

# OGP Local Engagement Strategy

Approved by the OGP Steering Committee on 29 May 2019

## Background on Local Engagement in OGP

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

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

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



## Vision

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

*OGP Strategic Refresh December 2016*

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

## Strategic Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## OGP Local Engagement Strategy

### Process

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



## Research Findings

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

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

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

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

## Proposed Strategy

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

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



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

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

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

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



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

The strategy is:

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

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

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



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

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

### Guiding Principles for the New Local Strategy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## Strategy Endorsement and Implementation Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Program Review

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

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





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

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

## Annexes

The following items are included below:

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

## Proposed Operational Framework

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

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



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



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



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



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



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



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

## Resourcing Plan

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

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



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

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

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

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





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

## Consultation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

## What we heard from the consultations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

### **There is convergence on the role for OGP**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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





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

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

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

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

## List of Stakeholders Interviewed

List as of 10 May 2019

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



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



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

