Open Government Partnership
Criteria and Standards Subcommittee
Monthly Call Summary | 9 April 2020

Attendees

- Government of Italy: Stefano Pizzicannella and Marco Marazza
- Government of Nigeria: Chidinma Ilechukwu and Stan Achonu
- Government of Georgia: Ketevan Tsanava
- Aidan Eyakuze, Twaweza
- Elisa Peter, Publish What You Pay
- Delia Ferreira Rubio, Transparency International
- Lucy McTernan, University of York

Apologies:

- Government of France

Call Summary

1. **Agile Response Mechanism:**
   Following the discussions in the Steering Committee (SC) Meeting in Berlin, the Support Unit (SU) presented a draft proposal of the "Agile Response Mechanism", designed to replace the Rapid Response Mechanism. C&S provided general support of the draft, particularly the flexibility and improved speed of response, with the following feedback and suggestions:

   - SU to extend the initial review timeline from 24 to 48 hours (Section 4);
   - SU to do the initial assessment first and the inform the SC whether the request meets the requirements and if response is warranted (Section 4.1);
   - SU to add explain further the circumstance under which it would recommend a full Response Policy concern be filed (Section 5.3.6);
   - Standardize asking for a formal response from the government subject of the concern (SU to remove the words "and if relevant" from Section 6.2)

   ***Next steps*:** SU to incorporate all feedback and present for final approval from C&S by circular in April. Socialize C&S-endorsed proposal with the Governance and Leadership Subcommittee and then send to the full SC for final approval at its next virtual meeting (Summer 2020, TBC).

2. **Action Plan Flexibility Proposal:**
   Following previous conversations and based on the Subcommittee's feedback and input, the Support Unit presented a draft proposal of the Flexibility in the Calendar

and Implementation period of OGP Action Plans. C&S provided general support of the proposal, with the following feedback and suggestions:

- Continue thinking through implications of allowing countries to extend the length of National Action Plans. In particular, how flexibility can continue to allow countries to keep progress and increase ambition, plan for milestones to be in place to encourage activity throughout a longer time period and consider these milestones to be tied to IRM check in moments.
- Provide clarity and options around the length of the learning and reflection period.
- Consider the question of who is responsible for deciding a timeline for a National Action Plan; emphasis placed on making sure decisions involve the MSF.
- Continue developing a visual guide around the different paths offered in this proposal.
- Consider implications around tracking plans with increased flexibility, as the current cohort system allows relatively straightforward tracking and comparison of progress.t
- Provide additional details and options around the Eligibility to develop extended Action Plans.
- Moving forward, SU to consider requesting countries prepare strategic plan documents alongside their National Action Plans.

Next steps: SU to consider and incorporate feedback, developing a more detailed proposal for the next C&S call including specific action items to roll out the plan.

3. **COVID-19 Implications for the IRM:**
   The IRM provided a brief update on the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on IRM. The IRM is currently working to develop concrete solutions to mitigate known delays and other challenges due to COVID-19. This was a non-decisional item and the SU/IRM will bring future updates to the C&S.