

# Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): [Name of Country/Entity] Implementation Report [Year]–[Year]

---

[Name of Researcher], [Affiliated Organization/Independent Researcher]

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary:</b>	<b>[Name of Country/Entity]</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Introduction</b>		<b>3</b>
<b>II. Action Plan Implementation</b>		<b>5</b>
I. More Open Data for Citizens and Media		6
<b>III. Multi-stakeholder Process</b>		<b>9</b>
<b>VI. Methodology and Sources</b>		<b>11</b>
<b>Annex I. Overview of</b>	<b>[country's/entity's]</b>	<b>performance throughout action</b>
<b>plan implementation</b>		<b>12</b>
<b>Annex II. IRM Indicators</b>		<b>14</b>

***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).

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

Be sure to put it in the “Normal” (Gill Sans 11) Word style



Researcher Logo (if needed)

## Executive Summary: [Name of Country/Entity]

**Headline:** Write 2 – 3 sentences to describe the key takeaways from the report. The headline can highlight particular context situations that affect (positively or negatively) OGP in the country. For second generation action plans, it can also highlight the most improved areas (or regression if it is the case). Finally, it can highlight promising aspects of the action plan or something to look forward during the remaining implementation period. This last sentence can also be forward looking with a recommendation.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) 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/entity) joined OGP in (year). Since, (country/entity) has implemented (number) action plans. This report evaluates the (design/implementation) of (country's/entity's) (ordinal number) action plan.

### General overview of action plan

- 2-3 sentences about the overall implementation of the action plan and engagement with civil society during implementation. Indicate here if the country had a starred process, when applicable.
- 2-3 sentences about areas of open government that improved or yielded “Major” or “Outstanding” DIOG results. Use examples of the changes to describe the main results of the action plan.

A starred commitment must meet several criteria:

- The commitment’s design was **Verifiable**, **Relevant** to OGP values, and had a **Transformative** potential impact. As assessed in the Design Report.
- The commitment’s implementation was assessed by IRM Implementation Report as **Substantial** or **Complete**.

Based on these criteria, (country)’s action plan has (number) starred commitments:

1. (list commitment number and title of starred commitment).

### 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: “insert IAP2 coding”  
Acted contrary to OGP process: “yes/no”

### Action plan design

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

### Action plan implementation

Starred commitments: N/A  
Completed commitments: N/A  
Commitments with Major DIOG\*: N/A  
Commitments with Outstanding DIOG\*: N/A  
Level of public influence: “insert IAP2 coding”  
Acted contrary to OGP process: “yes/no”

\*DIOG: Did it Open Government



**Table 2. Noteworthy commitments**

Commitment description	Status at the end of implementation cycle.
<i>Commitment (#) (Short title) (Text: aim or objective) (add “starred” symbol if applicable)</i>	<i>Note: this will be assessed at the end of action plan cycle. Narrative should explain level of completion and key results. If it was not implemented or no results to report, describe what was main constraint to implement it.</i>

**Five Key IRM Recommendations**

The IRM key recommendations are prepared in the IRM Design Report. They aim to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. In (Country's) (2017-2019) Design Report, the IRM recommended the following:

TEXT
TEXT
TEXT
TEXT
TEXT

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**[Author's name]** 50-word biography.

**The Open Government Partnership (OGP)** aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.

Open  
Government  
Partnership



## 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 follow through on commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their own progress and determine if actions have made an impact on people's lives.

The Independent Reporting Mechanism of OGP has partnered with [name of researcher and organization], who carried out 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>.

This report covers the implementation of [country/entity's] [ordinal number] action plan for [action plan cycle years].

(Include a short two-paragraph summarized update of the country context highlights. Followed by a description of the action plan overview. Preferably use the headline summary text used in the design report and the brief description provided in "Overview of Commitments". Please cite IRM report when using text from the a report. Explain in this update changes in government, improvements in indexes, any information that might have affected action plan implementation.

### Example:

*As reported in the IRM 2017-19 Design Report, Denmark continues to rank among the most open and least corrupt countries in the world. However, recent corruption scandals in both the public and private sectors have dominated the media and may affect public trust moving forward. While the action plan included commitments on Denmark's international efforts to promote openness, it did not sufficiently address potential areas for domestic reform.<sup>1</sup>*

*Denmark's 2017–2019 national action plan focused on four key themes: (a) more and better open data (Commitments 1–5), (b) tailored data to ensure a basis for citizen participation (Commitments 6–8), (c) working together for a better public sector (Commitments 9–11), and (d) a global effort for openness (Commitments 12–14).*

---

<sup>1</sup> Section II, "Open Government Context in Denmark", pg. 6, 2017-2019 IRM Design Report (link)

## II. Action Plan Implementation

**[Do not revise]** The IRM Implementation Report assesses “Completion” and “Did it Open Government?”. These two indicators are based on each of the commitment’s implementation progress at the end of the action plan cycle. This report does not re-visit assessments for “Verifiability”, “Relevance” or “Potential Impact”. The former are indicators assessed in IRM Design Reports. For more details on each of the indicators please see Annex II in this report.

### 2.1 Overview of Action Plan

This section should include a 1-2 paragraph summary of the implementation highlights for this action plan. When writing this summary please use the questions below to guide your narrative:

- What was the overall level of progress in commitment implementation?
  - How many commitments had “substantial” or “complete” implementation? Is this an improvement from the implementation of the previous action plan?
  - What were some of the factors that contributed to the positive progress in implementation? Or, what were some of the factors that limited progress in implementation, if the case is that implementation actually worsened from previous action plan?
- What are the results or tangible changes in open government practice?
  - Indicate how many commitments achieved “Major” or “Outstanding” changes in open government according to the DIOG variable and to which of the three values. Provide a general description of the type of commitments that yielded better results (for example, commitments that: relate to a specific theme, are led by a specific agency, counted with resources for their implementation, etc.).
  - What are the concrete changes in government practice? What has improved and how? Please use examples.
  - Where any of the “Major” or “Outstanding” commitments also “Starred Commitments”? If so, please highlight them or if not, please provide some insights about what could have been the possible reasons for this?

## 2.2. Commitments

### I. More Open Data for Citizens and Media

IRM Design Report Assessment	IRM Implementation Report Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Verifiable:</b> Yes/No</li> <li>• <b>Relevant:</b> Yes/No</li> <li>○ Access to Information, Civic Participation, Public Accountability</li> <li>• <b>Potential impact:</b> Transformative, Moderate, Minor, None.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Completion:</b> Complete, Substantial, Limited, Not Started.</li> <li>• <b>Did it Open Government?</b> Outstanding, Major, Marginal, Did not change, Worsened.</li> </ul>

There is only one narrative per commitment. It should be clear and concise. The flow should allow the reader to understand *what the aim of the commitment was, if it was completed or not, what are the results and did it open government*. Remember to cite additional perspectives as needed, not only the government or your own view.

To write the narrative please follow the guiding outline and questions below **(3-4 paragraphs)**:

- Write the commitment's aim, public problem being addressed and status quo prior to the implementation of the commitment. This section should briefly and clearly describe the baseline against which you are measuring the results of the commitment. Please use the "Context and Objectives" section of your Design Report to draw 2-3 sentences here. Please cite the report if you are using direct quotes or text from the report.. This needs to be consistent with the aim, public problem and status quo described in your Design Report. Check that you are writing in the correct tense, past if you are referring to how the commitment was designed.
- Provide a 2-3 sentence description of completion. Please be clear and concise. The information we want to know is:
  - Was the commitment complete or not? If not, please explain what is missing for it to be complete. Your description must justify the coding for completion and include evidence.
  - We do not need a description of each activity that was conducted or detailed account of what happened. Please focus on the overall completion of the commitment, its deliverables or the commitment's targets/outputs.
- Provide a 3-5 sentence analysis of the implementation. Please be clear and concise. The information we want to know is:
  - What factors contributed to successful (or weak) implementation?
  - Are there early results or outcomes from the commitment's implementation? What are they? How do they contribute to the public problem addressed by the commitment?
- Finally, provide a paragraph (3-5 sentences) conclusion to determine the "Did it Open Government?" assessment. If the commitment is relevant to more than one value, please provide a paragraph for each assessment.  
The DIOG is not an assessment of impact, we look for changes in government practice as a result of the commitment's implementation. Concretely, we compare the situation before the action plan vs. situation at the end of action plan in the areas of OGP values.

The evidence and analysis you provide from the questions on completion and implementation above, should support and illustrate clear examples to justify your DIOG assessment. The evidence and analysis should be able to answer the following questions:

- Did the government disclose more information, improve the quality of the information (new or existing), the value of the information, improve the channels to disclose or request information or improve accessibility to information?
- Did the government create new opportunities to seek feedback from citizens/enable participation/ inform or influence decisions? How was the input incorporated into decision making? How were decisions that resulted from citizen input implemented? Did the government improve existing channels or spaces to seek feedback from citizens/enable participation/ inform or influence decisions? Did the government create or improve capabilities in the government or the public aimed to improve how the government seeks feedback from citizens/enables participation/ or allows for the public to inform or influence decisions?
- Did the government create or improve channels, opportunities or capabilities to hold officials answerable to their actions? How robust are the mechanisms? How important are the areas over which accountability is being enabled, to the country's context? To what extent can the public influence and leverage these accountability mechanisms?

*Note: You do not need to respond to all three sets of questions for every commitment. Adapt your analysis to each commitment depending on which value it was coded relevant to in the Design Report. Compare what it was set out to achieve and what it actually accomplished using the guidance questions provided..*

*In some cases, unclear relevance commitments yield results that end up having relevance to OGP values. If this is the case, you should state that although it had unclear relevance, as implemented it did change government practice in OGP value area. Explain which one.*





### III. Multi-stakeholder Process

[Include a short two-to-three-sentence total summary of the multi-stakeholder process]

#### 3.1 Multi-stakeholder process throughout action plan implementation

**[Do not revise:]** In 2017, OGP adopted the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards intended 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.

**[Do not revise:]** OGP's Articles of Governance also establish participation and co-creation requirements a country or entity must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to OGP process. [Country/entity] **[acted/did not act]** contrary to OGP process.<sup>1</sup> (Country/entity) did not (add what requirement they did not complete).

Please see Annex I for an overview of [country's/entity's] performance implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan implementation.

#### Table [3.2]: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply to OGP.<sup>2</sup> 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	During implementation 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	The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered.		
Consult	The public could give inputs.		
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.		
No Consultation	No consultation		

In a short narrative, describe the level of government-civil society engagement during implementation of the action plan. Please make sure your narrative justifies the coding for table above and reflects your assessments in Annex I. **Keep narrative 1 – 2 paragraphs.**

<sup>1</sup> Acting Contrary to Process - Country did not meet (1) "involve" during the development or "inform" during implementation of the NAP (2) government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance.

---

<sup>2</sup> “IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum,” IAP2, 2014.

[http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations\\_course/IAP2\\_P2\\_Spectrum\\_FINAL.pdf](http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf)

## VI. Methodology and Sources

**[Do not revise]:** The IRM reports are written by national researchers in 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.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual<sup>1</sup> and in (Country's) Design Report (years).

### **Document Library (optional, delete if not used)**

**[Do not revise]** The IRM uses publicly accessible online libraries as a repository for the information gathered throughout the course of the research process. All the original documents, as well as several documents cited within this report, are available for viewing and comments in the IRM Online Library in [country], at [LINK].

---

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

## Annex I. Overview of [country's/entity's] performance throughout action plan implementation

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

Multi-stakeholder Forum	During Development	During Implementation
<b>1a. Forum established: There is a forum to oversee the OGP process</b>	Green	Green
1b. Regularity: The forum meets at least every quarter, in person or remotely	Yellow	Yellow
1c. Collaborative mandate development: Members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership and governance structure.	Yellow	Yellow
1d. Mandate public: Information on the forum's remit, membership and governance structure is available on the OGP website/page.	Yellow	Yellow
<b>2a. Multi-stakeholder: The forum includes both governmental and non-government representatives</b>	Red	Red
2b. Parity: The forum includes an even balance of governmental and non-governmental representatives		
<b>2c. Transparent selection: Non-governmental members of the forum are selected through a fair and transparent process.</b>		
2d. High-level government representation: The forum includes high-level representatives with decision making authority from government		
<b>3d. Openness: The forum accepts inputs and representation on the action plan process from any civil society or other stakeholders outside the forum</b>		
3e. Remote participation: There are opportunities for remote participation in at least some meetings and events		
3f. Minutes: The OGP forum proactively communicates and reports back on its decisions, activities and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders		

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

Action Plan Implementation	
4a. The government publishes via the national OGP website/webpage regular updates (i.e. at least every six months) on the progress of commitments, including progress against milestones, reasons for any delays, next steps. This is in addition to publishing self-assessment report	
4b. The website/webpage should have a feature to allow the public to comment on progress updates.	
4c. The government holds at least two open meetings with civil society (one per year) on the implementation of the NAP.	
4d. The government shares the link to the IRM report with other government institutions and stakeholders to encourage input during the public comment phase.	
4.e The multi-stakeholder forum monitors and deliberates on how to improve the implementation of the NAP	
4.f The government submit its self-assessment report to the national multi-stakeholder forum for comments and feedback on the content of the report	
<b>4.g. Repository: Government collects and publishes a document repository on the national OGP website/webpage, which provides a historical record and access to all documents related to the national OGP process, including (but not limited to) consultation documents, National Action Plans, government self-assessments, IRM reports and supporting documentation of commitment implementation (e.g links to databases, evidence of meetings, publications)</b>	

## Annex II. IRM Indicators

The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.<sup>1</sup> A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

- **Verifiability:**
  - Not specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, do the objectives stated and actions proposed lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
  - Specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, are the objectives stated and actions proposed sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
- **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 the 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 *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 *IRM Implementation Report*.

### Results oriented commitments?

A potentially starred commitment have more potential to be ambitious and to be implemented. A good commitment design is one that 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 percent 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

For Public Comment: Please Do Not Cite 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 particular interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries/entities. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- The commitment’s design should be **Verifiable, Relevant** to OGP values, and have **Transformative** potential impact. As assessed in the Design Report.
- The commitment’s implementation must be assessed by IRM Implementation Report as **Substantial** or **Complete**.

This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *Implementation IRM report*.

---

<sup>1</sup> “IRM Procedures Manual,” OGP, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>