



**Open Government Partnership
Steering Committee
October 26-27 2015 Meeting
Mexico City**

Documents for Reference

Table of Contents

Steering Committee Documents	Page
Draft Agenda for Steering Committee Meetings	3
Draft Participant List for Steering Committee Meetings	6
IRM Then and Now Summary Document	9
Biographies of IEP Members	10
Joint Declaration on Open Government for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development	13
Draft Implementation Plan For Linking OGP and the Global Goals	15
Summary Memo and Draft Resolution on Subnational Pilot Program	17
Section 2b – Steering Committee Annex	
2015 Peer Exchange Activities	19
Overview of the OGP Working Groups	25
Draft Concept Note on Subnational Government Pilot Program	37

**Working level meeting
Monday 26 October 4-7pm
Location: Hilton Mexico City Reforma, 2nd Floor**

3:45pm **Coffee**

Please arrive on time so we can begin promptly at 4pm

4pm **Welcome and introductions**

4:05pm **Peer exchange updates**

Background Papers: 2015 peer exchange activities; Overview of the OGP Working Groups

Steering Committee members will each be given up to 10 minutes to discuss, in small groups, the best or most successful peer exchange activities they have participated in since the last meeting. There will then be very quick feedback of highlights from each small group, which the PLS subcommittee will record and promote throughout and after the Summit.

4:30pm **Issues arising in Criteria and Standards subcommittee**

Background Papers: Draft report on Response Policy implementation; Country updates (withheld as pre-decision)

Update on ongoing implementation of the Response Policy and Criteria and Standards reviews.

4:50pm **IRM presentation and discussion with the International Expert Panel (IEP)**

Background Papers: Then and Now summary document; Biographies of IEP members

Two years ago, at the 2013 OGP Global Summit, the IRM published the first eight reports on the founding countries' national action plan progress. Then the IRM was hailed as the critical means by which OGP could hold governments to account for what they say they will do.

In the last two years, the IRM has produced an additional 64 reports on OGP action plans and the [OGP Explorer](#) contains over 2000 commitments tagged by sector and policy area. The Steering Committee will have the opportunity to discuss what the IRM has achieved; assess what we are learning about learning and accountability in OGP; explore country experience with the IRM, including benefits and challenges; and ask members of the International Experts Panel about their focus and perception of the opportunities and challenges for the IRM.

5:40pm **Organizational status issues: OGP Secretariat incorporation and OGP Trust Fund**

Background Papers: Memo on incorporation progress since Pretoria; Copy of draft bylaws; Draft OGP Trust Fund concept note (withheld as pre-decision)

This section of the agenda will follow up on the Pretoria SC meeting resolution.

The purpose of discussing incorporation is to give the Steering Committee an opportunity to:

- *To consolidate feedback on the draft bylaws, either in advance of the SC meeting, in 1-1 meetings with the SU and lawyer in Mexico City, or at the SC meeting itself.*
- *Agree the updated timeline for incorporation.*
- *Begin discussion of criteria and process for appointing Board of Directors.*

The purpose of including discussion of the draft OGP Trust Fund concept note is to receive input and feedback on the three proposed windows on types of support:

1. *Pass through grant to the OGP Support Unit;*
2. *Financial and Technical Assistance to OGP National Action Plans;*
3. *Peer Exchange, Learning and Research.*

Governance issues related to the Trust Fund will be covered at a future point.

6:30pm Update on search for new OGP Support Unit Executive Director

6:40pm Briefing on the Summit (Mexico), communications update/requests (Support Unit)

**Ministerial level meeting
Tuesday 27 October, 4.30-7pm
Location: Hilton Mexico City Reforma, 2nd Floor**

4:30pm Welcome and introductions

Remarks from the co-chairs: the Government of Mexico and Suneeta Kaimal

This will be the first Steering Committee meeting for new civil society member Fernando Straface, Executive Director of [CIPPEC](#); and new governments Chile and Romania. The Indonesian government was reelected to the Steering Committee this year and this is the last meeting for the Philippines and Tanzania.

The objective of this meeting is seek guidance from the Steering Committee on the key strategic issues facing OGP, including: how to maintain leadership, relevance and robustness of the Partnership, advancement of the Sustainable Development Goals and subnational work, support governments and civil society in participating countries.

4:45pm State of the Partnership

Background Papers: Updated infographic (to be circulate at the meeting)

This session will focus on the successes and challenges of OGP to date, looking at national action plans, IRM data and civil society feedback.

5:45pm OGP declaration on the new UN global goals

Background Papers: Joint declaration on open government for the implementation of the 2030 agenda for sustainable development; Draft implementation plan for linking OGP and the Global Goals; List of endorsing governments and civil society organisations (to be distributed at the meeting); Open Gov Guide Global Goals Special Edition (to be distributed at the meeting); Article by SC members: How Can the Open Government Partnership Accelerate Implementation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development? (new version to be distributed at the meeting)

On 27 September the OGP Steering Committee endorsed a declaration committing to use OGP infrastructure, including national action plans, co-creation and accountability processes, to implement the new UN global goals. The Co-Chairs have asked OGP governments and CSOs to join in this initiative, which will be featured throughout the Summit.

Questions for the Steering Committee:

- *How can we take advantage of the new declaration to broaden OGP action plans?*
- *What are the upcoming moments where OGP can further make the links to the Global Goals agenda?*
- *What ideas do SC members have for possible joint commitments on Global Goals related topics to be included in future National Action Plans?*

6:15pm OGP subnational government pilot programme

Background Papers: Summary memo on progress to date on OGP at the subnational level; Draft concept note on subnational government pilot programme

At the July meeting a number of Steering Committee members volunteered to participate in a temporary task force to design a pilot phase to engage subnational government, including how to give profile to this work at the Summit. The task force will use the Summit to solicit feedback from participants as an input to finalize the concept note.

Questions for the Steering Committee:

- *How do we ensure the pilot phase is designed in a way that meets OGP's objectives and attracts high calibre participation?*
- *What specific subnational governments should be approached to participate in the pilot phase?*
- *Is the Steering Committee happy to agree the resolution that is set out in the memo?*

6:45pm Any other business and close

Remarks from incoming co-chairs: the Government of France and Manish Bapna.

Participant List
OGP Steering Committee Meeting
October 26-27, 2015

Location:

Hilton Mexico City Reforma

Open Government Partnership Steering Committee

Governments

Brazil

Secretary Patricia Souto

Roberta Solis-Ribeiro

Otávio Neves

TBD

Secretary for Transparency and Corruption Prevention

Office of the Comptroller General (CGU)

Office of the Comptroller General (CGU)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Chile

Ambassador Ricardo Núñez

Hon. Senator Hernán Larraín

José Luis Santa María

Rodrigo Mora

Ambassador of Chile to Mexico

Chilean National Congress

Council for Transparency

Ministry of General Secretariat of Presidency

Croatia

Minister Vesna Pusić

Deputy Minister Joško Klisović

Tamara Puhovski

Deputy Prime Minister & Minister of Foreign Affairs

Deputy Foreign Minister

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

France

Minister Clotilde Valter

Boris Jamet-Fournier

Henri Verdier

Laure Lucchesi

Nicolas Niemtchinow

Secretary of State for State Reform and Simplification

Office of the Prime Minister

Etalab

Etalab

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Georgia

Minister Tea Tsulukiani

Zurab Sanikidze

Ministry of Justice

Ministry of Justice

Indonesia

Minister Sofyan Djalil

Yanuar Nugroho

Siliwanti

Husni Rohman

Muhammad Daud

Minister of National Development Planning

Office of the President

National Development Planning Agency

National Development Planning Agency

Office of the President

Mexico	
Minister Virgilio Andrade	Minister of Public Affairs
Ambassador Miguel Ruiz-Cabañas	Undersecretary of Human Rights and Multilateral Affairs
Hon. Alejandra Lagunes	Coordinator of the National Digital Strategy
Guillermo Ruiz de Teresa Mariscal	Coordinator of the National Digital Strategy
Ania Calderon	Coordinator of the National Digital Strategy
Pablo Villareal	Coordinator of the National Digital Strategy
Philippines	
Secretary Florencio 'Butch' Abad	Secretary of Budget and Management
Under Secretary Richard Moya	Department of Budget and Management
Asst. Director Tessie Gregorio	Department of Budget and Management
Patrick Lim	Department of Budget and Management
TBD	Department of Budget and Management
Romania	
Radu Puchiu	Prime Minister's Chancellery
Larisa Panait	Prime Minister's Chancellery
South Africa	
Deputy Minister Ayanda Dlodlo	Deputy Minister of Public Service and Administration
Alex Mahapa	Department of Public Service and Administration
Qinisile Delwa	Department of Public Service and Administration
Renisha Naidoo	Department of Public Service and Administration
Thokozani Thusi	Department of Public Service and Administration
Nontsikelelo Baqwa	Department of Public Service and Administration
Tanzania	
Susan Mlawi	Government State House
United Kingdom	
Lord Francis Maude	Minister of State for Trade and Investment
Sir Eric Pickles	UK Anti-Corruption Champion
Paul Maltby	Cabinet Office
Oliver Buckley	Cabinet Office
United States	
TBD	
<i>Civil Society</i>	
Manish Bapna	World Resources Institute (WRI)
Mark Robinson	World Resources Institute (WRI)
Sugeng Bahagijo	INFID

Mukelani Dimba	Open Democracy Advice Centre (ODAC)
Fernando Straface	CIPPEC
Alejandro Gonzalez	GESOC
Nathaniel Heller	Results for Development
Suneeta Kaimal	Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI)
Warren Krafchik	International Budget Partnership
Martin Tisne	Transparency & Accountability Initiative (Omidyar)

Open Government Partnership

Joe Powell	Support Unit
Paul Maassen	Support Unit
Dietlind Lerner	Support Unit
Sangita Sigdya	Support Unit
Alonso Cerdan	Support Unit
Kitty von Bertele	Support Unit
Jack Mahoney	Support Unit
Joseph Foti	Independent Reporting Mechanism

Regrets

Veronica Cretu	Open Government Centre
----------------	------------------------

Independent Reporting Mechanism Then-and-Now

Attribute	October 2013 (London Summit)	October 2015 (Mexico City Summit)
Publication		
<i>Number of reports</i>	8	72 (including first second round reports)
<i>Database</i>	No data.	Database (2500 commitments); OGP explorer; now tagged by sector and policy area.
<i>Length of reports</i>	Shorter narratives in reports; fewer commitments.	Shortened commitment presentations in IRM reports, but more milestones now. Reports getting longer* . First end-of-term* reports forthcoming.
Process		
<i>Clarity of process</i>	Some issues with transparency of method, timelines, and commenting process	<i>Procedures Manual 2.0</i> published; set timelines, including 3-week government review.
<i>Reporting schedule</i>	Lack of clarity on calendar (1, 2, 3 year plans); first year reports only	2-year cycle; Progress reports and end of term reports
<i>Researcher recruitment and retention</i>	Conflicts of interest policy and job description.	Regularized, ongoing processes for nomination, hiring, evaluation and dismissal* .
<i>Stakeholder consultation</i>	Some guidance, but weak consultation.	Clear guidance/training, but consultation* needs improvement.
<i>Public comments and launch</i>	Few public comments on reports. Launch on ad hoc basis	Huge improvements in government review processes; uptick in civil society comments. Support for launches and outreach* .
Method and analysis		
<i>Method</i>	Method still in “pilot” phase, making cross-country learning and comparison more difficult.	SMART-ness Ambition* - impact on open government, additionality, scope of commitments Relevance Starred commitments
<i>Synthesis</i>	No synthesis or comparative work.	Regular reporting to Steering Committee, public, 3 technical papers published, >10 academic and policy papers using IRM data. Longitudinal and cross-country comparison data still a challenge* .
Institution		
<i>Governance documents</i>	IRM concept note and guiding principles.	IRM Charter integrated into Articles of Governance. Clear guiding principles and governance structure.
<i>Number of active researchers</i>	39	63
<i>Internal capacity</i>	Two permanent staff; 5 IEP members	6 staff; 10 IEP members

IEP Member Biographies

Founding member in attendance

Jonathan Fox is a professor in the School of International Service at American University. He studies the relationships between accountability, transparency and citizen participation, and he has carried out field research in rural Mexico since 1982. He has also carried out field research in the Philippines, Brazil, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Chile. He received his PhD in political science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1986. His recent books include: *Subsidizing Inequality: Mexican Corn Policy Since NAFTA* (co-editor, 2010), *Accountability Politics: Power and Voice in Rural Mexico* (2007), *Mexico's Right-to-Know Reforms: Civil Society Perspectives* (coeditor 2007), *Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States* (coeditor, 2004), *Demanding Accountability: Civil Society Claims and the World Bank Inspection Panel* (co-editor, 2003). He currently serves on the editorial committee of www.subsidiosalcampo.org.mx, a Mexican right-to-know resource on agricultural policy. He also collaborates with the Global Partnership for Social Accountability, the Transparency and Accountability Initiative and serves on the boards of Oxfam-America and Fundar, a Mexican public interest group. For online publications, see <http://jonathan-fox.org/>

New members in attendance

Anuradha Joshi is currently a Senior Fellow in Governance at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, UK. She received her doctorate from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Her research has focussed on policy processes and institutional analysis. She has over twenty years of experience working on governance issues related to poverty, low-income housing, public services and forest policy. She has been a consultant for bilateral and multilateral agencies and has travelled and researched in India, Indonesia, Nepal, Vietnam and Ghana. Her current research interests include collective action, transparency, and accountability in the delivery of basic services.

Ernesto Velasco-Sánchez is a consultant specialized in the public and non-for-profit sectors, with particular focus on strategic and performance management, organizational analysis and program evaluation. He has been a consultant for the National Council for Evaluation of Social Policy in Mexico, the Inter-American Development Bank, the United Nations Development Program, and The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, among others. He has taught graduate and postgraduate courses in several higher education institutions. He has several publications on public management and accountability.

Hazel Feigenblatt is Managing Director of Research at the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT) and consultant at the World Bank's Public Integrity and Openness Department, in Washington DC. She is member of the International Expert Panel of the Independent Reporting Mechanism of the Open Government Partnership, the Ibrahim Index Advisory Council, and the Board of Smart Citizen Foundation in Chile. Previous experience include Managing Director of Research in Global Integrity, where she was in charge of global data collection projects on transparency and accountability, such as the Global Integrity Report, and was award winning investigative journalist for 10 years.

Liliane Klaus is a postdoctoral scholar from University of São Paulo, Brazil. She is both an accountant and a business administrator, and has developed her Ph.D on informational reception in Germany. Her research has been focused in tracking progress of governmental transparency and anti-corruption measures and in developing tools for citizens and media to assess them.

Not in attendance

New member

Hille Hinsberg is an Estonian policy researcher and adviser on civic engagement and open governance. Her work includes policy guidelines on public participation, evaluation of government e-services, assessment of social value generated by non-profits. Hille designs, leads and advises civic engagement processes. She has built open data sites and launched civic initiatives to monitor government accountability.

Founding members

Yamini Aiyar is currently a senior research fellow and director of the accountability initiative being set up at the Centre for Policy Research. The Accountability initiative aims to promote research, innovations and tools to strengthen accountability and citizen's engagement in India's governance processes. Prior to joining CPR Yamini was working as an independent consultant providing research and policy support to government, international donors and civil society organizations on governance reform with a focus on issues related to strengthening accountability in basic service delivery. Yamini has also worked with the World Bank's Water and Sanitation Program and Rural Development Unit in New Delhi. The focus of her work was on action research aimed at strengthening mechanisms for citizen's engagement in local government. She was a member of the decentralization team at the World Bank that provided policy support to strengthen Panchayati Raj (local governance) in India. Yamini has also worked on issues related to decentralization and service delivery at the Ford Foundation with the Foundation's Governance and Civil Society program. Yamini has an Msc in Development Studies from the London School of Economics, an MA in Social and Political Sciences from St. Edmunds College Cambridge University, UK and a BA in Philosophy from St. Stephen's College, Delhi University.

Debbie Budlender is an independent research consultant. She was employed as a specialist researcher with the Community Agency for Social Enquiry (C A S E), a South African non-governmental organisation working in the area of social policy research, from 1998 to June 2012. Previous employment includes administrative and research work for trade unions, and research for the Cape Town University-based Southern African Labour and Development Research Unit at the time of the Second Carnegie Enquiry into Poverty. Between April 1997 and March 2002 Debbie was on a long-term part-time secondment to Statistics South Africa, the country's national statistical bureau. At Stats SA, Debbie worked primarily on gender, employment, poverty and children's issues. She was also in charge of planning and running the country's first national time use study. Between April 2002 and June 2012 she was on a long-term part-time secondment to the Centre for Actuarial Research at the University of Cape Town. In addition to development- and policy-related work done in South Africa for government, civil society organisations and donors, Debbie has served as consultant – primarily on budgets, statistics and gender issues – to

non-governmental organisations, governments, parliamentarians, multilateral institutions and donors in countries which include Albania, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, China, Croatia, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Macedonia, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palestine, Philippines, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Rosemary McGee is a Fellow in the Participation, Power and Social Change team at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex. Trained in interdisciplinary Development Studies, she has alternated between her academic role at IDS and various development practitioner roles in the international NGO sector. She joined IDS's Participation, Power and Social Change team in 1999, and her initial work there was on participatory poverty assessment methodologies. From 2000-2003 her focus was on promoting and supporting the participation of civil society organisations in policy processes. Research and advisory work with donor agencies and NGOs on participation in Poverty Reduction Strategy formulation and monitoring led her onto more critical conceptual and [empirical work on the spaces available for CSO and citizen participation in policy processes](#). Since 1997 she held several posts in the international NGO Christian Aid, as a policy researcher on gender and on participation, an advocacy officer and a programme manager. In her current IDS role she continues to work for Christian Aid as well as other international development NGOs including Trócaire, Plan International, Plan UK, CARE, World Vision, ActionAid and Amnesty International. From seeking ways to enable CSOs and citizens to participate in policy processes, she joined the movement of southern community and youth groups, NGOs, users' associations and social activists seeking to hold to account states and aid agencies to account. Looking into these citizen-led and social forms of accountability brought her up against the tension often encountered between *accountability* as commonly understood - usually to donors - and *learning*, for improved performance and more equitable, accountable development outcomes. A Review of the Impact and Effectiveness of Transparency and Accountability Initiatives that she and John Gaventa led for DFID in 2010-11 highlighted the challenges of demonstrating this sort of impact, as well as the need for more learning-focused approaches to design and implementation. In several projects with the International Budget Partnership she has explored and supported civil society advocacy on budget policy and practice. From 2012 she also convenes the MA Participation, Power and Social Change program at University of Sussex.

Gerardo Munck, Argentinian by birth, is professor in the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California (USC). He received his Ph.D. in political science from the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) in 1990. His research focuses on democracy and governance, Latin America and methodology. His books include *Measuring Democracy: A Bridge Between Scholarship and Politics* (Johns Hopkins University, 2009); *Regimes and Democracy in Latin America* (Oxford, 2007); *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics* (with Richard Snyder; Johns Hopkins, 2007); and *Authoritarianism and Democratization: Soldiers and Workers in Argentina, 1976-83* (Penn State, 1998). He has published dozens of journal articles in the United States, Canada, England, Spain, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico.

Professor Munck collaborated in the preparation of the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) report *Democracy in Latin America* (2004) and a second regional report prepared by the UNDP and the Organization of American States (OAS), *Nuestra democracia* (2010). He developed a methodology to monitor elections for the OAS. He worked with the UNDP on a system to monitor corruption in Afghanistan and on the measures of corruption and gender equality used in UNDP regional reports on Asia and the Pacific. He has also worked as a consultant for the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Carter Center.

Joint Declaration on Open Government for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

As participants in the Open Government Partnership, committed to the principles enshrined in the Open Government Declaration, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and other relevant international instruments related to effective and inclusive institutions and human rights, we:

Recognize the importance of harnessing our efforts and championing the principles of transparency and open government as crucial tools for ensuring the effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Acknowledge this is an ambitious global plan of action for achieving inclusive sustainable development in its economic, political, social and environmental dimensions, in a balanced and integrated manner to end poverty and combat inequality within and among countries.

Welcome the inclusion in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of goals and targets related to transparency, accountability, integrity and citizen participation. They are essential for promoting the rule of law, reducing corruption, and promoting public access to information and the development of effective and accountable institutions.

Applaud the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for recognizing that peaceful and inclusive societies are vital components of sustainable development.

Value and welcome the participation of civil society organizations in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Promote the Open Government Partnership as a platform for voluntary cooperation and peer exchange and learning. The experience of its participating governments and civil society organizations can be drawn on to encourage transparent, accountable, participatory, and technology-enabled implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Together, we declare our commitment to:

1. Promote the rule of law consistent with international standards at the national, regional and international level through transparency, openness, accountability, access to justice and effective and inclusive institutions. This is consistent with Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
2. Promote public access to timely and disaggregated information and open data on government activities related to the implementation and financing of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in line with national legislation and international commitments. We support development of the International Open Data Charter and intend to explore its implementation in our countries.
3. Support citizen participation in the implementation of all the goals and targets in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including decision-making, policy formulation, follow up and evaluation processes.

4. Uphold the principles of open government, as described in the Open Government Declaration, when defining international, regional and national indicators for measuring the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, taking into account national circumstances and development priorities. We will identify and share lessons learned and good practices to strengthen country capacity for implementation.
5. Use our Open Government Partnership National Action Plans to adopt commitments that serve as effective tools to promote transparent and accountable implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

September 2015

Draft Implementation Plan: Linking OGP and the Global Goals

At the UN General Assembly in September countries agreed the new global Sustainable Development Goals for 2030. Government and civil society actors are now planning for the implementation of these new goals. OGP has moved quickly to be at the forefront of implementation, including through the launch of the “Joint Declaration on Open Government for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”. The SC should now consider how to translate that political commitment into action.

First, it is important that all OGP countries endorse the new Declaration. The SC can assist with outreach to countries who have not signed by the time of the Global Summit.

Second, the SC and Support Unit need to plan how to implement the five core commitments in the Declaration. This table outlines what activities are being planned, and their timeframe. The discussion at the SC in Mexico City should explore what additional activities should be planned and consider the following questions:

- How can OGP use its unique mix of civil society and government leadership to exercise leadership on this agenda?
- What other high level processes and/or initiatives should OGP try to partner with in order to promote open and accountable implementation of the SDGs? (e.g. G20, COP 21)
- What upcoming events are most important for OGP to be involved with on the SDGs?
- What is the role of OGP’s multilateral partners?

Declaration Commitment:	SC/SU Activities:
<p>1. Promote the rule of law consistent with international standards at the national, regional and international level through transparency, openness, accountability, access to justice and effective and inclusive institutions. This is consistent with Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</p>	<p>Encourage all OGP countries to endorse the new Declaration.</p> <p>Include commitments related to access to justice in future National Action Plans.</p>
<p>2. Promote public access to timely and disaggregated information and open data on government activities related to the implementation and financing of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in line with national legislation and international commitments . We support development of the International Open Data Charter and intend to explore its implementation in our countries.</p>	<p>Encourage OGP countries to endorse the Open Data Charter.</p> <p>Formalise the links between OGP and the new Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data by signing up as a ‘Champion’ and encouraging National Action Plan commitments related to sustainable development data.</p> <p>Include commitments in National Action Plans on SDG monitoring and spending.</p>

	<p>Create new peer learning cohorts of countries who will exchange best practice on implementation of parts of the SDG agenda, such as access to information.</p>
<p>3. Support citizen participation in the implementation of all the goals and targets in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including decision-making, policy formulation, follow up and evaluation processes.</p>	<p>Encourage use of the OGP model of citizen consultation and engagement in SDG implementation plans.</p> <p>Crowdsource citizen and civil society generated content to suggest relevant OGP commitments for the Open Gov Guide Special Edition on the Global Goals.</p>
<p>4. Uphold the principles of open government, as described in the Open Government Declaration, when defining international, regional and national indicators for measuring the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, taking into account national circumstances and development priorities. We will identify and share lessons learned and good practices to strengthen country capacity for implementation.</p>	<p>Commit to championing and engaging in peer learning exercises related to the new goals, bilaterally, regionally or at global meetings.</p> <p>Use OGP Working Groups to develop discussions about specific commitments and to provide expertise and support for implementation.</p>
<p>5. Use our Open Government Partnership National Action Plans to adopt commitments that serve as effective tools to promote transparent and accountable implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development</p>	<p>Promote the advantage of the OGP Independent Reporting Mechanism as a means of holding governments to account for implementation of the 2030 Agenda.</p> <p>Consider joint - or bundled - commitments between SC members in future National Action Plans focused on achieving targets and indicators for the new goals.</p> <p>Use the new Open Government Guide Special Edition on the Global Goals to identify National Action Plan commitments that could help with implementation of the 2030 agenda.</p>

OGP Subnational Government Pilot Program

Summary memo and draft resolution

At the July working level Steering Committee meeting a small group of members introduced a paper on subnational governments and OGP. This paper presented preliminary thoughts about how to engage subnational governments in OGP, what a pilot phase for this effort might entail, and how to showcase subnational open government innovations at the upcoming Global Summit.

Steering Committee members expressed strong support for this effort, noting that some of the most practical and innovative applications of open government are seen at a local level. Members recognized that OGP could consider various ways of engaging subnational governments, and that we should use a pilot period to understand the pros and cons of different approaches. Steering Committee members felt there was advantage in making sure the initial stages of this work were flexible enough to learn from, and adapt to, what is working.

A number of Steering Committee members volunteered to participate in a temporary task force to: update the issues and options paper; design the pilot phase; work on how to best use the Summit to advance this; and explore other opportunities or partnerships that could be useful. The subnational task force agreed to develop and present a more detailed recommendation for the pilot phase for discussion at the October Steering Committee meeting. The draft concept for a pilot program is presented here, including a plan for how to use the Summit to get more input and a roadmap for the months following the Summit.

The Steering Committee is being asked to provide input and feedback on this draft concept and particularly to think about how we ensure the pilot phase is designed in a way that meets OGP's objectives and attracts high calibre participation and which specific subnational governments should be approached to participate in the pilot phase.

The Steering Committee will also be asked to agree this resolution:

The Steering Committee commends the work of the subnational task force and agrees to the scope of the pilot program in the draft concept note. The Steering Committee supports the outlined concept, timeline and roadmap, and mandates the subnational task force to continue this work with any further changes to be circulated to the full Steering Committee. An update on the progress of the pilot program should be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting. The full Steering Committee will be responsible for decisions related to subnational engagement arising from the pilot program.

Steering Committee Annex

2015 Peer Exchange Activities

The following is a list of bilateral, regional, and Working Group peer exchange activities in 2015. It is updated as activities are confirmed by the Support Unit or reported by POCs, Working Groups, and Multilaterals.

Complete / Ongoing Peer Exchange Activities

	Countries Involved	Date	Format	Description
Bilateral/ Regional				
1	Sierra Leone + Chile + World Bank	January 2015	Videoconference	Videoconference with Chile's Council on Transparency and Sierra Leone's ATI Commission on setting up institutional mechanisms for overseeing the implementation of ATI laws.
2	Panama + Uruguay	February 2015	Conference call	Conference call on lessons learned on action plan development.
3	Argentina + Honduras	February 2015	Conference call	Conference call on lessons learned on plan development.
4	Sierra Leone + International Records Management Trust	February 2015	Conference call	Discussion on best practices for records management in support of legislative reform of Sierra Leone's archive law.
5	Liberia + Ghana + Sierra Leone + World Bank	March 2015	Videoconference	Videoconference on lessons learned from action plan development and implementation.
6	Croatia + Montenegro	June 2015	In-person meeting	Experience sharing/lessons learned on action plan implementation.
7	Georgia + Ukraine	June 2015	Ministerial meeting	Georgian Minister Tea Tsulukiani and Ukrainian Minister of Justice Mr. Petrenko and vice-PM Zubko discussed Ukraine's action plan and the Global Summit.
8	Georgia + France	June 2015	In-person meeting	Assistance on judicial openness programs.

9	US + Macedonia + Romania + Bulgaria + Slovak Republic	June 2015	In-person meeting	Govt. POCs and CS representatives exchanging experiences, lessons learned, and challenges.
10	US + Turkey	June 2015	In-person meetings	Discussion on action plan development with Govt. POCs and US Civil society.
11	Canada + Tunisia	June 2015	In-person meeting	Canadian POC advised on consultation methodologies, followed by sharing material Tunisian counterparts. Follow up meeting planned for the Fall.
12	Mexico + Colombia	July 2015	Conference call	Discussion on dashboards and other tools for monitoring commitment implementation. Mexico shared the source code for their tracking site.
13	Philippines + Sierra Leone	July 2015	In-person Meeting	Exchange on open data and anti-corruption.
14	Georgia + Romania + Armenia	July 2015	In-person meeting	Sharing experiences and best practices for action plan monitoring and implementation as well as citizen engagement and technology.
15	Paraguay + Chile + Brazil + Uruguay + World Bank	July 2015, ongoing	Study visits, in-person meetings, conference calls, etc.	A 9-member delegation from Paraguay is visiting Santiago de Chile for 3 days to learn about Chile's experience with ATI law implementation and Brazil's CGU expert will travel to Asuncion next week to advise on the e-platform for ATI requests submission. WB also to co-sponsor a seminar in Sept. on implementation of the ATI law in Paraguay with ATIWG possible in attendance.
16	South Africa + Ghana + Sierra Leone + Liberia + Tanzania	July 2015	In person meeting	African caucus that involved sharing experiences on developing and implementing OGP action plans on the sideline of the SC meeting.
17	Ghana + Sierra Leone	August 2015	Written feedback	Sierra Leone provided written feedback to Ghana on the draft action plan as part of the African caucus of

				OGP countries.
18	Albania + Bosnia + Macedonia + Montenegro + Croatia + Serbia + Romania + Georgia + Kosovo	September 2015	In person meeting	Western Balkans Regional Dialogue hosted by Albania involved an organized event for PoCs to share experiences on developing and implementing OGP action plans. The event also included lightning talks and informal exchanges.
19	Moldova + World Bank	September 2015	In person meeting	Pre-Summit event where Moldovan civil society organizations, government representatives, and World Bank colleagues exchanges challenges, lessons, learned, and ideas to strengthen government and civil society collaboration in Moldova.
20	Brazil + Paraguay	September 2015	In person meetings/ Study tour	Study tour to sharing lessons learned and best practices on action plan development, monitoring, and implementation.
Working Groups				
21	FOWG + Mexico	January 2015	Workshop	Workshop on public participation in the budget process.
22	FOWG + Tunisia + World Bank	February 2015	Workshop	Workshop on citizen engagement and other fiscal openness issues.
23	ATIWG + Sierra Leone	February 2015	Conference calls	Sharing best practices related to implementation of ATI legislation and setting up an ATI commission .
24	FOWG + Brazil	March 2015	Workshop	Workshop on budget portals and virtual schools .
25	ONRWG + Liberia	April 2015	Technical Assistance	Draft commitments on land reforms and land use rights transparency.
26	ODWG	April 2015	Research	Published the Open data Standards Inventory available on ODWG's Resources page .
27	FOWG + South Africa	May 2015	Workshop	Workshop on public participation in the budget process.

28	ODWG	May 2015	Research	Research included the publication of final research deliverables from the OD4D Research Fund, which can be found on the ODWG's Resources page .
29	FOWG + Georgia	June 2015	Emails	Sharing best practices on citizen engagement in the budget process.
30	FOWG + Liberia	June 2015	Written feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
31	ATIWG + Liberia	June 2015	Written Feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
32	ODWG + Liberia	June 2015	Written Feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
33	ODWG + Morocco	June 2015	In person meeting	Govt. co-anchor visited Morocco to discuss approaches to open data as Morocco seeks assistance on developing and implementing their open data strategy.
34	FOWG + Philippines	July 2015	Written feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
35	ONRWG + Colombia	July 2015	Written feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
36	ONRWG + Philippines	July 2015	Written feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
37	LOWG + Philippines	July 2015	Written feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
38	ODWG + Philippines	July 2015	Written feedback	Feedback on draft action plan.
39	ODWG + France	July 2015	Technical assistance	France seeking input through a survey to members of the ODWG on public interest data for the upcoming Law on Digital Matters.
40	FOWG + Ghana	July 2015	Written Feedback + Conference Call	Feedback on draft action plan with follow up conference call to be scheduled.
41	ATIWG + Sierra Leone	July 2015	Conference calls + Technical Assistance	Shared procedures manual developed for Liberia. Conference calls for advice and determining needs to broker funding/ technical assistance.
42	FOWG + Philippines + Indonesia + Mongolia + New Zealand	September 2015	Workshop/ In person meetings	Workshop on challenges and opportunities related to fiscal openness in the region. Topics included improving performance on

	Non OGP: India + Sri - anka Cambodia + Vietnam			the Open Budget Index, enhancing citizen engagement in the budget process, and tools and techniques for greater transparency.
43	LOWG + Montenegro + Chile + Canada + Colombia + Guatemala + Mexico + Serbia + Brazil + Paraguay + Argentina + Uruguay + Denmark + Australia + USA + Jordan + Israel + Liberia + UK	September 2015	Conference/ Workshops/ Meetings	Global Legislative Openness Week, the second annual week dedicated to legislative openness. In addition to meetings, advocacy campaigns, and other activities organized by LOWG members in over 10 countries, the week included a global meeting of the Working Group hosted by the Parliament of Georgia.
44	ODWG + Liberia	October 2015	Written feedback	Sharing resources on open data and e-government.

Planned Peer Exchange Activities

The following are activities that are being planned:

	Countries/ Organizations	Date	Format	Description
1	ATIWG	October 2015	In person meeting	Convening a Peer Learning Network per the new WG guidance at the Global Summit.
2	LOWG	October 2015	In person meeting	Convening a Peer Learning Network per the new WG guidance at the Global Summit.
3	ODWG	October 2015	In person meeting	Convening a Peer Learning Network per the new WG guidance at the Global Summit.
4	ONRWG	October 2015	In person meeting	Convening a Peer Learning Network per the new WG guidance at the Global Summit.
5	FOWG	October 2015	In person meeting	Convening a Peer Learning Network per the new WG guidance at the Global Summit.
6	FOWG	October 2015	Workshop	Two-day workshop for peer exchange and learning on fiscal transparency portals, citizen engagement, SDGs advancement, and fiscal openness tools.

7	ATIWG	October 2015	In person Meeting	In person breakfast meeting of ATIWG members to discuss lessons learned and opportunities for future ATIWG programming
8	Support Unit + World Bank + Sierra Leone	October 2015	In person training workshop	Training civil society in Sierra Leone on tools and techniques for monitoring action plan progress and developing shadow assessment reports.

OGP Working Groups

OGP Working groups provide an opportunity for open government reformers working on similar issues to share experiences, lessons, and best practice in specific open government policy areas. The goal of the working groups is to connect government and civil society participants so they can inspire and learn from each other to improve the quality of OGP national action plans. They are a resource for peer learning and technical assistance in support of developing and implementing more ambitious commitments. The working groups can help you tap into the expertise you need to develop more meaningful and innovative open government initiatives.

Each working group is led by government and civil society co-anchors that are experts in their field. Working groups are open to interested government and civil society reformers, professional networks, and others who are interested in the broader open government agenda. Currently there are five working groups covering critical open government policy areas:

1. [Open Data Working Group](#) - led by World Wide Web Foundation and the Government of Canada
2. [Access to Information Working Group](#) - led by Carter Center and Mexico's Federal Institute for Access to Public Information and Data Protection
3. [Fiscal Openness Working Group](#) - led by the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency, the Federal Secretary of Budget & Planning of the Government of Brazil, and the International Budget Partnership.
4. [Openness in Natural Resources Working Group](#) - led by Natural Resources Governance Institute and World Resources International)
5. [Legislative Openness Working Group](#) - led by the National Democratic Institute and the Congress of Chile

How Working Groups Can Help

Working groups can assist OGP countries depending where they are in the national action plan cycle. They can help countries develop more ambitious commitments by facilitating peer learning and providing feedback on draft action plans. They can also serve as a resource for targeted peer exchange and direct technical assistance to improve the quality of implementation of action plans. The following are different ways in which the Working Group can be of assistance:

Action Plan Cycle	How Working Groups Can Help
Action plan development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share experiences and best practices on aspects of action plan development (e.g. consultations with civil society, development of commitment milestones).• Review and provide feedback on content of draft action plans.• Help broaden the organisations involved in consultations by recommending thematic experts in specific issue areas.• Identify ambitious model commitments for OGP countries to include in their action plans.• Connect governments to learning resources such as country case studies, best practices, research papers, etc.
Action plan implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share experiences and best practices on aspects of action plan implementation (e.g. implementing ATI legislation, setting up open data

	<p>portals, coordinating with civil society, etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct targeted bilateral or regional peer exchanges among countries (e.g. study tours, video conference calls). • Connect the working group’s experts to governments that request technical assistance on implementation.
Action Plan Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist governments and civil society with performance monitoring methodologies for self assessment and shadow reports. • Help governments incorporate feedback from the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) to strengthen subsequent national action plans. • Participate in domestic IRM report launches. • Supplement IRM findings with additional analysis and recommendations for government and civil society actors.

Contact Us

Contact the OGP Support Unit or working group co-anchors if you would like to participate in working group activities or receive support in developing and implementing your action plan. For more information please email Abhinav Bahl, OGP Support Unit, Washington DC at abhinav.bahl@opengovpartnership.org.

OGP Open Data Working Group

The [Open Data Working Group \(ODWG\)](#) supports the design and implementation of ambitious action plan commitments related to the release of high quality, open government data, helping OGP countries around the world to advance their open data agendas.

The ODWG has focused its efforts to date on four work streams: Principles (led by Government of Canada and OECD), Standards (led by Open North and Government of the United States), Measurement of Impact (led by the World Wide Web Foundation and Government of the United States), and Capacity Building (led by AVINA and Government of Mexico).

The ODWG is co-anchored by the Government of Canada and the World Wide Web Foundation. The working group is governed by a Steering Committee (SC), which is made up of representatives of governments, civil society, and multilateral institutions. Under the leadership of its co-anchors, the steering committee plans and manages work plans, working group meetings, and other related activities.

How We Can Help

The ODWG offers a number of services to support government and civil society in participating countries:

1. National Action Plan Development and Review: Assist in formulating ambitious open data commitments as well as review draft national action plans to provide feedback and suggest how open data commitments could be strengthened.
2. Expert Network: Provide access to a network of open data experts and advocates, allowing OGP members to circulate information or request expert input for commitment implementation and other specific initiatives.
3. Event Planning Support: Plan events related to open data, suggesting potential speakers and providing information on key topics.
4. Bilateral Discussions: Engage in bilateral discussions with country or civil society representatives to support increased capacity for open data.

The ODWG is always looking for new ways to support OGP participants, both government and civil society. If there is a way the working group can help you, please get in touch with the co-anchors and we will do all we can to provide our support and guidance.

Recent Achievements

Throughout 2015, each work stream has focused on developing key products or initiatives to support open data implementation worldwide. Recent achievements of the ODWG work streams include:

- Principles: The development and launch of the [International Open Data Charter](#), an initiative which seeks to codify common foundational open data principles.
- Standards: Creating and publishing an inventory of open data standards by type.
- Measurement of Impact: Consulting with subject matter experts on common criteria, metrics, and methodologies to measure the impact of open data activities.
- Capacity Building: Providing on-demand consultation and peer review services to support the development of Action Plan Open Data commitments in multiple OGP member countries.
- Open Data for Development Research Fund: Providing almost \$100,000 in funding for [research projects](#) dedicated to open data for sustainable development.

- International Open Data Conference: Contributing to shaping the agenda of the [International Open Data Conference \(IODC\) 2015](#) in Ottawa, Canada.
- Open Data Leaders' Summit: Working with the ODI to support a Leaders' Summit on the margins of IODC 2015, bringing together open data leaders from countries around the world.

Contact Us

Visit our [webpage](#) for more information on the open data working group. If you are interested in participating in the working group or requesting assistance please contact Jose M. Alonso, Program Manager, Open Data, World Wide Web Foundation at jose.alonso@webfoundation.org or Stephen Walker, Treasury Board Secretariat, Government of Canada at stephen.walker@tbs-sct.gc.ca.

OGP Legislative Openness Working Group

Greater openness of the legislative process enables citizens to engage more effectively in the policymaking process by providing access to information about the laws under consideration, as well as opportunities to influence legislative deliberation. While some countries have made OGP action plan commitments to improve public consultation in legislative or regulatory action, legislative engagement has been underemphasized in the action plans of many OGP participating countries. The Legislative Openness Working Group aims to expand the number and quality of relevant commitments in national action plans. The Working Group is co-chaired by the Congress of Chile, led by Senator Hernán Larraín, and the National Democratic Institute, led by Scott Hubli.

How we can help

1. Deepen parliamentary engagement in OGP and build awareness of open government issues within the parliamentary community.
2. Support governments, legislatures and civil society in developing legislative openness commitments.
3. Provide a forum for peer-to-peer sharing of best practices, experiences, and innovative technologies.
4. Develop high-quality tools, resources, and research products to be shared within the broader OGP community.
5. Strengthen the capacity of and provide opportunities for legislatures and civil society to collaborate towards greater openness.
6. Identify technical assistance and partnership opportunities on legislative openness.
7. Support OGP national action plans especially where commitments require passing legislation.

Recent achievements

Global Legislative Openness Week (GLOW): GLOW, which took place September 7-15, was the second annual week dedicated to legislative openness. In addition to meetings, advocacy campaigns, and other activities organized by LOWG members in over 10 countries, the week included a global meeting of the Working Group hosted by the Parliament of Georgia. The meeting brought together more than 100 open parliament champions from 32 countries to discuss strategies for advancing legislative openness through the OGP process.

Comparative Research and Data Explorer: Over the last year, the Working Group has collected detailed information on openness practices in more than 40 countries. In the coming months, the Working Group will launch a data explorer to make it easy for users to search, sort, and analyze the collected data, which can be used to inform OGP commitments and reform efforts.

Developing Standards on Legislative Ethics: Members of the Working Group, in conjunction with the broader parliamentary openness community, has drafted *Common Ethical Principles for MPs*, a set of normative standards on legislative ethics. Following a public comment period, the document is currently being finalized and will be published in advance of the OGP Summit.

Contact Us

Visit our [webpage](#) for more information on the Legislative Openness Working Group. If you are interested in participating in the working group or requesting assistance please contact Dan Swislow, Senior Partnerships Officer, National Democratic Institute at dswislow@ndi.org.

OGP Openness in Natural Resources Working Group

The [Openness in Natural Resources Working Group](#) (ONRWG) fosters the creation and implementation of concrete and impactful natural resource-related commitments. The ONRWG provides a space for peer learning and exchange of experience between and across government and civil society. Our ultimate ambition is to advance our collective understanding of how openness in natural resources can improve citizen's lives.

The ONRWG brings together governments and civil society organizations who have a demonstrated track record advancing natural resource governance and are deepening their commitment through the Open Government Partnership. The ten participating countries include: Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Mongolia, Philippines, Tunisia, United Kingdom and United States of America. The Working Group also provides technical support on a request basis to OGP participating countries.

The ONRWG is co-chaired by the Government of Indonesia, the [Natural Resource Governance Institute](#) (NRGI) and the [World Resources Institute](#) (WRI), and is supported by international initiatives such as the [Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative](#) (EITI), and organizations such as the [World Bank](#) and [UNDP](#).

How we can help

The Working Group recognizes that while significant progress has been made in the disclosure of information related to the natural resource sector, there remain persistent areas of opacity. The Working Group seeks to **promote disclosure of contracts, beneficial ownership and environmental policy, management and compliance data**. OGP participating countries have already made progress on many of these fronts. To illustrate, the UK announced a publicly accessible central registry of company beneficial ownership information in 2013, and Mongolia has committed to develop a central information database of land tenure, minerals and oil license owners, open to the public. The Working Group will seek to capitalize on that momentum and broaden the number of countries and commitments promoting disclosure in these key areas.

Disclosure of information will only be made meaningful if countries adhere to **open data standards** that promote accessibility and usability by a range of stakeholders. The Working Group members have experience and expertise to share in how to use spatial data, maps and portals effectively to ensure disclosure advances transparency. There are more than thirty commitments focused on the creation of natural resource information portals: for example, Indonesia has created the OneMap portal for forest management. The Working Group will leverage this and other experiences to draw lessons on good practice in the release and organization of information.

The Working Group also **provides support** to better understand and identify key natural resource issues, formulate commitments that offer concrete solutions, share experience in implementation and seek partnerships with contacts across the globe for expertise and advice. By supporting regional meetings, such as the Africa and LAC (Latin America and the Caribbean) meetings on open data and extractives, and the publication of [OpenGov Guide](#), the Working Group is able to capitalize on the collective knowledge of its members.

Contact Us

Visit our [webpage](#) for more information on the Openness in Natural Resources Working Group or click [here](#) to become a member of the Working Group. If you are interested in participating in the working group or requesting assistance please contact Suneeta Kaimal, Chief Operating Officer, Natural Resources Governance Institute at skaimal@resourcegovernance.org or Carole Excell, Project Director, The Access Initiative, World Resources Institute at CExcell@wri.org.

OGP Access to Information Working Group

The [Access to Information Working Group \(ATIWG\)](#) serves as a resource to help government in designing and implementing effective and ambitious commitments that advance the right of access to information and lead to greater transparency and openness. The ATIWG is co-anchored by the Carter Center and the Federal Institute for Access to Information and Data Protection, Government of Mexico. The working group includes almost 200 participants from government and civil society across all regions that support the group's activities.

The ATIWG has four goals:

- 1) Become a resource that helps participating governments in designing and implementing effective and ambitious commitments regarding Access To Information and disclosure of relevant information.
- 2) Support the participation of key stakeholders, access to information oversight agencies, networks, and civil society in the OGP access to information dialogue.
- 3) Encourage best practices and coordinate efforts to promote access to public information with OGP participating countries.
- 4) Promote the right of access to information as a catalyst for generating useful public knowledge and contributing to building more open institutions and accountability.

How We Can Help

The ATIWG offers the following assistance to OGP participating countries:

1. Support in developing more ambitious access to information commitments and reviewing new draft commitments
2. Provide concrete opportunities for peer exchange and mentorship
3. Provide advice and assistance to countries related to the implementation of their access to information commitments
4. Demonstrate how access to information theoretically and substantively strengthens other OGP principles and objectives
5. Encourage member participation in upcoming OGP activities and organize ATIWG panels or speakers for key events
6. Develop new research and analysis related to ATI OGP commitments and disseminate additional relevant information among its members, such as IRM reports, research, and articles related to access to information and OGP, etc.

The ATIWG is open to interested government representatives, civil society organizations, networks, advocates of the right to access information, and others whose work relates to access to information and the broader transparency and accountability agenda. The working group is always looking for new ways to support both government and civil society from OGP participating countries.

Recent Achievements

Since 2014 the ATIWG has supported access to information commitments across the Partnership.

Highlights include:

- Analysis of access to information-related commitments in OGP action plans
- Recommendations on developing and implementing access to information commitments to interested countries, such as Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Georgia, and Liberia
- Exchange visit on access to information implementation of government and civil society leaders from Georgia to Mexico

- Award of four microgrants to support research demonstrating access to information linkages to OGP commitments
- Webinars on lessons learned and best practices
- ATIWG panels and workshops at OGP annual and regional meetings including:
 - European Point of Contact Meeting in Georgia, June 2015
 - Americas Regional Meeting in Costa Rica, May 2014
 - European Regional Meeting in Ireland, May 2013
 - OGP Global Summit in London, October 2013

Contact Us

Visit our [webpage](#) for more information on the Access to Information Working Group. If you are interested in participating in the working group or requesting assistance please contact Laura Neuman, Director, Global Access to Information Program, The Carter Center at laura.neuman@cartercenter.org or Joel Salas, Commissioner, Federal Institute for Access to Information and Data Protection, Government of Mexico at joel.salas@ifai.org.mx.

OGP Fiscal Openness Working Group

The [Fiscal Openness Working Group](#) enables peer-to-peer learning to advance transparency and public participation in fiscal policies around the world. The working group aims to strengthen learning on good practices, challenges, and solutions in public finance management and supports the development and implementation of better fiscal openness commitments in national action plans

The FOWG is co-anchored by the [Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency](#), the Federal Secretary of Budget & Planning of the Government of Brazil, and the International Budget Partnership. GIFT is a multi-stakeholder action network that works to advance and institutionalize significant and continuous improvements in the state of fiscal transparency, participation, and accountability worldwide by strengthening global norms, incentives, peer-learning, and technical assistance. The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the International Budget Partnership, the International Federation of Accountants, and the Governments of the Philippines and Brazil are part of GIFT. More information at <http://fiscaltransparency.net>.

How We Can Help

The FOWG can:

1. Provide a platform for peer-to-peer exchange and learning on fiscal openness
2. Offer efficient and coordinated access to international good practices, tools, norms, assessments, and technical expertise on fiscal openness
3. Support participating countries to implement better fiscal openness commitments and pursue ambitious goals
4. Motivate governments to become champions of fiscal openness.

Recent Achievements

Technical Assistance: FOWG has responded to requests for technical assistance in the formulation and implementation of national action plan commitments in Paraguay, Liberia, Ghana, the Philippines and New Zealand.

Peer learning opportunities: FOWG has organized several sessions at OGP regional meetings in Ireland, Costa Rica, Indonesia, and Tanzania; peer learning workshops in Brasilia and Manila; and meetings on public participation in fiscal policies in Mexico, South Africa, Tunisia, and Washington DC. Ministry of Finance representatives from more than 25 OGP countries have attended these meetings to exchange ideas and experiences on fiscal transparency portals, budget analysis, citizens budgets, public participation, and timely publication of budget documents.

Tools and resources: The working group has produced analytical and policy background papers on fiscal openness commitments across the partnership. GIFT is developing a global tool with visualization and analysis capabilities for publishing micro-level budget and fiscal outturn information in open data formats to help non-experts use the data. The governments of Paraguay, Brazil and Tunisia have actively engaged on this project.

Contact Us

Visit our [webpage](#) for more information on the fiscal openness working group. If you are interested in participating in the working group or requesting assistance please contact Juan Pablo Guerrero, Network Director, Global Initiative on Fiscal Transparency at guerrero@fiscaltransparency.net.

OGP Subnational Government Pilot Program Draft Concept Note

At the July OGP Steering Committee meeting in South Africa several members tabled and presented a paper detailing the case and options for OGP to engage subnational governments. There was wide support for the proposal and a temporary task force was created to design a pilot program to engage subnational governments, work out how to best use the Summit to announce the program, and develop a timeline for implementation. This Concept Note below presents a draft vision, rationale and process for a subnational engagement pilot program for discussion and feedback. The task force will combine feedback from the Steering Committee, with that solicited at the Summit from subnational government practitioners, to finalize the pilot to an agreed timeline.

The objectives of the pilot program are to:

- Foster more diverse political leadership and commitment from governments to OGP across countries and to hold governments accountable at a local level, where many citizens are directly accessing services and information.
- Discover and promote new and innovative open government techniques and practices emerging at the subnational level around the world.
- Create practical opportunities for subnational governments to learn from each other, share experiences, and build upon the open government work of their counterparts.
- Support and empower government reformers with technical expertise and inspiration.
- Broaden and deepen participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) in OGP.
- Learn how OGP can best support subnational governments in making their cities, municipalities, counties, etc. more open, accountable, and responsive to their citizens.
- Determine the best structure for subnational participation in OGP by testing various engagement models.

Why should the OGP work with subnational governments?

1. **More people are living in cities than ever before.** Cities and other local governments have become more and more important to people's everyday lives. The UN estimates that, '54 % of the world's population [currently] lives in urban areas, a proportion that is expected to increase to 66 per cent by 2050.' More than half the population in developing countries, which traditionally have more rural areas, will be living in cities by 2030. A new stand-alone Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11 recognizes the transformative potential of cities: 'Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.' When combined with the governance aspirations of SDG Goal 16, to 'build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels,' these two SDGs provide a powerful mandate for efforts to deepen transparency and open government at the subnational level.
2. **Local governments are closer to the people and their work has a more direct impact on citizen's everyday lives than national level governments.** With increased populations in urban areas come increasing demands for services and the need for more effective and responsive local level governments. But it's not just city governments that are facing new challenges that could benefit from the OGP's support. States, regions, provinces, and counties deliver crucial services, especially within federalized systems, where much of healthcare and education is administered at the state and local county levels. These subnational governments can often be more flexible and less bureaucratic than national level governments, and are in closer proximity to the people they exist to serve. This makes the

impact they can have through participating in OGP sizeable. They are also often inadequately resourced and thereby have a greater need for support.

3. **Improved visibility of the types of open government initiatives happening at all levels of government will help OGP to better serve not just *subnational* but *national* level governments as well.** Many innovations and open government reforms are happening at the local level. If, as a partnership, we fail to engage with subnational governments, we will miss out on crucial opportunities to learn about more innovative and effective open government reform programs (see Annex 3). By engaging, we capitalize on opportunities to surface examples, share them, and better support both national and subnational governments in their reform efforts.

4. **Subnational governments are in need of a mechanism to convene and support them in moving towards more open and accountable local governments.** To our best knowledge, no other organization is actively working to specifically support subnational governments in their work to advance open government. While organizations like Transparency International and the Open Knowledge Foundation provide institutional support to strengthen local civil society chapters, their focus is on broader transparency efforts and not specifically geared to helping to build partnerships between local governments and CSOs to make their governments more open, accountable and responsive to citizens.

5. **Subnational governments could benefit much more from OGP involvement.** Within the existing OGP structure, subnational governments are only marginally benefitting from the experience of their national level governments participating in OGP. For example, of the 83 commitments from action plans from 2011-2014 that were tagged as “subnational,” only 4 clearly demonstrated that a subnational government helped to develop the actual commitment. Furthermore, the majority of national Action Plans (NAPs) make rare mention of subnational open government reforms, and those that do tend to articulate top down commitments instead of commitments that arise from the subnational governments themselves.

The rationale laid out above for engaging subnational governments does not by any means diminish the value of supporting national level governments. Many national level institutions, such as the legislature, judiciary and executive branch, have a far-reaching impact and create overarching policy frameworks that have a very real effect on people’s lives. Moreover, national level governments can serve as open government leaders for their respective countries, exerting influence, paving the way, and supporting other institutions through leading by example. By working in a more ‘bottom-up’ way, the subnational pilot program would complement and reinforce these national, more “top-down,” efforts.

The case for subnational governments to engage with OGP

1. **To derive inspiration and receive recognition** for open government innovations and reforms at the local level. There is no existing international forum that brings together subnational governments to reward such efforts and document their impact on transparency, accountability and citizen engagement.
2. **To learn from each other** as part of a larger open government network. There is no existing network of open government reformers at the subnational level, whether domestically in OGP countries or internationally across countries. Subnational governments could use the opportunity of becoming part of OGP to benefit from a peer-to-peer learning experience with other subnational government figures and civil society organizations championing similar open government reform.

3. **To receive institutional support** from an international partnership with a sound reputation in open government. OGP has developed a strong partnership of national governments and CSOs that combines the best practical knowledge on policies and practices related to transparency and open government, with a platform to reward and incentivize meaningful, measurable reform. Subnational governments could benefit significantly from this institutional support and network.

4. **To learn new ways to make local governments run more openly and efficiently.** Subnational governments want clear, concrete support to help their cities, states, provinces, and regions run better. Cities and other subnational governments around the world have been facing the challenge of trying to do more with less. Populations are increasing while many cities are facing budget shortages and ever-increasing demands from their citizens to provide services.

5. **Increased global visibility and positive publicity.** Just as national governments benefit from the global platform and visibility associated with joining OGP, subnational governments would receive the same benefits. Engaging subnational governments and civil society organizations in OGP increases international exposure and visibility for reform-minded mayors, governors, and local civil society leaders. Many of these subnational governments and their civil society counterparts aspire to be global actors pioneering local solutions to global problems. OGP can highlight and amplify these efforts in the international domain.

Proposal for pilot program

What: A two-tier program for local government officials and CSO representatives to reflect different levels of aspiration and engagement in the open government agenda. Subnational governments in both tiers would work with their national OGP governments to develop and include subnational commitments in their respective NAPs, and invited to become part of a larger OGP network of peer learning and networking.

1. **Pioneers Program:** 6 – 10 local governments that are acknowledged global pioneers in open government will be invited to engage directly with OGP in an experimental pilot program with local CSOs. Participants will receive dedicated assistance and advice from the OGP Support Unit to develop and fulfill independent open government commitments at the local level and to actively contribute to peer learning and networking activities with other subnational and national governments. An annual award will be given to celebrate the most innovative open government reform success in a Pioneer subnational government.

2. **Leaders Program:** A larger network of subnational open government actors, both from civil society and local governments, that are interested in and/or already innovating around open government will be invited to participate in learning and networking events such as global and regional OGP summits and to develop and include subnational commitments in their respective NAPs.

This approach allows us to test two methods for strengthening OGP engagement at the subnational level: for Pioneers, developing more subnational commitments on open government within the OGP's existing support structure; and for Leaders, building a global network of subnational governments to

foster peer learning. We will be best able to understand the value and drawbacks of each approach through in-depth, ongoing analysis and identification of lessons learned.

In two years we would expect to see the following impacts from the pilot program: each Pioneer would develop and implement 2-3 fresh open government commitments, with an increase in the number of subnational open government commitments in NAPs led by Pioneers and Leaders to 50% of the total. The subnational OGP declaration would have signed-up commitments from all OGP national governments and two rounds of an annual award program will have been conducted and widely publicized.

Who: All program participants will be from OGP signatory countries and work in subnational areas with a minimum population of 250,000 people.

How: Interested subnational governments will submit an expression of interest in participating in the program. On selection, they will commit to a subnational open government declaration modeled on the OGP Declaration and begin participation in the program.

When: The pilot program will be announced at the OGP Summit in October 2015 with application details to be distributed in December. Official pilot program selections for subnational governments will be made in early 2016, in order to launch the program.

Participants: Who are ideal Pioneers and Leaders?

Program participants will share a passion for and commitment to transparency and open government. For the pilot program, subnational governments will be able to participate if their national government is already participating in OGP. Beyond this requirement and minimum population size there are no tightly defined criteria but the following considerations may be useful in identifying potential participants.

Pioneers

- Have a demonstrated track record of open government innovations and programs through world-class, pioneering and ongoing work on implementing open government techniques and processes (e.g., open data, civic engagement, access to information, budget and fiscal transparency, participatory policymaking and oversight).
- Ideally can point to concrete, compelling examples of the positive impact of open government on citizens' lives in their localities.
- For subnational governments, have a positive relationship with local civil society and a genuine commitment to protecting civic space and engaging constructively with non-governmental actors (as evidenced, for example, by recommendation letters from two CSOs as part of their application).
- Have a willingness to share lessons learned and insights from their experience with peers and recognition of the advantage of the OGP platform to encourage and develop this.
- Are willing to take on a formal mentorship role with another subnational government after year one of the pilot program is complete.
- Are committed to signing the subnational open government declaration.
- Express interest in receiving direct, institutional support from OGP to co-create commitments and advance their open government reform efforts.

Leaders

- Demonstrate an explicit commitment to open government principles, ideally with some experience implementing core open government techniques and processes (e.g. open data, civic engagement, access to information, budget and fiscal transparency, participatory policymaking and oversight). At a minimum, they express an interest in piloting open government initiatives.
- For subnational governments, committed to developing a positive relationship with local civil society and to protecting civic space and engaging constructively with non-governmental actors.
- Express a willingness to share lessons learned and insights from their experience with peers and recognition of the advantage of the OGP platform to encourage and further this.
- Are committed to signing the subnational open government declaration.

What will participation entail?

1. Subnational commitments in National Action Plans: Pioneers and Leaders

As part of the pilot program, both Pioneers and Leaders will be encouraged to work closely with their respective national governments to develop subnational open government commitments in their next National Action Plans (NAP). Depending on the country's NAP cycle, this might be a 2016 or a 2017 activity.

As countries with OGP subnational Pioneers or Leaders begin to embark upon their next NAPS, the Support Unit's direct country support team will prioritize those countries for dedicated advice and technical support to explore ways in which subnational open government priorities can become part of the country's next NAP. This support should also include peer learning events that encourage discussions among this subset of countries and Leaders/Pioneers to present the subnational commitments they are exploring for inclusion in their next NAP as inspiration for others.

2. Specific subnational commitments: Pioneers

In the Pioneers program only, we envision an additional layer of experimentation that goes beyond the inclusion of more subnational commitments in NAPs. In this group, we want to test more of the OGP co-creation methodology to explore whether standalone subnational commitments outside of the NAP might be a fruitful path to explore for OGP's future work with subnational governments. For the two-year pilot program, we envision a process by which Pioneers – with robust support from key Steering Committee members as well as the Support Unit's direct country support and civil society teams – develop subnational open government commitments outside of the NAP cycle or framework. Rather than pursuing full OGP Subnational Action Plans, the objective is to foster the co-creation of a handful of ambitious and high-priority subnational open government reforms that go beyond what might ordinarily make their way into NAPs. These should be ambitious commitments at the subnational level that reflect Pioneers' reputations as innovators in subnational open government reforms. These experimental commitments should reflect the best methodologies OGP has identified and developed to-date around genuine co-creation of commitments (processes that go well beyond consultation or solicitation of ideas). The ambition of the commitments themselves should also be world-class in their aspiration, meeting or exceeding the quality and content of OGP "starred commitments" in the national context.

For this process, a very small number of these unique Pioneer experimental commitments are co-developed each year during the two-year pilot program. The Support Unit – drawing on

enhanced resources in the direct country support team and the civil society outreach team – would play integral roles in assisting Pioneers from government and civil society in the country to co-create these commitments and coach them on best practices. Steering Committee members with expertise and interest in the countries/localities/issue areas in question would also offer time and expertise to the process.

3. Peer learning and training activities

The subnational pilot program will encourage participants to learn from each other. To best facilitate this learning, the pilot program could:

- **Bring together select Pioneer and Leader cohorts in special OGP subnational events to share the open government commitments they are considering for inclusion in NAPs.** These gatherings could occur semi-annually, in the margins of OGP regional and global events, and would stimulate sharing and learning between our Leaders and Pioneers.
- **Convene subnational governments and CSOs in topic based sub-groups** through webinars, Google hangouts, and in-person meetings to share their expertise, complemented by training sessions addressing high-priority reforms and common challenges.
- **Document and distribute case studies and toolkits** based on relevant subnational open government reforms.
- **Support attendance of Pioneers and Leaders at OGP global events**, both the global summit as well as regional meetings.
- **Support interested and proactive government and civil society actors in proposing and establishing an OGP Working Group on subnational open government innovations.** Participation would be open to all Pioneers and Leaders as well as other interested experts. The working group would surface and compile useful and concrete information to support subnational pilot program participants in achieving their open government goals. The creation of this working group would be contingent upon the availability of resources and interest from a third party to lead the group.
- **Create a mentorship framework** in which Pioneers who have participated in the pilot program for at least one year are paired with subnational governments who are new to the program. Pioneers would be responsible for sharing their experience from year one and would be expected to advise and support incoming subnational governments in overcoming challenges similar to those they themselves overcame through the support they received in the Pioneers program.

OGP Award for Subnational Innovations

As the Open Government Award has been an effective incentive for motivating action and surfacing great examples of open government reforms, in 2016 we should explore possibilities for including a new category of the OGP Open Government Award to celebrate the most innovative success specifically in a Pioneer subnational government. This new category prize could be awarded based on the Open Government Award's existing parameters and processes (e.g. a public call for entries, professional and independent judges and scoring, presentation of the award at OGP Summits) and would provide visibility and recognition for subnational government leaders.

Monitoring Subnational Commitments

During the two-year pilot program, we should not attempt to assess or track these experimental commitments via the existing Independent Review Mechanism (IRM) process, given the many

complexities and cost implications of doing so. Instead, we should encourage and seek to develop a public review of the progress in implementing these commitments through local public events and discussions in the towns, cities, states, and provinces where these commitments are playing out. These reviews could learn from IRM methodology and include a series of public discussions in these localities where both government and civil society Pioneer leaders would come together to evaluate and debate the progress made in the past 1-2 years on their experimental subnational commitments. These discussions, if properly planned and executed with rich public participation, could generate incredible inputs and insights for OGP's long-term subnational plans while also helping to avoid a credibility gap in our pilot program.

Annex 1: Pilot Program Design Process

Roadmap for the design of this pilot program:

1. **Generate interest** and support for OGP's subnational pilot program through a high-level plenary panel at the OGP Summit. The plenary will begin with a 5-10 minute TED-style talk from someone from civil society who has an umbrella view of local, open government reform work and can set the tone, emphasizing why open government work at the subnational level matters. The panel will proceed with a number of mayors giving a very brief introduction to a specific and concrete open government initiative their city enacted and responding to questions pulled from the audience via twitter as well as some that have been pre-selected by the panel's moderator.
2. **Hold an informal feedback meeting** with subnational government leaders and CSOs at the summit for input on the draft pilot program. The meeting will be open to all government officials and civil society representatives with an interest in subnational open government issues. The room will be divided into round tables with members of the subnational program task force leading discussion sessions with small groups of participants to collect feedback on the draft pilot program, request suggestions, and better understand the needs and desires of subnational governments as they relate to future OGP engagement (exact format still to be determined).
3. **Use the Summit to talk to national POCs and CSOs** to learn more about the elements of OGP engagement that they've found most useful in their own work. We will take this feedback into account when determining the subnational pilot program.
4. **Task force finalizes the vision of the pilot program and produces an operational plan** to implement the program that covers issues such as staffing, scale-up of resources, and budgetary implications of the program, for final Steering Committee approval.

Tentative Timeline

October 27th: Civil society members of the subnational task force will hold an informal information gathering session at the OGP Summit CSO Day to discuss the subnational pilot program with participants and solicit feedback.

Government points of contact will also be invited to contribute feedback and ideas to the subnational task force during a townhall session at the POC day.

October 29th: OGP Summit subnational plenary panel marking the official launch of the pilot program; convening of subnational government reformers for feedback on pilot program following the plenary.

end November 2015: Subnational task force finalizes pilot program design, with feedback incorporated

early December 2015: Application process for subnational pilot program opens.

end January 2016: Application closes.

end February 2016: Selections are announced for participation in subnational pilot program. Program officially launches.

Annex 2: How to address concerns about OGP working at the subnational level

1. Opening up OGP to subnational governments could overload OGP's existing support structures and require substantial additional investment. Unlike at the national level where there is a "manageable" number of governments, there are far more numerous subnational government entities.

Mitigation: It will be important for OGP to design a clear strategy for how to focus and prioritize its subnational engagement and the additional demand for support that it will bring. The pilot phase will go some way to addressing this as it will be contained and provide us with good intelligence about the level of demand, resources needed, and insight into which programs are more easily scaled.

2. Working at the subnational level could detract from OGP's national level efforts. One could argue that the OGP should focus on ensuring and improving the participation of national level governments while avoiding OGP staff diverting their time and resources to subnational engagement.

Mitigation: This concern gets to the heart of OGP's mission and to two important issues that all organizations must address: priority and focus. However, given that for many citizens their primary interaction with government is at the local level and that the ultimate aim of OGP is to improve people's lives through more open, accountable and responsive governments, it appears premature to close off an opportunity to have a measurable impact on the quality of people's everyday lives before piloting some options. It will be important to start with a small group of pilot subnational governments and to measure the impact of these interventions to better understand their long term value. We can also anticipate how much time will be diverted by using data points we have about the time and resources it takes to support each national level government as a proxy for how much support subnational governments and CSOs would require.

3. The lack of quality data at the subnational level could make it too difficult to determine OGP eligibility. The data and indicators that OGP currently uses to determine national level government eligibility in OGP do not exist at the subnational level, which could make determining subnational government eligibility for OGP unwieldy, subjective and too difficult. Again, this is more of a long term concern, but worth discussing now.

Mitigation: There are a few alternative methods to evaluate eligibility and progress on commitments which should be considered and that we should test during the pilot phase.

Annex 3: Examples of Successful Subnational Open Government Innovations

1. Mexico City: Institutionalizing Innovation and Citizen-Centered Programs

At 21 million people, Mexico City is the biggest city in the western hemisphere and larger than most countries in the world. The challenges of implementing open government reforms in this context are

immense but global cities like Mexico City are poised to take the lead on issues that nation-states would have tackled in the past. For example, elected in 2012, Mayor Miguel Angel Mancera founded the Laboratorio Para la Ciudad (Mexico City Government Innovation Lab), which is run as a creative think tank to institutionalize innovation inside city government. The Lab recently spearheaded an open government law for the city that encourages residents to participate in the design of public policies and requires that city agencies take their suggestions into account. The city also collaborated with students through the “Yo Propongo” initiative in which students took tablets out into the community to find out more about people’s problems. These conversations informed the city’s four year policy agenda, helping Mexico City to be more citizen-centered and were used to improve their policies.

Mexico City’s “Lab” is also home to Codigo DF (Code for Mexico City), a program that pairs technology fellows with Mexico City government departments where they work in partnership to use technology to devise solutions to problems facing city residents. For example one fellow created an application that pulls from the city’s taxi registration data to help residents to differentiate between legal and illegal taxis, empowering them to make smarter and safer transportation decisions. Another fellow created a website that aggregates the multitude of policies and requirements that drivers must abide by to do their part in mitigating Mexico City’s high pollution rates by allowing citizens to input their vehicle information and receive tailored compliance information. By making this data actionable and putting the citizen at the center of the experience, Verificalo makes it vastly easier for citizens to comply with clean air regulations and helps Mexico City mitigate air pollution.

2. The Philippines Seal of Good Local Governance Program (The Seal): Incentivizing Local Governments to be More Transparent and Better Serve their Residents

Many national level governments have also taken important strides to advance open government reform work at the local level in their countries. Using a comprehensive indicator assessment and performance-based grants incentive system, the Philippines “Seal of Good Local Governance” (The Seal) program aims to: 1. Improve government service delivery by fostering openness and participation; and 2. Improve the capacity of local governments.

To confer the Seal, a total of 1,676 civil society organizations assess 1,715 provincial, city and municipal governments based on a set of criteria that fall under six umbrella areas: (1) Financial Good Housekeeping; (2) Disaster Preparedness; (3) Social Protection, (4) Business Friendliness and Competitiveness; (5) Peace and Order; and (6) Environmental Management. To make assessment possible, local government must first open up their information. As a result of the program today more than 90% of 1715 provincial, city and municipal governments regularly upload their financial documents to a “Full Disclosure Policy Portal,” which can be viewed and downloaded by citizens at anytime. Local governments who meet the program’s criteria are conferred with the Seal and can then access incentive packages, such as grants and loans from financing institutions to implement projects in support of the Millennium Development Goals. Through performance-based grants such as these, around 15,000 development projects amounting to \$1.2 billion dollars were implemented across 1,500 local governments.

The program has had significant results on local governments. For example, in 2009, before the program was implemented, 480 local governments obtained “adverse financial audit findings.” In 2013, this number was reduced to only 120, a 75% decrease. Moreover, access to some services at the local level has also improved considerably. For instance, before the implementation of the scaled-up Seal in 2013, only 56% of city and municipal governments offered complete maternal care services, compared to 67%

a year after the program began. As a further testament to the Seal's usefulness, banks and many government agencies are now using it as a requirement for local governments to access development loans, grants and programs.

3. Amsterdam 'Indische Buurt' Neighborhood: Participatory Budgeting at the Very Local Level

Since the City of Porto Alegre, Brazil, pioneered participatory budgeting, many governments have used the practice to engage residents in an action-oriented way at the local level. The City of Amsterdam took this one step further when it piloted a one year participatory budgeting project not just at the city but at the neighborhood level in IndischeBuurt, where they found that localizing a program to that degree was a very effective way to get citizens involved. Upon being informed of the pilot program and that they would have a say in the allocation of public money, local residents who were previously uninvolved in neighborhood activities began to emerge in high numbers. They were then trained in budget practices so that they could most effectively contribute to the new collaborative form of budget allocation and monitoring.

The trained pilot groups began by commenting on the municipality's 2013 'perspective paper and proposed budget,' complemented by an array of facts and figures that the local authorities displayed by creating a website, organized by neighborhood. The community members also produced their own perspective paper detailing their priorities for the neighborhood of IndischeBuurt. For example, while studying the budget, the community members discovered that there had been under spending on youth and education, as compared to official reports and municipal plans. The group worked jointly with their local government counterpart to create new programs for youth and education in the neighborhood.

4. New Orleans: Using Live Data to Address Abandoned Buildings

The city of New Orleans has long faced problems with blighted, abandoned, and derelict properties (problems made worse in the wake of Hurricane Katrina in 2005). Broken windows, caved-in roofs, and abandoned buildings have a negative effect on the way residents think and feel about their city. These — and other symptoms of blight — are more than just eyesores. Blight becomes everyone's problem when it leads to increased crime and lower property values throughout neighborhoods. This is a problem faced by many cities across the world. After Hurricane Katrina hit, the city of New Orleans had 35,000 abandoned properties and no restoration tracking system to address them. Original estimates made the creation of such a system a 3-year multimillion-dollar project.

To tackle this problem, the City of New Orleans partnered with the non-profit technology organization Code for America to create a public-facing web platform to help residents report on new properties and track those already being processed by the city's enforcement system. By merging live data from across multiple city departments into a simple interface, this newly created web platform, BlightStatus, helped to tell clear stories about individual properties, and what was being done to deal with them, in a way that anybody could understand. The platform kept citizens informed and equipped city officials with the data they needed to tackle the problem in an efficient and data-driven manner, saving the city millions of dollars.