Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): [Name of Country] Design Report [Year]–[Year]

This report was prepared in collaboration with [Name of Researcher], [Affiliated Organization]

Table of Contents

Editorial Note: This template includes the theme (colors) and styles (font sets) to be used for all future IRM reports.

Paragraphs that are preceded by "**[Do not revise:]**" indicate boilerplate text that should not be revised/edited. The "Do not revise" notes should be deleted when writing the report. Highlighted text indicates text that should be replaced with an exact replacement (e.g., author name, country name, action plan year span).

Blue text indicates text that should be approximated and replaced with developed text. Be sure to put it in the "Normal" (Gill Sans 11) Word style.

Green text indicates notes on content and should later be deleted when the report is written.

Open Government Partnership

Researcher Logo (if needed)

Executive Summary: [Name of Country]

Headline: Write 2–3 sentences to describe the key takeaways from the report. The headline can highlight particular context that positively or negatively affects OGP in the country. For second generation action plans, it can also highlight improved or regressed areas. Finally, it can note promising aspects of the action plan or areas to watch during the remaining implementation period. This last sentence can also be forward-looking with a recommendation.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. (Country) joined OGP in (year). Since, (country) has implemented (number) action plans. This report evaluates the (design/implementation) of (country's) (ordinal number) action plan.

Table 1. At a glance
Participating since:
Action plan under review:
Report type:
Number of commitments:

Action plan development
Is there a multistakeholder forum: "yes/no"
Level of public influence: "IAP2 coding"
Acted contrary to OGP process: "yes/no"

Action plan design
Commitments relevant to OGP values: #(%)
Transformative commitments: #(%)
Potentially starred commitments: #

General overview of action plan

Write a narrative that briefly describes the main takeaways from the different sections of the report, in the same sequence. The narrative should not exceed 11–12 sentences. Use the following guiding questions:

- *How does the action plan fit in the national context? Use the report's Section II on context to provide an overall conclusion of how the action plan's scope matches up with the open government context in the country. (2–3 sentences)*

- *What were the highlights from the development process? Focus on changes, for example, things that were done differently to improve from previous action plans, whether there an improvement or regression in the level of public influence according to IRM assessments, or examples of good practices or shortcomings. (2–3 sentences)*

- *How did the action plan process reflect on the quality of the action plan as a whole? Here, we want to point to a conclusion that signals whether the co-creation approach yielded more ambitious commitments. (1–2 sentences).*

- *Overall, what are some characteristics of the commitments worth highlighting, i.e., priority themes, diversity, ambition, relevance, how it includes (or not) diverse stakeholders such as government institutions, civil society, private sector, academia, citizens, or others. (2–3 sentences).*

- *For implementation reports, add 2–3 sentences about the overall implementation process and areas of open government that improved or yielded "Major" or "Outstanding" DIOG results.*

Table 2. Noteworthy commitments

Commitment description	Moving forward	Status at the end of implementation cycle
Commitment (#) (Short title) (Text: aim or objective)	(Text: Brief summary of the main recommendation that would make this commitment achieve a star, "Major DIOG," or "Outstanding DIOG," as the case may be.)	Note: this will be assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.

Recommendations

IRM recommendations aim to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. Please refer to Section V: General Recommendations for more details on each of the below recommendations.

Table 3. Five KEY IRM Recommendations

TEXT
TEXT
TEXT
TEXT
TEXT

ABOUT THE IRM

OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses the development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.

Open Government Partnership

(Researcher's name) collaborated with the IRM to conduct desk research and interviews to inform the findings in this report. **(Researcher's name)** is **(**two-sentence bio).

I. Introduction

[Do not revise:] The Open Government Partnership is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. Action plan commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments complete commitments. Civil society and government leaders use these evaluations to reflect on their own progress and determine if actions have impacted people's lives.

[Country] joined OGP in [year]. This report covers the development and design of [country's] [ordinal number] action plan for [action plan cycle years].

The Independent Reporting Mechanism of OGP has partnered with [name of researcher and organization] to conduct this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of the IRM's methodology, please visit https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism.

II. Open Government Context in [Country]

[Include a short two-to-three-sentence total summary of the country context highlights.]

How to write this section (maximum 2 pages):
This section should include an overview of status or progress in the country in the areas listed below.
Note: for countries that have already implemented at least one action plan, please use the information on each of the topics below that was provided in the IRM Design Report for the previous action plan. You may also update this information with any important developments around the topics listed below that occurred after the previous plan's implementation. Information in this section should describe the context **at the time the action plan was being developed**. Please refer to the bibliography of potential sources, the OGP Global Report, and previous IRM reports.

Transparency and access to information (legal framework and practice)
Does the country have strong freedom of information legislation? How does the country score on the Right to Information Index (RTI)? How is the law implemented? What are the major challenges in accessing information in practice?

How does the country score on the Open Data Barometer? Do any government institutions publish information in open data?

In the last two years, have there been any changes to the legislation on access to information? Have there been any developments that affect the practice of access to information?

Civil Liberties and Civic Space
How are civil liberties (freedom of expression, freedom of association and assembly) protected in law and in practice? How strong and diverse is civil society in the country? Does the country have sufficient policies and opportunities for citizen participation? What are the legal and administrative requirements for public engagement in policy or rule-making?

Accountability and anticorruption
Does the country have anticorruption legislation criminalizing bribery? Does the country have laws for whistleblower protection or transparency in political financing and lobbying?
Are public officials required to declare their assets and interests? Are asset declarations public? Are major oversight institutions effective in prevention of and the fight against corruption?

Budget Transparency
Are the key budget documents public? How transparent and open is the budget process? Does the public have opportunities to participate in the planning and execution of budgets? If the country has data from the International Budget Partnership's Open Budget Survey, please reference these findings.

Briefly summarize any major areas of governance concern in the country (e.g., extractives, revenue collection, beneficial ownership transparency electoral integrity), and changes in power during the period of the action plan, that might affect the open government agenda in the country.

III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process

[Include a short two-to-three-sentence total summary of the multistakeholder process.]

3.1 Leadership

[Do not revise:] This subsection describes the OGP leadership and institutional context for OGP in [country].

[OGP Guiding Text] In this section, please describe the lead institutions responsible for the action plan, explain their powers of coordination, and describe how their mandate and composition influences OGP action plans in the country. Use clear fact-based analysis to respond to questions below.

How to write this section:

1.   Write a brief narrative that answers the guiding questions below (5−7 sentences):
    ● What is the agency or office in charge of OGP? Explain how offices or agencies coordinate if OGP is led by multiple entities.
    ● IF APPLICABLE: A brief reference to changes (2−3 sentences) in OGP leadership from the previous action plan cycle. You do not need to do a full recap, simply highlight any differences in leadership structure or mandates between the previous and current action plan cycles. Exclude if reporting on the country's first action plan.
    ● How does OGP leadership in the country impact the ambition of the action plan or commitments?
        ○ For example, you may consider whether there is high-level political support for OGP. Is the head of government or any other high-level official involved in official action plan presentations, co-creation processes, or OGP events? Has this translated into a better process or a more ambitious action plan?
2.   Are there any resource constraints (financial, cross-governmental coordination, or human resources) that might have affected their OGP process?

3.2 Action plan co-creation process

In a narrative of 3-4 paragraphs, provide a general analysis of the main highlights and shortcomings of the co-creation process. Focus on the following:
● How did the process improve or decline compared to previous action plans?
● What are good practices or innovative approaches in the development process worth highlighting?
● What were the challenges and weaknesses of the development process?
● Did the action plan as a whole, or its individual commitments, improve (or not) as a result of how the development process was conducted? How were they affected by who participated and how they participated? How did the final commitment selection respond to the country's policy priorities or to the policy areas prioritized by stakeholders during consultation?
● Assess the level of public influence during the action plan development process.
    ○ What was the quality of public engagement?
    ○ To inform this assessment of quality, use the parameters in the adapted IAP2 table below and the supplementary guidance on meeting the minimum threshold for countries to act in accordance with OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards.

Table 4: Level of Public Influence
The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply to OGP.[1] This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for "collaborate."

Level of public influence		During development of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.	
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda.	
Involve[2]	The government gave feedback on how public input were considered.	
Consult	The public could give inputs.	
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.	
No Consultation	No consultation	

OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards

[Do not revise:] In 2017, OGP adopted OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards to support participation and co-creation by civil society at all stages of the OGP cycle. All OGP-participating countries are expected to meet these standards. The standards aim to raise ambition and quality of participation during development, implementation, and review of OGP action plans.

The following table provides an overview of [country's] performance implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan development.

Key:
Green = Meets standard
Yellow = In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)
Red = No evidence of action

Multistakeholder Forum	Status
1a. Forum established: (Add a sentence about the MSF, for example: "The OGP National Steering Committee oversees the creation process of the action plan.")	Green
1b. Regularity: How often did the forum meet? E.g., "The OGP National Steering Committee met once during the six months of the co creation process. OGP standards require that the forums meet at least once every quarter.[3]"	Yellow
1c. Collaborative mandate development: State whether members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership, and governance structure.	Yellow
1d. Mandate public: State whether or not information on the forum's remit, membership, and governance structure is available on the OGP website/page.	Yellow
2a. Multistakeholder: Does the forum include both governmental and nongovernment representatives?	Red
2b. Parity: State whether or not the forum includes an even balance of governmental and nongovernmental representatives.	

2c. Transparent selection: State whether or not nongovernmental members of the forum are selected through a fair and transparent process.	
2d. High-level government representation: State if the forum includes high-level representatives with decision-making authority from government.	
3a. Openness: State if the forum accepts input and representation on the action plan process from any civil society and other stakeholders outside the forum.	
3b. Remote participation: State whether there are opportunities for remote participation in at least some meetings and events.	
3c. Minutes: State whether the OGP forum or the government proactively communicates and reports back on its decisions, activities, and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders.	

Action Plan Development	
4a. Process transparency: State if there is a national OGP website (or OGP webpage on a government website) where information on all aspects of the national OGP process is proactively published.	
4b. Documentation in advance: State if the forum or the government shares information about OGP to stakeholders in advance to facilitate informed and prepared participation in all stages of the process.	
4c. Awareness-raising: State if the forum or the government conducts outreach and awareness-raising activities with relevant stakeholders to inform them of the OGP process.	
4d. Communication channels: State if the forum or the government facilitates direct communication with stakeholders to respond to action plan process questions, particularly during times of intense OGP activity.	
4e. Reasoned response: State whether the multistakeholder forum or the government publishes its reasoning behind decisions and responds to major categories of public comment, in accordance to the supplementary guidance provided to you by IRM staff.	
5a. Repository: Explain if the forum or the government documented, collected, and published a repository on the domestic OGP website in line with IRM guidance.	

---

[1] "IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum" (IAP2, 2014), http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf.

[2] OGP's Articles of Governance also establish participation and co-creation requirements a country must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to OGP process. Based on these requirements, [Country] [**acted/did not act**] contrary to OGP process during the development of the (year–year) action plan.

[3] There is only one meeting of the NSC documented on the national OGP website (link).

IV. Commitments

[Do not revise until "General overview of the commitments":] All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values detailed in the *OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration* signed by all OGP-participating countries.[1] Indicators and methods used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[2] A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses can be found in the Annex of this report.

General Overview of the Commitments

[OGP Guiding Text] Please provide an overall view of the action plan and describe how it was organized or what it emphasized. This section should describe any unique characteristics of the plan that are necessary to understanding this report, for example whether the plan is structured per themes, other broader national/subnational policies, or Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and how this was done. This is a brief overview and **does not need to be more than one paragraph.** It should be easily readable for the general public.

- How does the action plan respond to stakeholder priorities or feedback from consultations?
- Does the action plan address challenges identified in any of the policy areas discussed in the country context?
- Has the ambition or diversity of themes in the action plan improved compared to previous action plans?

---

[1] "Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance" (OGP, 17 Jun. 2019), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/articles-of-governance/ .

[2] "IRM Procedures Manual" (OGP), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

1. Name of Commitment

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan (e.g., main objective and milestones):

Main Objective
Copy paste here the "Main Objective" as it appears in the action plan.

Milestones
Copy paste here the "Milestones" as they appear in the action plan.

Editorial Note: For the complete text of this commitment, please see (country's) action plan at (link to action plan).

IRM Design Report Assessment	
Verifiable:	Yes/No
Relevant:	Yes/No
	Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability
Potential impact:	Transformative, Moderate, Minor or None.

Commitment Analysis
[Do not exceed 1 page]
There is only one narrative per commitment and it will be completed in collaboration between IRM Staff and the researcher. It should be clear and concise. The flow of the narrative should allow the reader to understand:
1. What is the aim of the commitment?
2. As a whole, is it relevant to OGP values?
3. What is the starting point or baseline?
4. If implemented fully, what is the expected change or results of the commitment on the policy area?

The researcher will respond to these questions following the guidance below:
1. What is the aim of the commitment?
   ○ Describe the problem identified in the action plan and put it in context. Why was it included in the action plan? What is its purpose? What activities does the commitment propose to achieve the objective?
2. As a whole, is it relevant to OGP values?
   ○ Describe the relevance of this commitment to OGP values and justify the coding for relevance.
3. What is the starting point or baseline?
   ○ When interviewing stakeholders, ask questions that can help you understand the starting point or baseline. In this section, you should provide details about the status quo and where it stands in relation to the problem identified above. The clearer this information is, the easier it will be to assess the potential impact of the commitment.
4. If implemented fully, what is the expected change or results of the commitment on the policy area?
   ○ In one sentence, is the commitment clear enough to understand what will be done?
   ○ How is it expected to change the status quo (think of how it will change the starting point or baseline)? What results or changes in government practices are expected to be achieved by the commitment's implementation? How do the objective and proposed

activities relate to each other and contribute to solving the problem? How ambitious are the commitment's activities?

Finally, **if necessary,** you may conclude with a sentence on possible next steps for governments, civil society, or MSF members to improve commitment design in the next action plan and to help governments improve the scope of intended activities during implementation.

V. General Recommendations

[Do not revise:] This section aims to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. It is divided into two sections: 1) IRM key recommendations to improve OGP process and action plans in the country and, 2) an assessment of how the government responded to previous IRM key recommendations.

5.1 IRM Five Key Recommendations

[OGP Guiding Text] This section recommends strategic next steps for OGP in the country. The researcher should make prioritized recommendations in a descriptive narrative. The five key IRM recommendations should be clearly identified in the narrative. Focus on high-level strategic messages for principal actors to help improve OGP process and action plan content overall.

Recommendations for the next action plan's development process	
1	
2	

To develop your two recommendations, please consider what are the 2 or 3 major gaps in the development of the action plan process that should be addressed to improve the next co-creation? Refer to OGP's co-creation and participation standards. If the country is at risk of falling into a procedural review for acting contrary to OGP process, please highlight a key recommendation to help the country prevent this situation.

Recommendations for the next action plan's design	
1	
2	
3	

To develop the three recommendations please consider the following criteria and provide at least one paragraph per recommendation.
- State which existing commitments would benefit from carrying over and continuation/expansion in the next action plan. Highlight some of the major steps and actions to be taken under these commitments. Identify who should act on the recommendation.
- According to the stakeholders interviewed for this report, what are the top 2–3 themes and actions that could benefit from prioritization in future action plans? Describe what the commitments should entail. Please make sure that these themes are discussed in Section II: Open Government Context and/or in the General Overview of Commitments section.
- Are there any potential champion ministries or promising government initiatives that have demonstrated a good track record on open government and could be included in the next plans?

5.2 Response to Previous IRM Key Recommendations

[OGP Guiding Text] Governments are required to respond to IRM key recommendations. This section provides an overview of how stakeholders addressed IRM recommendations and how the recommendations were incorporated into the next action plan process or content.
How to write this section:
1. First fill out the table below using the key recommendations table from previous report. For longer recommendations (or those that included many indicators), please use the recommendations box from the "Executive Summary" section of the previous report.
2. Based on the information in the table, provide a brief description of how the government incorporated the previous IRM recommendations. If they were not incorporated, provide a brief explanation of why **(1–2 sentences)**.

13

3. Then, describe how the recommendations were incorporated in the new action plan. The narrative should draw from both the text of the action plan and stakeholder opinions **(2−3 sentences per recommendation)**.

Previous IRM Report Key Recommendations

	Recommendation	Did it inform the OGP Process?
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

Example:

Of the five recommendations, government addressed four in their self-assessment and integrated three in the next action plan. The IRM researcher did not receive a response from the Point of Contact (PoC) explaining why the fifth recommendation, to expand the scope of the action plan to other sectors, was not addressed in the self-assessment. Stakeholders, however, who participated in the multistakeholder forum stated that the government decided to focus commitments on open budgeting and open contracting because they were part of the government's larger four-year strategy. Finally, the government noted in their self-assessment that they have proposed draft legislation to institutionalize an OGP permanent dialogue mechanism. However, Parliament and civil society stakeholders were of the opinion that because of the way the draft legislation was formulated, it would restrict future civil society participation, and therefore this initiative was not pursued further.

VI. Methodology and Sources

[Do not revise:] IRM reports are written in collaboration with researchers for each OGP-participating country. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

[Do not revise:] Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, observation, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholders. The IRM report builds on the evidence available in [Country's] OGP repository (or online tracker), website, findings in the government's own self-assessment reports, and any other assessments of process and progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organizations.

[Do not revise:] Each IRM researcher conducts stakeholder interviews to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested parties or visit implementation sites. Some contexts require anonymity of interviewees and the IRM reserves the right to remove personal identifying information of these participants. Due to the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary during the pre-publication review period of each report.

Each report undergoes a quality-control process that includes an internal review by IRM staff and the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP). Each report also undergoes an external review where governments and civil society are invited to provide comments on the content of the draft IRM report.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual.[1]

Interviews and stakeholder input

How to write this section (1 paragraph per event or bulleted list):
Describe the considerations taken into account when selecting stakeholders to interview. How many interviews were conducted and with which stakeholders? What challenges were encountered, if any? If focus groups or stakeholder meetings were held, please provide information on:
1. Name of organizations or groups represented (If anonymous, explain why),
2. Date of interaction,
3. Format of interaction (e.g., interview, focus group, workshop), and
4. Synopsis of meeting.

If a survey was sent out, describe the sample universe of survey and type of questions it asked. Finally, if the IRM researcher participated as an observer in OGP events/meetings, please provide information on the number, dates, and purpose of meetings attended.

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

[Do not revise:] The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) is a key means by which all stakeholders can track OGP progress in participating countries and entities. The International Experts Panel (IEP) oversees the quality control of each report. The IEP is comprised of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

Current membership of the International Experts Panel is

- César Cruz-Rubio
- Mary Francoli
- Brendan Halloran
- Jeff Lovitt
- Fredline M'Cormack-Hale
- Showers Mawowa
- Juanita Olaya
- Quentin Reed
- Rick Snell
- Jean-Patrick Villeneuve

[Do not revise:] A small staff based in Washington, DC, shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researchers. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org.

---

[1] IRM Procedures Manual, V.3: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

Annex I. Commitment Indicators

[Do not revise:] All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP-participating countries.[1] The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[2] A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

- **Verifiability:**
  - Not specific enough to verify: Do the written objectives and proposed actions lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment?
  - Specific enough to verify: Are the written objectives and proposed actions sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment?

- **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine relevance are:
  - Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
  - Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions or policies?
  - Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve public-facing opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
  - Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?

- **Potential impact:** This variable assesses the potential impact of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
  - Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
  - Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
  - Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.

- **Completion:** This variable assesses the commitment's implementation and progress. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the country's IRM Implementation Report.

- **Did It Open Government?:** This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice, in areas relevant to OGP values, has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the country's IRM Implementation Report.

What makes a results-oriented commitment?

A results-oriented commitment has more potential to be ambitious and be implemented. It clearly describes the:

1. **Problem:** What is the economic, social, political, or environmental problem rather than describing an administrative issue or tool? (E.g., "Misallocation of welfare funds" is more helpful than "lacking a website.")
2. **Status quo:** What is the status quo of the policy issue at the beginning of an action plan? (E.g., "26% of judicial corruption complaints are not processed currently.")

3. **Change:** Rather than stating intermediary outputs, what is the targeted behavior change that is expected from the commitment's implementation? (E.g., "Doubling response rates to information requests" is a stronger goal than "publishing a protocol for response.")

Starred commitments

One measure, the "starred commitment" (✪), deserves further explanation due to its interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries/entities. Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria.

- Potential star: the commitment's design should be **verifiable**, **relevant** to OGP values, and have **transformative** potential impact.
- The government must make significant progress on this commitment during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of **substantial** or **complete** implementation.

These variables are assessed at the end of the action plan cycle in the country's IRM Implementation Report.

---

[1] "Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance" (OGP, 17 Jun. 2019), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/articles-of-governance/ .

[2] "IRM Procedures Manual" (OGP), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.