitment:* OGP members mandate social media companies to adhere to codes of conduct that require them to report the misuse or manipulation of their platforms. These companies should work closely with academics, civil society, governments to identify and review malicious content.

- **Protecting freedom of association:** Analysis of international indicators and OGP commitments by OGP’s forthcoming flagship report shows that 40 percent of OGP members have noteworthy challenges around freedom of association and that over half of all members (56 percent) have the potential to ambitiously adopt freedom of association commitments in their action plans. In fact, across OGP members, almost two-thirds, enable civil society organizations to operate without registration restrictions. Countries with commitments to improve enabling environment for civil society include Bulgaria, El Salvador, Kenya, Latvia, Ukraine, among others.

 - *OGP example:* Canada included a commitment to improve their information flows on the regulation of charities in a timely manner, and to engage them to ensure rules around tax and other revenue activities are fair, open, and easily accessible.
 - *Sample commitment:* Streamline the process of registration for CSOs to make it easier for CSOs to operate without administrative burdens, and make access to public funding equitable for all CSOs. Develop and implement OGP commitments - and transparency reforms more broadly - using the “do-no-harm” principle, taking steps to ensure that transparency measures are in line with international



frameworks and inadvertently do not adversely impact space for civil society to operate.

- **Protecting freedom of assembly:** Similarly, analysis by OGP’s forthcoming flagship report has found that between a third and half of OGP countries have notable interference with the right to peaceful assembly.
 - *OGP example:* Ukraine developed a draft law titled “On Procedure of Organising and Conducting Peaceful Events”. Various ministries - from Justice and the Interior as well as the Cabinet of Ministers - were actively engaged in the process.
 - *Sample commitment:* Any commitment in this area should include reference to international legal standards for assembly. One example is to develop open and streamlined processes for proactive dissemination of rules and restrictions on peaceful assembly, training of law enforcement personnel on interfacing with crowds and protestors, among other things.
- **Protecting freedom of expression:** Similarly, the Freedom House report finds that freedom of expression, including press freedom, has declined each year over the past 13 years, with sharper drops since 2012. Journalists are not only being directly attacked by authoritarian regimes, libel laws are increasingly being misused to target them.
 - *OGP example:* Mongolia committed to amend the Law on National Broadcasting to meet international standards, to help ensure political and financial independence of the media. The commitments also sought to consult the media on the current limitations in the legal environment for free press. Croatia committed to strengthen protection mechanisms for journalists who speak out against censorship in their editorial offices.
 - *Sample commitment:* Create policy tools that safeguard public news channels from domestic or foreign interference by ensuring legal autonomy, provide independent access to funding through public funding mechanisms like subsidies or tax relief.
- **Defending human rights defenders:** OGP IRM data shows that 11 countries have made commitments to strengthen human rights institutions, implementation of human rights conventions, and safeguarding activists and journalists from attacks. Countries with commitments related to this include Colombia, Jordan, Mexico, Montenegro.
 - *OGP example:* Ireland committed to build a culture of whistleblowing and adopt national legislation to protect people speaking up. Uruguay, in its third action plan, is moving towards an open data approach to look at access to information, including human rights violations under the military dictatorship.
 - *Sample commitment:* Implement strong whistleblower protection laws, frameworks or programs that protect human rights defenders. OGP members could also consider institutionalizing funds to support human rights defenders and activists (E.g. the [EU Human Rights Defenders Mechanism](#)). Other ideas include mandating collection of official open data (e.g., reports filed on killings, harassment, other forms of violence against civil society actors and the number of cases investigated and prosecuted).
- **Improve civil society-state relations:** Establish consultative strategies involving CSOs for the development of the CSO sector and for CSO-government relations.



- *OGP example:* Macedonia had eight commitments over three action plans on co-creating the strategy that would govern cooperation with civil society. One of the most recent commitments highlights the role of non-governmental stakeholders in supporting government efforts around delivery of public services.
- *Sample commitment:* Involve civil society in co-creating a cross-agency strategy; creating consultation processes for different policy areas to involve civil society groups with thematic expertise.
- **Cross-cutting areas of action:**
 - *Effective oversight and redress mechanisms* - create independent bodies, vested with the necessary mandate and resources, that can provide proactive redress of violations such as offices of ombudsman or such as the EU’s GDPR, which allows citizens (and organizations acting on behalf of citizens) to file complaints in the event they believe their rights under the GDPR have been violated.
 - *Cross-regional diplomatic action* - given the translational flows of information and functioning of corporate entities, cross-country initiatives may be more effective in tackling digital threats to democracy. For example, the G7’s Rapid Response Mechanism against election meddling and disinformation.
 - *“Do no Harm” test* - In some cases, transparency efforts have unintentional consequences on civic space such as placing undue burden on the functioning of civil society through onerous reporting targeting specific groups or lobbying regulation that restricts the space for advocacy. To avoid this, ensure that any commitments that relates to functioning of civil society is analyzed by experts on international and domestic non-profit, human rights laws and frameworks.

Related OGP Resources

- OGP’s 2018 paper on civic space - [The Right Tools for the Right Job](#)
- ICNL’s [guide](#) on commitments to improve the enabling environment for civil society organizations
- OGP’s forthcoming Flagship report

Partners Who Can Support Commitment Development and Implementation

For any support for the development or implementation of commitments, please reach out to the OGP Support Unit (Please write to Tonu Basu at tonu.basu@opengovpartnership.org). OGP’s partners and other expert organizations (a few listed below) can also provide advice and implementation support.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| ● Access Now | ● Oxfam | ● Human Rights Watch |
| ● Article 19 | ● Oxford Internet Institute | ● The Web Foundation |
| ● CIVICUS | ● The Atlantic Council | |
| ● ICNL | | |
| ● Luminate | | |
| ● Open Data Charter | | |



Key Programmatic Updates for the Steering Committee

Non-decisional brief updates and current state of play of key programs



OGP's Country Contribution Policy

A Briefing Update for the Steering Committee
(As of 14 May 2019)

Overview

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) has requested contributions from each of its members since the OGP Steering Committee resolved on May 4, 2014 that all countries would be expected to contribute to the partnership's budget. The resolution text read:

The Steering Committee resolves that, starting in 2015, the Partnership will expect all participating governments to contribute towards OGP's budget. The Steering Committee authorizes the Support Unit to communicate the decisions outlined below to the broader OGP community. The Steering Committee also offers the Support Unit all needed assistance to help secure government contributions, both by paying their own contributions on time and in full, as well as conducting diplomatic outreach to other governments as needed.

As part of the resolution, the Steering Committee validated an invoice amount model based on World Bank Income Level:

Income Level	Minimum Contribution	Recommend Contribution
Low income	\$10,000	\$25,000
Lower middle income	\$25,000	\$50,000
Upper middle income	\$50,000	\$100,000
High income	\$100,000	\$200,000

Since 2015 a request for contributions has been made annually by ministerial letter, and invoice. Since 2018, the packet of materials has also included information on paying through the OGP Multi-Donor Trust Fund, which all members have the option to do if it is logistically easier.

Breakdown of Contributions 2017-2018

The following OGP members have not made an OGP contribution for the past two years:

Countries in non-payment for both 2017 and 2018					
Albania	Costa Rica	Greece	Kyrgyz Republic	Moldova	Sri Lanka
Brazil	Czech Republic	Guatemala	Latvia	Mongolia	Sweden
Burkina Faso	Dominican Republic	Honduras	Liberia	Nigeria	Tunisia
Cabo Verde	El Salvador	Jamaica	Lithuania	Papua New Guinea	Ukraine
Chile	Finland	Jordan	Luxembourg	Sierra Leone	Uruguay
Colombia	Ghana	Kenya	Malawi	Slovak Republic/ Slovakia	

Call to Action

- Contributions from participating countries are approximately one quarter to one third of the Support Unit's annual revenue.
- As completely unrestricted funding, these contributions allow the Support Unit to respond to developing issues or shifting contexts. It also allows for support to countries and locals outside our donor's priorities.
- The contributions pay for country and local support staff, IRM staff and researchers, travel, and events like peer exchanges and thematic workshops that support and enrich country processes. For example, with beneficial ownership as an emerging theme across the partnership, in 2017 and 2018 the Support Unit hosted sub-regional thematic workshops in Europe and West Africa.
- In 2018, 35 countries (44%) contributed to the Support Unit with a total of \$2.8 million. If every country paid the minimum requested amount, the total would have been almost twice that amount.
- As stewards of the partnership, we call on all Steering Committee members to lead by example, and convey the importance of country contributions in the numerous bilaterals to take place around the Ottawa Global Summit.



Criteria and Standards Cases

A Briefing Update for the Steering Committee (As of 14 May 2019)

Countries Under Procedural Review

A country's participation in OGP may be reviewed by the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee (C&S) if it acts contrary to OGP process. Additional information about the Procedural Review and all details regarding the following cases can be found here: <http://bit.ly/2W36aEs>. The following three countries acted contrary to OGP processes by failing to deliver an OGP action plan for two consecutive cycles since 2017, and have therefore been placed under Procedural Review by the C&S since January 2019. The current state of play in each country, to the knowledge of the Support Unit, is as follows:

I. Jamaica

- The Support Unit conducted a visit the week of May 6 to engage with different stakeholders, which included hosting a workshop to activate civil society held on May 9th. A civil society coalition is emerging with leadership from Slashroots, Jamaicans for Justice, and the Jamaican Environmental Trust.
- With funding from the World Bank, the Ministry of Finance has contracted researchers from the Caribbean Policy Research Institute (CAPRI) to conduct the consultation process. The Inter-American Development Bank has also expressed interest to financially support the consultation and implementation processes.
- The Support Unit is awaiting confirmation regarding the national OGP process being moved from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Energy and Technology where our ministerial contact, the Honorable Fayval Williams, is based. According to partners on the ground, this change signals a renewed commitment from the Jamaican government.
- Jamaica must submit an Action Plan in 2019 to avoid being designated as inactive.

II. Luxembourg

- On 29 April, the Government shared an advanced draft of their action plan with the OGP Support Unit. This plan has also been shared for approval with government agencies responsible for commitments, and will be shared soon with the multi-stakeholder group for their approval.
- Commitments in the draft action plan focus on access to information, climate, open data, civic tech and civic space. It is expected that the plan will be delivered before summer.
- Luxembourg must submit an action plan in 2019 to avoid being designated as inactive.

III. Pakistan

- A draft action plan was developed in 2017 through a consultation process coordinated by the Ministry of Finance as the lead ministry for OGP. The process came to a stall in November 2017 due to a political crisis that continued in the lead up to elections in May 2018, which brought in a new administration.
- Since the transition, the OGP Support Unit has reached out several times directly to Ministers and senior officials in the new government, and indirectly through in-country partners.

- In April 2019, the Support Unit met with Pakistan’s Ambassador to the United States, and the Finance Minister, and also communicated with a Senior Advisor to the Prime Minister, encouraging them to resume the process for finalizing their action plan. Confirmation is awaited on any domestic follow up from these discussions.
- Pakistan must submit an Action Plan in 2019 to avoid being designated as inactive.

Inactive Countries

When a country fails to address the problems that lead to the review process, the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee may recommend to the full Steering Committee that the country be designated as inactive. The following two countries have been designated as inactive by resolution of the OGP Steering Committee on 5 December 2018:

I. **Bosnia & Herzegovina’s (BiH)**

2016 decision to participate in OGP mandates that an Advisory Committee for OGP be established to advise and coordinate the promotion of transparency and openness in public administration, and citizen engagement in the design of public policy. The Advisory Committee would also be responsible for the coordination of the development of BiH’s OGP action plan. The decision of the Council of Ministers mandated the Advisory Committee to be composed of representatives from State and Entity levels of government, as well as civil society. The four government institutions are: The Central Government (Council of Ministers), the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brcko District, and the Republika Srpska.

The Advisory Committee was fully constituted for the first time in May 2018 since joining OGP, following the appointment of the Republika Srpska representative to the Advisory Committee. This enabled the Advisory Committee to officially begin the co-creation of BiH’s first OGP action plan in accordance with the official decision of the Council of Ministers, which would consist of four plans developed by each of the four government institutions. Since then, all institutions began the co-creation process in cooperation with civil society and drafted action plans, which were put forward for public consultation with the exception of the Republika Srpska. Despite the process being stalled due to parliamentary elections in October 2018, all institutions resumed activities to finalize their action plans, again with the exception of the Republika Srpska.

On 16 April 2019, the Advisory Committee met to discuss next steps in light of the delay from the Republika Srpska and proposed submitting the Central Government’s plan as BiH first OGP action plan without the remaining plans from the other three institutions. Given that this approach differs from the formal initial decision, the Advisory Committee is discussing internal procedural steps to endorse this approach. Consequently, it is expected that the Government will deliver the Action Plan within the deadline of 5 December 2019 as outlined in the inactivity decision of the OGP Steering Committee. See the December 2018 Steering Committee resolution regarding the status of the Government of BiH participation in OGP here: <http://bit.ly/2VRle8r>

II. **Trinidad and Tobago**

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has been found acting contrary to OGP processes due to failure to deliver an action plan for four consecutive action plan cycles since 2016. Consequently, Trinidad and Tobago’s participation in OGP has been under review by the Criteria and Standards (C&S) Subcommittee since November 2016 and on 5 December 2018, the OGP Steering Committee unanimously designated Trinidad and Tobago inactive.



On 4 December 2019, the government of Trinidad and Tobago delivered a letter to the Support Unit indicating their intent to re-engage in OGP, signed by Joan Mendez, Permanent Secretary. Several attempts to maintain communication with the government of Trinidad of Tobago have taken place, including over half a dozen emails in the first quarter of 2019. The government Point of Contact has informed that they are reviewing their last action plan (2014-2016) before starting new plan. No further communication or opportunities to re-engage have been received despite numerous Support Unit attempts.

If Trinidad and Tobago fails to deliver a new action plan or to engage and determine a work plan with C&S by 5 December 2019, the C&S will recommend that the Steering Committee removes Trinidad and Tobago from the list of participating countries. See the December 2018 Steering Committee resolution regarding the status of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago's participation in OGP here: <http://bit.ly/2LD62rC>

Response Policy Cases

The OGP Response Policy, formally known as “Policy on Upholding the Values and Principles of OGP”, aims to maintain OGP’s credibility - and safeguard its long-term future - by helping to ensure that all Participating Countries uphold OGP values and principles, as expressed in OGP’s foundational documents. Details about the Response Policy and all details regarding the following cases can be found here: <http://bit.ly/2vUPGQo>. There are currently two active Response Policy cases:

I. Azerbaijan

Azerbaijan is currently suspended from OGP pursuant to Steering Committee resolutions on inactivity passed in May 2016, June 2017, and December 2018, following the OGP Response Policy case that was triggered by a Letter of Concern received by civil society groups in March 2015 citing concerns around closing civic space, and validated by the Criteria and Standards (C&S) subcommittee. The December 2018 resolution recognized the positive steps taken by the government of Azerbaijan but found that core issues remain unresolved and that Azerbaijan had not made systematic changes or reforms that would thoroughly address the most recent recommendations made by C&S in September 2017. The resolution extended the suspension status of Azerbaijan for a full action plan cycle, pending the completion of the following milestones, with terms of the resolution contingent on timely achievement of each:

- i. *By 1 March 2019, prepare a roadmap for the development of the 2019-21 OGP action plan in line with at least the minimum requirements outlined in the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards. This roadmap shall also include a timeline of key meetings for the OGP Forum, and the process for involving other stakeholders outside of the OGP Forum to participate in the co-creation of the action plan. This roadmap shall be published by the government, and submitted to the C&S co-chairs by the established deadline.*
- ii. *By 1 June 2019, appoint a high-level government representative (ministerial level or above) to lead the OGP process in Azerbaijan.*
- iii. *By 1 June 2019, begin the development of an OGP action plan through an inclusive process that engages a wide array of actors beyond the OGP Forum, and includes reforms to address the civic space constraints highlighted in the updated recommendations and other domestic priorities.*
- iv. *By 31 December 2019, complete, adopt and submit to the Support Unit a finalized OGP action plan.*

- v. *By 31 August 2021, complete implementation of the OGP action plan. This action plan will be assessed by the IRM.*

The first two milestones have been met, with the roadmap for national action plan development submitted on 1 March 2019, and Vusal Huseynov, Chief of State Migration Service confirmed as the high-level government representative. Concerns were raised by some civil society groups around the extent to which their recommendations were incorporated into the roadmap. These concerns relate to proposals for reforms to be covered in the action plan which are not strictly within the requirements of a roadmap. However, given the relevance of the concerns for the remaining milestones, the Support Unit will continue to monitor progress and regularly update C&S. See the full December 2018 Steering Committee resolution here: <http://bit.ly/2VDsd5C>

II. Mexico

On 16 July 2018, the core group of civil society organizations that used to form part of the secretariat tasked to coordinate the OGP agenda in Mexico submitted a Letter of Concern with respect to the case of digital surveillance under the OGP Response Policy. After an initial review of the concern (Section III.A.2), the Support Unit concluded that it met the eligibility criteria to trigger a Response Policy inquiry, and the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee (C&S) Co-Chairs began leading a review of the merits of the concern in coordination with the Support Unit.

The Mexican government issued two official responses to the Letter of Concern. The first was sent on 20 November 2018, by Dr. Eber Omar Betanzos Torres, on behalf of the government of then-President Enrique Peña Nieto. The second response was issued on 31 January 2019 by Dr. Irma Eréndira Sandoval Ballesteros, on behalf of the government of President Andrés Manuel López Obrador

After completing the review process, the C&S acknowledged that the Concern is relevant to the values and principles of OGP and that the evidence submitted by the filers supports the veracity of the Concern. Furthermore, in view of the acknowledgement on behalf of Mexican civil society and government representatives regarding the positive role that OGP has played in this issue, the C&S recognized that continued engagement on behalf of OGP is both warranted and welcomed by domestic actors.

On March 5 2019, the new administration represented by the Ministry of Public Affairs, the National Institute for Transparency, Access to Information and Protection of Personal Data (INAI, in Spanish) and the Civil Society Core Group (filers of the letter of concern) formed a new figure named the Coordination Committee and resumed the national open government process in Mexico. The Coordination Committee has begun a process to address the issues raised and agreed on a roadmap to tackle illegal state surveillance in Mexico. In view of findings of the review report and acknowledging the timeline of domestic efforts taking place, the C&S resolved to maintain this Response Policy case active through the conclusion of activities included in the roadmap established to address the challenges that originally led to the filing of the Concern. The C&S will, in coordination with representatives of the Coordination Committee, assess the progress made by the Government of Mexico through 31 August 2019 and determine if further intervention on behalf of OGP, if any, is warranted in line with the policies and procedures outlined in the Response Policy. See the full May 2019 C&S report on the Mexico Response Policy case here: <http://bit.ly/2LGAHc7>.

OGP Multi Donor Trust Fund

A Briefing Update for the Steering Committee

Overview

Working collectively with development partners, OGP and the World Bank established a dedicated vehicle for donor support to domestic and global OGP processes. The OGP Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) was launched in 2018 to support participating country and local members in co-creating and implementing OGP commitments and action plans. Additionally, MDTF also supports the research and thematic exchange agenda. The OGP MDTF enables donor assistance through three windows: 1) Country Support; 2) Cross-Country Research, Learning and Thematic Priorities; 3) contributions to the OGP Support Unit.

This document provides a brief overview of the activities completed to date and upcoming calls for expressions of interest to come in 2019.

Window 1 - Country Support

Support for Co-Creation and Participation 2019 (Window 1.2)

The second round of funding to facilitate OGP Co-creation and Participation was launched in January for countries and locals seeking assistance to develop their OGP action plan this year. The duration of the award is one year with a maximum amount of USD 60,000 each. Following a two-step selection process and an assessment based on objective evaluation criteria, the Implementation Team has recommended the MDTF Council to endorse six organizations from six countries, to be announced before the Summit.

Support for Co-Creation and Participation 2018 (Window 1.2)

The first round of co-creation awards supported five national and four local members (Armenia, Kenya, Paraguay, Serbia, Tunisia, Bojonegoro, Elgeyo Marakwet County, São Paulo and Sekondi-Takoradi) to strengthen the ambition and ownership of their action plans. As the 2018 co-creation awards draws to a close, the MDTF is bringing together the awardees and government counterparts to participate in a workshop at the Ottawa summit to reflect on their experiences, gather actionable insights for the broader OGP community working on co-creation, and provide feedback on how to improve future MDTF efforts.

Support for Implementation of Commitments 2019 (Window 1.1)

The MDTF received and is currently reviewing 10 Expressions of Interest from 10 different countries seeking a grant to support implementation of a commitment in their action plan. Out of the 20 countries and locals eligible, 10 submitted an EOI covering six thematic areas. The OGP MDTF has allocated funding to support up to five recipient-executed grants each with an amount of \$150,000 - \$400,000. The grants will be implemented over the course of two to three years.

Window 2 - Cross-Country Research, Learning and Thematic Priorities

Support for Research 2019 (Window 2.1)

The MDTF research window supports a two-track approach:

- Track 1 looks at the global picture:
- For Track 1 we are developing 2 programs with partners: a) Research on the Effectiveness of Open Government Reforms in the Context of Limited Media Freedom, and b) Open

Regulatory Governance. Track 2 conducts country-level studies that increase the evidence of impact of open government reforms.

- For Track 2, we are launching a request for expression of interest for country-level research on public participation in open government reforms. Track 2 EOIs will open for submission prior to the Summit.

Advancing OGP’s Thematic Priorities 2019 (Window 2.2)

Earlier this year, we invited 19 organizations with the relevant experience to submit a technical and financial proposal covering 12 themes. The duration of each award is two years with a maximum of USD 200,000 each. Following an evaluation of the proposals, the MDTF Implementation Team recommended seven organizations working on seven different themes for the Council’s endorsement, to be announced prior to the Summit.

What to Look for at the Summit

Time	Event	Description
Tuesday, May 28 th , 6:30PM - 8:00PM at the Westin	OGP MDTF Reception	Reception for Council Members and all MDTF awardees.
Thursday, May 30 th , 3:10PM - 4:30PM at the Shaw Centre, Room 202	MDTF Panel Discussion	A look at the MDTF one year after its launch.



Overview of OGP Research and Publications

What to Know About OGP

- **[The Skeptic's Guide to Open Government](#):** Provides an overview of the impact of opening government in five areas: 1) public service delivery 2) business opportunities 3) government efficiency and cost saving 4) prevention of corruption and 5) trust in government. Each chapter draws from empirical evidence, and highlights reformers who are opening government in innovative ways.
- **[OGP Handbook Rules + Guidance for Participants](#):** Provides OGP participants information about OGP in different areas. Among other things, it includes the roles and responsibilities of domestic actors; action plan cycle with updated calendar, including new IRM reporting structure and deadlines, and general guidance on how to develop an action plan and Self-Assessment Reports
- **[OGP Participation and Co-Creation Toolkit](#):** This toolkit shares good practices on creating opportunities for dialogue and participation to help government and civil society partners improve the quality and output of the co-creation processes across OGP.
- **[Trust the Fight to Win it Back](#):** A publication reflecting on the sources of distrust. A compilation of the work and effort of courageous reformers who talk about compelling solutions to build and renew citizens trust in government.

Are OGP Reforms Making a Difference?

- **[Thematic Fact Sheets](#):** The updated series of factsheets uses data from March 2019 to provide brief analyses and recommendations on OGP reforms in 10 policy areas. The themes highlighted this year are health, education, water, natural resources, gender, beneficial ownership, open contracting, open budgets, right to information, and access to justice.
- **[Early Results of OGP Commitments](#):** Case studies on four commitments that have significantly changed government policy or practice and are seeing uptake from citizens. Countries profiled are: Philippines, Paraguay, United Kingdom and United States.
- **[Star Reforms](#):** Highlights 12 exemplary commitments from 2015 and 2016 action plans, focusing on civic participation. Countries and locals profiled are: Austin, Buenos Aires, Colombia, France, Madrid, Liberia, Ukraine, Kenya, Israel, Georgia, Sri Lanka, Mongolia, New Zealand and Uruguay.
- **[Stories](#):** Our new stories portal showcases bite-sized stories of how OGP commitments are making a difference.

What's Coming Up in OGP?

- **2019 OGP Academy:** The third OGP Academy will be held at Carleton University in Ottawa as a partner event to the OGP Summit. Visiting academics and students will give presentations on nearly 40 papers, presenting the latest research related to topics of inclusion, participation, and impact in open government. An ongoing series of reflective blogs will be written in the months following the summit, highlighting opportunities to put the conclusions drawn from the research into practice i.e. how the research can be a tool for strengthening open government reforms.



- **Learning to Co-create: Highlights and lessons from the 2018 co-creation awards -** Following the first round of Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) co-creation awards, this publication brings together highlights of how MDTF supported efforts enhanced co-creation, and draws lessons for the broader OGP community and future efforts. The MDTF provided support for co-creation through 9 awards to 5 national and 4 local OGP members (Armenia, Kenya, Paraguay, Serbia, Tunisia, Bojonegoro, Elgeyo Marakwet, Sekondi-Takoradi and Sao Paulo). The reporting focuses on summarizing the activities and outputs supported by MDTF awards for each member, and gleans insights on the different areas to enhance co-creation, featuring approaches and tools used by awardees.
- **Strengthening Open Government: New Commitments, New Approaches (Emerging Policy Areas in 2018 Action Plans):** The newest iteration of the What's in the Action Plan publication showcases a selection of commitments from 2018 action plans from 5 key thematic areas - Gender and Inclusion, Access to Justice, Anti-corruption, Civic Engagement, and Public Services. It also highlights some of the first commitments to receive enhanced co-creation support powered by the OGP Multi-Donor Trust Fund.
- **SDG16+ Publication:** Upcoming publication on sustainable development goals focusing on Goal 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions. The publication is using the Goal 16 Plus framework outlined by [Pathfinders](#) that includes many parts of other Goals contributing to Goal 16. It will explain the OGP 's value proposition at the country, policy and global level as key platform for Goal 16 Plus implementation. Featured examples will show impact and progress towards the SDGs.
- **Do we trust democracy? A future agenda for Europe:** This publication looks at the state of democracy in Europe and the erosion of public trust in governments. OGP collaborated with authors from European Union (EU) members states, including leading decision-makers, civil society activists, academics, migrants, youth leaders to share recommendations for a more democratic European Union.
- **OGP Global Report: Democracy Beyond the Ballot Box:** A Comprehensive assessment of the state of open government. The report provides a thorough and honest assessment of progress made by OGP member countries over the first seven years of the partnership.



Break the Roles Campaign Overview

Overview

In 2019, Open Government Partnership (OGP) is launching *Break the Roles*, a multifaceted campaign designed to bring awareness to the underrepresentation of women's voices in OGP and drive the community towards more inclusive commitments. The goal of the campaign is to encourage at least 30 percent of OGP members to take a concrete action to advance gender equality and inclusion through open government by the end of 2019.

Why We Must Do This

Opening up government is an underexplored method for accelerating gender equality and closing critical gaps in information, access, and participation. And, when women and girls are absent from open government, so are the knowledge and skills that limit the potential of ambitious reforms impacting daily lives. However, only [82 OGP commitments include women or gender](#) – representing less than [2 percent of the nearly 4,000 commitments](#) made by national and local governments. This is simply not good enough. At the current rate of progress, it will take 108 years to close the global gender gap in political power and 202 years to close the global wage gap, according to the World Economic Forum. While there have been marginal gains in participation for women in government policy and decision-making, there are still entrenched power asymmetries and repressive social norms that prevent the realization of additional gains, and women remain at the margins. With *Break the Roles*, we are calling on OGP partners to be intentional, strategic, and ambitious in meaningfully engaging with women and gender perspective in the co-creation and implementation of actions plans.

Who's Involved

This campaign will bring together OGP governments and partners in civil society with the goal of promoting gender inclusion and equality. *Break the Roles* will leverage government leaders, civil society, OGP ambassadors and Steering Committee members to disseminate key messages.

Implementation

Digital Activation

The *Break the Roles* campaign leverages the voices of influential stakeholders to tell the story of why women's participation and gender equality is critical to the mission of open government. This digital campaign will feature portraits and videos of leaders in their respective industries sharing their views on gender inclusion and how they broke through systemic barriers.

Coalition

In addition to the digital campaign, OGP will convene a gender coalition that will bring together a dedicated group of global leaders on open government and gender equality. This group will help build political momentum behind gender and inclusion within open government practices and commitments.



