Independent Reporting Mechanism

Action Plan Review: Côte d'Ivoire 2020-2022

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Introduction

Starting in January 2021, the IRM began rolling out the new products that resulted from the IRM Refresh process.[1] The new approach builds on the lessons from more than 350 independent, evidence-based and robust assessments conducted by the IRM and the inputs from the OGP community. The IRM seeks to put forth simple, timely, fit-for-purpose and results-oriented products that contribute to learning and accountability in key moments of the OGP action plan cycle.

The new IRM products are:

1. **Co-creation Brief** - brings in lessons from previous action plans, serves a learning purpose, and informs co-creation planning and design. This product is scheduled to roll out in late 2021, beginning with countries co-creating 2022-2024 action plans.

2. **Action Plan Review** - an independent, quick, technical review of the action plan's characteristics as well as the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process. This product is scheduled to roll out in early 2021 beginning with 2020-2022 action plans. Action Plan Reviews are delivered 3-4 months after the action plan is submitted.

3. **Results Report** - an overall implementation assessment that focuses on policy-level results and how changes happen. It also verifies compliance with OGP rules and informs accountability and longer-term learning. This product is scheduled to roll out in a transition phase in early 2022, beginning with 2019-2021 action plans and ending implementation on August 31, 2021. Results Reports are delivered up to four months after the end of the implementation cycle.

This product consists of an IRM review of the Côte d'Ivoire 2020-2022 Action Plan. The action plan is made up of ten commitments that the IRM has filtered and clustered into eight. This review emphasizes its analysis on the ability of the action plan to contribute to implementation and results. For the commitment-by-commitment data, see Annex 1. For details regarding the methodology and indicators used by the IRM for this Action Plan Review, see Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators.

[1] For more details regarding the IRM Refresh, visit https://www.opengovpartnership.org/process/accountability/about-the-irm/irm-refresh/

Table of Contents

Section I: Overview of the 2020-2022 Action Plan

Côte d'Ivoire's third action plan continues reforms in civic participation and transparency in national and local budget processes. The plan also continues to build on ambitious commitments to improve transparency around the assets of high-ranking public officials and civil servants. Looking ahead, greater inclusion of civil society in commitment implementation will raise the ambition of these reforms and strengthen relations between government and civil society.

Côte d'Ivoire's third OGP action plan consists of ten commitments covering six policy areas. Most commitments stem from the previous action plan, although with renewed focus. Ongoing reforms include open budgets and asset transparency, anticorruption efforts, and reproductive health transparency. New areas include developing legislation for teleworking and school canteen provisions. Strategically, half of the commitments align with the National Development Plan and Sustainable Development Goals, while those considered as promising are linked to support and funding by international partners.

Civil society reported that the co-creation process was improved from the previous action plan. The OGP Technical Committee was reconfigured to include equal government-civil society representation.[1] The civil society platform (PSCI-OGP) played a central role from the start, proposing policy areas to the Technical Committee.[2] PSCI-OGP consulted citizens through webinars and proposed or reformulated the majority of commitments in the action plan. The public could also provide input through the online OGP website.[3] Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, planned face-to-face public consultations were shifted online.

AT A GLANCE

Participating since: 2015
Action plan under review: 2020-2022
IRM product: Action Plan Review
Number of commitments: 10

Overview of commitments:
- Commitments with an open gov. lens: 7 (70%)
- Commitments with substantial potential for results: 4 (40%)
- Promising commitments: 4

Policy areas carried over from previous action plans:
- Open budgets
- Anticorruption strategy
- Asset declarations
- Healthcare/contraceptive products

Emerging policy areas:
- Teleworking
- Provision of school canteens

Compliance with OGP minimum requirements for co-creation:
- Acted according to the OGP process: Yes

For the purposes of this report, Commitments 1 and 2 are clustered together as they both aim to expand budget openness. Commitments 4 and 5 are likewise evaluated together as they both seek to strengthen asset transparency. The IRM evaluated both of these clusters as having promising potential for results and therefore they are analyzed in detail in this report. Both clusters aim to consolidate and expand work commenced in previous action plans. They also seek to establish a legal framework and collaborative environment on which to base reforms. The IRM strongly recommends that civil society be engaged from the very start of the legislative review and drafting processes.

Commitment 3, which aims to collaboratively develop a national anticorruption strategy may result in significant open government gains. However, the IRM lacked sufficient information on the intended content of the strategy to evaluate this reform as a promising commitment.

Three commitments (7, 8, and 10) are not directly relevant to the open government values of transparency, accountability or civic participation. Meanwhile, Commitments 6 and 9 are evaluated to have modest ambition as they are either one-time events or limited in scope. These commitments relate to government provision of contraceptives, school canteen food, and teleworking legislation.

To ensure that commitments in future action plans contain an open government lens, the Technical Committee should review all commitments to determine whether they set out to make a policy area, institutions, or decision-making process more transparent, participatory or accountable to the public. To design ambitious commitments, PSCI-OGP and government partners should strive to create commitments that represent change or create new practices, policies, or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector and/or relationship between citizens and state.

[1] Civil society members of PSCI-OGP platform, interview/email exchange with the IRM researcher, May 2021.
[2] Website for Côte d'Ivoire's OGP Civil Society Platform: https://psci-pgo.org/en
[3] Côte d'Ivoire's OGP government website: http://ogp.gouv.ci/

Section II: Promising Commitments in the Côte d'Ivoire 2020-2022 Action Plan

The following review analyzes four commitments that the IRM identified as having the potential to render the most promising results. This review will inform the IRM's research approach to assess implementation in the Results Report. The IRM Results Report will build on the early identification of potential results from this review to contrast with the outcomes at the end of the action plan's implementation period. This review also provides an analysis of challenges, opportunities and recommendations to contribute to the learning and implementation process of this action plan.

If fully implemented, the four promising commitments on open budgets (Commitments 1 and 2), and transparency and strengthening of the asset declarations system (Commitments 4 and 5), as indicated in Table 1 below, could deliver substantial open government results. Both clusters introduce binding and institutionalized changes across government that represent an important departure from standard practice. These clusters also have the potential to increase citizen access to budget and asset information. The open budget cluster would also significantly increase the public's ability to participate in national and local budget processes.

Through Commitment 3, the High Authority for Good Governance's aim to collaborate with civil society to develop a national anticorruption strategy holds potential for significant open government reforms. This commitment promises to address an issue of national importance and engage civil society in both developing and monitoring the strategy. The IRM did not assess this commitment in detail as the strategy's content, and therefore its relation to open government, is yet to be determined.

However, the IRM acknowledges that this commitment may result in significant outcomes, especially if the following criteria are met: (i) consultations should be inclusive and non-government priorities and perspectives should be reflected in the final draft; (ii) the resulting strategy should institutionalize transparency, accountability and participation in pursuit of anti-corruption aims; (iii) the strategy should focus on binding and institutionalized changes across government. In this sense, Côte d'Ivoire could look at examples of consultative approaches to create anticorruption strategies with an open government lens, such as the open and participatory drafting of the Croatian Anti-Corruption Strategy or the establishment of a joint committee with civil society to oversee the implementation of Afghanistan's Anti-Corruption Strategy.[4]

Commitments 6 through 10 (which cover the areas of teleworking, contraceptives, and school canteens) are not analyzed in this report as they are either unconnected to open government values or have modest ambition due to being a standalone initiative that does not change standard government practice. Commitments are relevant to open government if they make a policy area, institution, or decision-making process more transparent, participatory or accountable to the public. Based on these criteria, Commitments 7, 8, and 10 address important national issues but do not have an open government lens. For example, Commitment 7 promotes the use of technology, but not towards greater government transparency, civic participation or public accountability. On the other hand, Commitment 6 is relevant to open government because the government will consult with workers and employers when drafting the teleworking law, but

this commitment has moderate ambition as it is a one-time project. Commitment 9 is relevant as it will result in greater public information on government funding and purchase of contraceptives. While important, this reform is modest in scope and therefore not discussed in detail.

Table 1. Promising Commitments

Promising Commitments
Open Budget Cluster (Commitments 1 and 2): The creation of a participatory budgeting decree and guide promise to standardize civic participation in budget formation across Ivorian communes. Likewise, the government's inclusion of civil society in validation sessions for budget guidelines begins to increase civic participation in fiscal processes at the national level.
Asset Transparency Cluster (Commitments 4 and 5): The government aims to issue a legal mandate for the annual asset declaration of public officials and civil servants and create an online platform featuring disaggregated statistics on asset declaration. These measures would improve asset declaration transparency for the general public and their overall management by the relevant authorities, with an overall aim to fight corruption.

Open Budget Cluster (Commitments 1 and 2)
(Ministry of Interior and Security, General Directorate for Decentralization and Local Development; Ministry of Budget and State Portfolio; PSCI-PGO)[5]

For a complete description of Commitments 1 and 2 included in this cluster, see the action plan: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Cote-dIvoire_Action-Plan_2020-2022_FR.pdf

Context and Objectives

This policy cluster aims to increase citizen participation in national and local budget processes. Specifically, through Commitment 1, the government aims to issue a decree, order, and guidelines to standardize participatory budgeting across local governments. Participatory budgeting is a process that enables citizens to directly participate and influence their local government budget. Under Commitment 2, the government seeks to invite civil society organizations to participate in annual plenary sessions to pre-validate national budget guidelines, thereby shaping the Multi-Year Budget and Economic Programming Document from 2021 onwards.

The Civil Society Platform (PSCI-OGP) proposed Commitment 1,[6] which was endorsed by the OGP Technical Committee to consolidate progress made under past action plans.[7] The commitment aligns with the National Development Plan and is supported by the United States' Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Open Government Support Program in Francophone Developing Countries (PAGOF), and the European Union.[8] Civil society and the Ministry of Budget and Finance jointly proposed Commitment 2 to include CSOs in annual pre-validation sessions for the national budget guidelines. Taken together, Commitments 1 and 2 are more specific, and therefore verifiable, than previous open budget commitments. This policy cluster is relevant to the OGP values of access to information and civic participation.

Potential for Results: Substantial

Together, these commitments hold a substantial potential to strengthen budget transparency and civic participation in national and local budget processes. The government's creation of a legal framework and guide promises to formalize and expand participatory budgeting beyond previous commitments. Commitment 2 contains modest milestones to include civil society representatives in only two pre-validation sessions in 2021 and 2022 for the national budget. However, a civil society interviewee stated that this commitment is a reflection of the government's broader willingness to increase civic participation beyond the sessions explicitly mentioned.[9] Currently, there are no opportunities for the public to participate in budget formation at the national level. Therefore, a formal and standard moment for civil society to influence the national budget document would represent a significant step in the right direction.

Civic participation in budget processes is very limited in Côte d'Ivoire. The 2019 Open Budget Survey granted Côte d'Ivoire a score of 7 out of 100 points for formal opportunities for the public to participate in budget processes. However, this score does reflect improvement from 0 out of 100 points five years ago.[10] As noted in the action plan, the national budget process does not currently include opportunities for civic participation. However, Côte d'Ivoire's first action plan increased the number of communes practicing participatory budgeting, although the exact number is not clear.[11] The IRM subsequently recommended that the government establish a legal mechanism to institutionalize participatory budgeting across the country.[12] The second action plan encouraged more communes to adopt participatory budgeting but did not introduce a legal framework or enforcement measures.[13] This cluster therefore expands on Côte d'Ivoire's important work at the local level and also introduces moments for participation at the national level.

Civic Participation in State Budget Formation

Under Commitment 2, the government aims to invite CSOs to participate in the 2021 and 2022 pre-validation sessions to determine the budgetary guidelines for 2022-2024 and 2023-2025. In these plenary sessions, participants will pre-validate the government's Multi-Year Budget and Economic Programming Document (DPBEP), before its presentation to the parliament.[14] This is a modest aim that will only achieve substantial results if (i) this commitment represents a permanent change to government practice by continuing CSO participation beyond the two years mentioned in the action plan and (ii) civil society input is considered and reflected in the final budget document.

The OGP Civil Society Platform will determine which CSOs will attend the pre-validation sessions. All session participants, including CSOs, can contribute input on budgetary orientations.[15] A CSO representative explained that the government "may incorporate into the [document discussed] the observations made during the sessions if these prove to be relevant. CSOs will propose modifications to documents if necessary and in accordance with reality on the ground."[16] A civil society representative also shared their preference for the government to publish a public report on budgetary discussions, but "the bottom line is that the conclusions or recommendations are taken into account in the outcome document, or in that of the following year if this is the case."[17] Civil society representatives also noted that their attendance at the sessions may improve their knowledge of the criteria, priorities and guidelines that inform the state budget. Citizens, through

civil society organizations, are then better positioned to evaluate whether these priorities and the resulting budget respond to their needs.[18]

Civic Participation in Local Budget Formation

Local level participatory budgeting is also at an early stage in Côte d'Ivoire.[19] Specifically, "government officials and CSOs have still limited knowledge of the principles and rules associated to participatory budgeting" and it seems to be confused with transparency initiatives (citizen budgets).[20] Participatory budgeting consists of "involving the populations in discussions and decisions concerning the allocation of the municipal budget, either globally, or on a particular theme (the development of a district for example), or on decisions of investment".[21] The current action plan commits to the drafting of a decree to institutionalize participatory budgeting at the commune level and an order to create a monitoring body. It also commits to the elaboration and dissemination of a guide detailing the procedures and stages of participatory budgeting. The establishment of a legal and regulatory framework for participatory budgeting in Côte d'Ivoire would begin to address the lack of clarity and political will that has limited its adoption across Ivorian communes.[22]

A working group composed of four government representatives and two experts in governance and local development will draft the legal texts, which will ultimately be proposed by the Ministry of Interior and Security. Government representatives of the OGP Technical Committee stated that the drafting process will include opportunities for stakeholder consultations—in particular subnational governments, institutions and local authorities—and public comment on the draft text.[23] The Participatory Budget Monitoring Body is expected to include eight members, three of which from civil society. The criteria to determine which CSOs will participate in the Monitoring Body is yet to be established.[24]

Members of the OGP Technical Committee shared that citizen participatory committees will also be established through this commitment.[25] The government aims to establish one committee in each municipality, to be specified in the forthcoming decree. Each committee will include local civil society organizations and local territorial administrators and elected officials. The committees will (i) develop a citizen participation charter or internal regulations for elected officials to sign; (ii) provide guidance and coordinate implementation; (iii) organize meetings, debates, and 'citizen days; and (iv) conduct impact studies. A representative from the General Directorate for Decentralization and Local Development stated that there is currently one such committee operating, in the Tiassalé commune, thanks to the municipal mayor's support.[26]

Civil society has called for an evaluation of municipalities already engaged in participatory budgeting and for a public consultation with civil society, communities and religious organizations to kick off the legislative drafting process.[27] So far, participatory budgeting has been unevenly applied across the country through individual projects supported by a diverse set of CSOs and international development partners.[28] The General Directorate of Decentralization and Local Development reports that it monitors 20 municipalities' use of participatory budgeting. These municipalities are also supported by various partners such as PAGOF and the *Forum des ONG et Associations d'aide à l'enfance en difficulté*.[29] Meanwhile, civil society reports that 23 municipalities are engaged in participatory budgeting and 35 have been sensitized to the practice.[30] The government agrees that the experiences of these municipalities will inform the decree, order and guide.[31] However, it remains unclear when and how this feedback will be

obtained. The government also expects that the legal texts will take into account vulnerable or marginalized groups but cannot guarantee specific content.[32] The dissemination and outreach activities remain imprecise at this stage.

Ultimately, evidence of substantial results would include activities and documents demonstrating that participatory budgeting has become standard procedure across a majority of communes. The evidence should indicate that citizen suggestions are considered and responded to by the local government. Most importantly, long-term results would include local budgets that closely reflect the needs and priorities of citizens as a result of public input. In this way, Commitment 1 has the potential to significantly expand the number of Ivorians with direct influence on how the local government allocates public spending.

Nevertheless, both government and civil society interviewees stated that establishing a legal, regulatory, and institutional framework will increase public participation in the management of local budgets. A civil society representative anticipates that these commitments will integrate civic participation in the budget process at the local and national level. They stated that, "the texts constitute a guarantee of citizen participation and the implementation of the participatory budget in all localities of the country."[33] In sum, civil society stakeholders perceive political will and expect that the commitments will translate into advancing open government and defining a collaborative environment for public decision-making, especially at the local level.[34]

Opportunities, Challenges and Recommendations During Implementation

A government member of the OGP Technical Committee noted that there is significant national level political support behind the adoption of participatory budgeting legislation. These reforms benefit from the support of the Council of Ministers, who adopted the OGP action plan, and engaged officials in the Ministry of Trade and Industry as well as the Prime Minister.[35]

Challenges to implementation include a lack of resources and political will at the local level. COVID-19 presents a hurdle for resource availability and management.[36] Côte d'Ivoire may require support from development partners to carry out dissemination and training activities "for organizing seminars, caravans or forums."[37] The government has also not set aside funding for the Participatory Budgeting Monitoring Body or identified technical and financial partners. Additionally, it is necessary to secure buy-in on the part of local elected officials to integrate participatory budgeting.[38]

A lack of public budget information and 'budget literacy' among civil society and the public continues to present an obstacle to civic participation.[39] As a result of a previous commitment, Côte d'Ivoire has published a simplified 'Citizens' Budget' since 2019.[40] However, a lack of paper publications and dissemination activities, particularly in rural areas, meant that these efforts did not significantly increase citizens' budget knowledge.[41] A civil society representative noted that limited CSO capacity and information on the government's aims and priorities that guide budget formation inhibits CSO participation.[42] As a result, the IRM recommends that the Ministry of Budget and Finance continue to expand timely and comprehensive public access to key budget documents in an accessible format. This will ensure that citizens and CSOs have the relevant information prior to civic engagement opportunities.

Côte d'Ivoire can refer to participatory budgeting commitments popular among OGP action plans.[43] For instance, in 2016, the Madrid city council allowed the public to allocate 100 million euros and propose potential expenditures. The final proposals were then voted on by the population.[44] In 2013, Ghana established a citizen's budget and facilitated collaboration between government and civil society organizations to create a participatory budget that reflected the priorities and needs of citizens.[45] With these opportunities and challenges in mind, the IRM specifically recommends the following:

- **Institutionalize civil society participation in national budget processes** to ensure civic engagement continues beyond the two pre-validation sessions listed in the action plan text.
- **Actively seek out and invite civil society representatives beyond the 'usual actors'** to ensure representatives from marginalized communities, such as youth and women's groups, are included in pre-validation discussions.
- **Design a fair and transparent selection process for the inclusion of civil society** representatives at all stages, from drafting legislation to monitoring and information dissemination.
- **Publish documentation of the discussion and decisions made** during the pre-validation sessions for state budget documents, highlighting in particular how civil society input was considered and incorporated.
- **Use offline dissemination and awareness-raising activities** of the state budget process and of the legal texts on participatory budgeting (such as through print, radio, and workshops) to reach rural and marginalized community members.[46]
- As recommended by civil society, **conduct an assessment** on the municipalities that have piloted participatory budgets. This assessment could give greater confidence to local elected officials in the benefits of this practice.[47]
- **Consider opportunities to expand budget transparency and participation in future action plans**, such as allowing members of the public or civil society to testify during hearings for the budget proposal and audit report.[48] The government could also consider opportunities to continue to expand budget transparency, such as timely, accessible, and comprehensive disclosure of the eight key budget documents and greater dissemination of the Citizens' Budget.[49]

Asset Transparency Cluster (Commitments 4 and 5)
(High Authority for Good Governance, National Bureau of Technical Studies and Development)

For a complete description of Commitments 4 and 5 included in this cluster, see the action plan: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Cote-dIvoire_Action-Plan_2020-2022_FR.pdf

Context and Objectives

Côte d'Ivoire ratified the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and the African Union Convention on the Prevention and Fight Against Corruption in 2012.[50] Since then, Côte d'Ivoire has worked towards the asset declaration of public officials as a key reform for greater public integrity and good governance.[51]

The High Authority for Good Governance (HABG) is responsible for collecting the asset declaration of public officials. The agency has long sought implementation of an online platform for the submission, management, and publication information related to asset declarations.[52] Obstacles such as security concerns and limited internet penetration in Côte d'Ivoire have so far inhibited this aim.[53]

The HABG proposed the inclusion of Commitments 4 and 5, which build on Commitment 5 of the previous action plan.[54] Previously, Côte d'Ivoire committed to increasing the rate of asset registrants to 90% by June 2020 and enforcing sanctions for noncompliance.[55] However, the declarations of public officials and civil servants when leaving office are not guaranteed to date, and publicly available information on asset declarations is scarce.[56] PSCI-PGO specifically proposed that the commitments revise the law on asset declarations and publish information related to public officials' assets. PSCI-PGO also proposed that the HABG form a multistakeholder forum that includes the public and private sectors, civil society, and the media. However, this suggestion is not reflected in the final commitment text.[57]

Commitments 4 and 5 seek to strengthen the legal and technical framework in the country to increase the government and citizens' access to information on assets held by individuals in positions of authority. Specifically, Commitment 5 promises to review the current legislation to ensure that asset declaration be mandatory for public officials and civil servants while in office. Commitment 4 aims to gather all declarations in an online platform and publish aggregated statistics.[58] The government also intends to establish online channels for submission and management of declaration forms.[59] It is not clear whether civil society will participate in the implementation of this commitment; however, it is supported by the United States' Millennium Challenge Corporation.[60]

Potential for Results: Substantial

Annual asset declaration by public officials is currently not mandatory. Decree No. 2014-219 on the modalities of asset declarations establishes that public officials must submit declarations upon entering and leaving public office, within a period of 30 days, as well as in the event of wealth fluctuations. However, there is limited public information available on the assets of public authorities.[61] Additionally, the rate of compliance is low for certain groups, such as parliamentarians, mayors, presidents of general councils, or the defense and security forces.[62] From 2015 to 2020, the total compliance rate was around 79% with magistrates at 96%, members of government at 83%, and local elected officials at 39%.[63] This commitment will make annual asset declaration mandatory. Up-to-date information of public officials' assets is a critical component in the mitigation of corruption and the uncovering of illicitly gained wealth.

This reform also aims to enable digital submission and management of asset declaration forms. Currently, public officials must submit paper forms in person to the HABG or local government offices to be filed with the HABG or the Court of Auditors.[64] The HABG specifies three objectives for the integrated online platform: facilitate asset declaration collection, improve data management, and give public access to disaggregated data. The National Bureau of Technical Studies and Development (BNETD) will develop the platform with a particular aim to address data security concerns that previously held up its creation. The BNETD will "work with the latest technologies in data security and following specifications on security requirements" and incorporate the expertise of the Ivory Coast Telecommunications Regulatory Agency (ARTCI) so

that "the development and deployment of this platform take into account the requirements of the Law on the protection of personal data."[65]

At the moment, the HABG publishes a list of public officials subject to asset declaration along with an anonymous tally of the number of individuals who submitted declarations by role.[66] While a 2020 report states that the HABG also publishes monthly summaries and maps showing declarations by region, the IRM could not locate this information online at the time of writing.[67] Under this commitment, the new platform will add real-time statistics and information on historic asset declarations on a regular basis.[68]

The government intends to engage civil society during the final stages of the legislative reform process and development of the online platform. The government will hold one consultation with civil society once new legislation has been drafted. Likewise, the HABG states that "once the first version of the platform is completed, it will be presented at a session open to the public to take into account their observations and especially their needs in terms of statistics on the declaration of assets." The representative added that there will be public awareness-raising and training sessions.[69] The IRM recommends that civil society and the public be continuously engaged throughout the reform.

However, reforms will not increase the range of individuals subject to asset declaration obligations, beyond taking into account institutions newly created by the 2016 Constitution. Nor does the commitment aim to broaden the type of assets to be disclosed, which currently concentrates on family-held assets and excludes interests that potentially conflict with their public office, such as beneficial ownership or positions in a company.[70] Additionally, the asset declarations themselves will remain confidential, with only aggregate statistics open to the general public.[71] Despite limitations, these commitments hold a substantial potential to increasing citizen access to asset declaration information. The government expects that the digital platform will "allow the HABG to effectively and sustainably resolve the problem of availability and access to statistics on asset declarations."[72] In the medium-term, this reform could establish a foundation for civic monitoring of statistical information on asset declaration.

Opportunities, Challenges and Recommendations During Implementation

Civil society expressed optimism for this reform as the commitments' design explicitly takes previous obstacles into account. Additionally, the work of the Ministry of Good Governance, Capacity Building and the Fight Against Corruption also promises to advance asset transparency.[73] Civil society also noted that a national anticorruption plan (Commitment 3) is also vital to implementing an effective asset disclosure system.[74] The inclusion of various agencies—including the Office of the Prime Minister—in the action plan indicates high-level and broad engagement across government.

In regard to possible constraints, the scope of the legislative overhaul will determine whether the HABG and partners are able to implement the ambitious procedural and technical tools needed to increase asset transparency. Currently, the law does not provide for online submission of asset declarations. Therefore, legal reforms stipulated in Commitment 5 will dictate the scope and function of the platform. An HABG official acknowledged that online reporting is all the more necessary in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.[75] Legal limitations on who can access asset declaration data also currently inhibits cross-sharing and verification of the data within

government. A contact from the HABG stated that, "reforms must be introduced with the legislature to lift the confidentiality of the declared information and increase the powers of the HABG in terms of access to national metadata which can enable it to check the completeness and sincerity of asset declarations."[76]

Altogether, these commitments could inspire other countries in the region, as offering public disaggregated asset data is a new practice in Francophone Africa. Only Niger has a law, which has not been implemented, that requires asset data to be public.[77] In turn, Côte d'Ivoire could follow best practices from other countries such as those put in place by Ukraine, Georgia and Croatia in recent years. Ukraine established an "electronic asset disclosure system for public officials replacing the previous ineffective paper-based system and allowed an unprecedented level of transparency of public officials' assets."[78] Georgia introduced an official monitoring mechanism to verify the accuracy of public officials' asset declarations. Through the electronic system, over 280 asset declarations were randomly selected for verification.[79] Croatia improved asset transparency by developing new tools allowing easier public access to information. Electronic submission of the financial reports of public officials also allowed the Conflict of Interest Commission and the public to better verify the accuracy of the submitted information. This, in turn, enabled greater transparency concerning the property of officials and increased their public accountability.[80]

In implementing this cluster, the IRM recommends that Côte d'Ivoire refer to Transparency International's *Recommendations on Asset and Interest Declarations for OGP Action Plans.*[81] Specifically, the IRM recommends that Côte d'Ivoire consider taking the following steps:

- **Consult civil society** throughout the legislative review and drafting process as well as on the criteria and characteristics of the online platform for asset declarations management.
- **Review legislation to strengthen the HABG's oversight capacity** to enforce compliance and implement sanctions, verify submissions, initiate investigations, and evaluate public complaints.[82]
- **Review legislation to allow for online asset declarations** through the platform.
- Analyze the benefits and constraints to **eventually eliminate confidentiality clauses** and make asset declaration data publicly available in open-data format.
- In the medium-term, **expand the scope of asset declarations** to include not only property and wealth but also private interests that might conflict with public office such as additional jobs or positions held, beneficial ownership of companies, and participation in civic or professional bodies.

---

[4] See: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/croatia/commitments/HR0022/ and https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/afghanistan/commitments/AF0010/

[5] The government reports that CSOs engaged in implementation will include Akwaba Foundation Delegation, Forum of NGOs and Associations to help children in difficulty, MPLCI, and Association JEKAWILI. PSCI-PGO stated that it will be the primary CSO liaison for this commitment with greater participation from CSOs with experience in participatory budgeting such as: Social Justice, CREFDI, IDEF, and NGO Forum.

[6] PSCI-OGP is the platform of civil society organizations engaged in the OGP process in Côte d'Ivoire. It is supported by PAGOF. See: https://psci-pgo.org/

[7] According to civil society representatives from the PSCI-OGP, in this action plan development, the OGP Technical Committee (CT-OGP) has included an equivalent number of government and civil society representatives (6/7), and a fewer number of private sector members (1 or 2). The representatives from civil society were proposed by the platform; Civil society representatives, interview/email exchanges with IRM researcher, May 2021.

[8] Côte d'Ivoire Third OGP National Action Plan 2020-2022; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2020-2022/
[9] Civil society members of PSCI-OGP platform, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[10] International Budget Partnership. Open Budget Survey. Côte d'Ivoire. 2019. https://www.internationalbudget.org/open-budget-survey/country-results/2019/cote-divoire
[11] Côte d'Ivoire First OGP National Action Plan 2016-18, Commitment 14; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2016-2018/
[12] IRM Côte d'Ivoire End-of-Term Report 2016–18, p.37-38: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Cote-dIvoire_EOTR_2016-2018_EN.pdf
[13] Côte d'Ivoire Second OGP National Action Plan 2018-20, Commitment 6; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2018-2020/; Draft Côte d'Ivoire Hybrid Report on design and implementation of the 2018-2020 action plan, Independent Reporting Mechanism, Open Government Partnership, publication forthcoming.
[14] "CSOs will be invited in agreement with the PSCI-PGO." Interview with civil society representative with IRM researcher, May 2021
[15] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[16] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO platform, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[17] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[18] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, April 2021.
[19] Accelerating Participatory Budgeting in Côte d'Ivoire. A Guide for Effective Design and Operation, Reboot, June 2020. Commissioned by Development Gateway with funding from MCC.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.
[22] IRM Côte d'Ivoire End-of-Term Report 2016–2018, p.37-38: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Cote-dIvoire_EOTR_2016-2018_EN.pdf
[23] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[24] The Participatory Budget Monitoring Body is expected to be composed of a Monitoring Committee of 8 "personalities and experts" including 3 from civil society, assisted by a Technical Secretariat composed exclusively of decentralization agents, and hosted by the Ministry of Interior and Security; Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[25] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[26] Mr. Rodolphe Monoko Séri, Deputy Director of Training and Internships, General Directorate of Decentralization and Local Development, e-mail communication forwarded by Mrs. Koné from the Technical Committee, 26 May 2021.
[27] Civil society member of the PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[28] According to the General Directorate of Decentralization and Local Development, existing participatory budgeting projects include: 6 municipalities in Ifou and Moronou regions under the Local Inclusive Governance Initiative in Cote d'Ivoire; 7 communes through the support of PAGOF; and 7 communes (Adiaké, Béoumi, Bouaflé, Bouna, Soubré, Odienné et Zan Hounien) supported by Forum des ONG et Associations d'aide à l'enfance en difficulté.
[29] Mr. Rodolphe Monoko Séri, Deputy Director of Training and Internships, General Directorate of Decentralization and Local Development, e-mail communication forwarded by Mrs. Koné from the Technical Committee, 26 May 2021.
[30] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, 26 May 2021.
[31] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[32] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[33] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[34] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[35] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.

[36] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, April and May 2021.
[37] Mrs. Mariama Koné, Government representative and Chair of the Technical Committee, and Mrs. Chantal Angoua and Mr. Oumarou Coulibaly, resource persons in the CT-OGP, interviewed by the IRM researcher by phone on 16 April 2021.
[38] Civil society members of PSCI-PGO, interview/email exchange with IRM researcher, April and May 2021.
[39] Draft Côte d'Ivoire Hybrid Report on design and implementation of the 2018-2020 action plan, Independent Reporting Mechanism, Open Government Partnership, publication forthcoming; Côte d'Ivoire Action Plan 2018-2020, Government of Côte d'Ivoire https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Cote-Divoire_Action-Plan_2018-2020_EN.pdf
[40] Côte d'Ivoire First OGP National Action Plan 2016-18, Commitment 4 https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2016-2018/ ; Côte d'Ivoire Second OGP National Action Plan 2018-20, Commitment 1; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2018-2020/
[41] Draft of Côte d'Ivoire Hybrid Report on design and implementation of the 2018-2020 action plan, Independent Reporting Mechanism, Open Government Partnership, publication forthcoming and Accelerating Participatory Budgeting in Côte d'Ivoire. A Guide for Effective Design and Operation, Reboot, June 2020. Commissioned by Development Gateway with funding from MCC.
[42] Draft Côte d'Ivoire Hybrid Report on design and implementation of the 2018-2020 action plan, Independent Reporting Mechanism, Open Government Partnership, publication forthcoming.
[43] OGP Fiscal Openness Factsheet, May 2019: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Fiscal-Openness-Fact-Sheet-May-2019.pdf
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] There were 12.25 million Internet users in Côte d'Ivoire in December 2020 out of a population of almost 26,492 million. "Number of Internet users in selected countries in Africa as of March 2019, by country (in millions)", Statista, website, June 6, 2019: https://www.statista.com/statistics/505883/number-of-internet-users-in-african-countries ; Côte d'Ivoire, Population Data, website, December 13, 2018: https://www.populationdata.net/pays/cote-divoire
[47] Civil society members of the PSCI-PGO, email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[48] 2019 Open Budget Survey. Côte d'Ivoire: https://www.internationalbudget.org/open-budget-survey/country-results/2019/cote-divoire
[49] 2019 Open Budget Survey. "Transparency" Côte d'Ivoire: https://www.internationalbudget.org/open-budget-survey/country-results/2019/cote-divoire
[50] AUCPCC, article 7: "States Parties commit themselves to (…) require all or designated public officials to declare their assets at the time of assumption of office, during and after their term of office in the public service. (…)"
UNCAC, article 8: "(…) Each State Party shall endeavour (…) to establish measures and systems requiring public officials to make declarations to appropriate authorities regarding, inter alia, their outside activities, employment, investments, assets and substantial gifts or benefits from which a conflict of interest may result with respect to their functions as public officials."
[51] Ordinance N° 2013-660 of 20 September 2013 (and subsequent amendments), see: https://habg.ci/fichier/Ordonnance_2013-660.pdf. The Constitution of 2016 sealed the obligation of asset declaration for public authorities in Article 41, see: http://www.caidp.ci/uploads/52782e1004ad2bbfd4d17dbf1c33384f.pdf . On the current modalities of asset declarations, see: https://habg.ci/patrimoine.php?ID=3
[52] The HABG receives the asset declarations of public officials, with the exception of HABG members, secretary general, directors and heads of service who make their declaration of assets to the Court of Auditors. The President and the Vice-President of the Republic present as well as their declaration of assets to the Courts of Auditors and have a different regime provided for by the Constitution (Articles 60 and 79).
[53] There were 12.25 million Internet users in Côte d'Ivoire in December 2020 out of a population of almost 26,492 million. "Number of Internet users in selected countries in Africa as of March 2019, by country (in millions)", Statista, website, June 6, 2019: https://www.statista.com/statistics/505883/number-of-internet-users-in-african-countries ; Côte d'Ivoire, Population Data, website, 13 December 2018: https://www.populationdata.net/pays/cote-divoire
[54] HABG representative(s), e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021.
[55] Côte d'Ivoire Second OGP National Action Plan 2018-20; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2018-2020/
[56] Côte d'Ivoire Third OGP National Action Plan 2020-22; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2020-2022/
[57] PSCI-PGO document on proposed commitments provided to the IRM. May 2021.
[58] Representatives from the High Authority for Good Governance, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee to the IRM researcher, 4 May 2021.
[59] Ibid .

[60] Côte d'Ivoire Third OGP National Action Plan 2020-22, Commitments 4 and 5; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2020-2022/
[61] Côte d'Ivoire Third OGP National Action Plan 2020-22, Commitments 4 and 5; https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/cote-divoire-action-plan-2020-2022/
[62] Mr. Desire Djiriga Dago, Directeur du Traitement des Déclarations de Patrimoine, HABG, e-mail communication sent by the HABG contact person, Mrs. Esther Adou-Coulibaly, 11 May 2021.
[63] Network for Integrity (December 2020), Developing digital tools to promote transparency in public life: http://www.networkforintegrity.org/developing-digital-tools-promote-transparency-public-life/
[64] Network for Integrity (December 2020), Developing digital tools to promote transparency in public life: http://www.networkforintegrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Networkforintegrity_Developing-Digital-Tools-and-Open-Data-dec-20.pdf
[65] Representative(s) of the HABG, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021.
[66] High Authority for Good Governance website, 'publications': https://habg.ci/publication.php
[67] Network for Integrity (December 2020), Developing digital tools to promote transparency in public life, p.22: http://www.networkforintegrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Networkforintegrity_Developing-Digital-Tools-and-Open-Data-dec-20.pdf
[68] Representative(s) of the HABG, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021
[69] Representative(s) of the HABG, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021
[70] The content of the asset declaration currently concerns movable property (tangible and intangible) and immovable property located on national territory or abroad and includes the property of spouse if married under the community of property regime, as well as those of minor children, see: https://habg.ci/patrimoine.php?ID=3 . Representative(s) of the HABG, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021 reported that "Currently, declaration of assets in Côte d'Ivoire do not yet formally concern potential interests in the broad sense and this is not part either of the ambition of Commitment 5."
[71] Representative(s) of the HABG, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021
[72] Côte d'Ivoire Third OGP National Action Plan 2020-22, Commitment 4.
[73] Civil society members of the PSCI-PGO, email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[74] Email exchanges between IRM researcher and the PSCI-PGO in April and May 2021.
[75] Representative(s) of the HABG, e-mail communication sent by the Technical Committee on 4 May 2021
[76] Ibid .
[77] Ousseynou Ngom. Senior Regional Coordinator, Africa and the Middle East. Open Government Partnership. Support Unit Discussion with IRM. April 2021.
[78] See OGP website https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/ukraine/commitments/UA0044 and Ukraine OGP National Action Plan 2014-2015.
[79] See OGP website https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/georgia/commitments/GE0050 and Georgia OGP National Action Plan 2016-2018.
[80] See OGP website https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/croatia/commitments/HR0019 and Croatia OGP National Action Plan 2014-2016.
[81] Transparency International (2020), Recommendations on Asset and Interest Declarations for OGP Action Plans: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Recommendations-on-Asset-and-Interest-Declaration-for-OGP-Action-Plans.pdf
[82] Draft of Côte d'Ivoire Hybrid Report on design and implementation of the 2018-2020 action plan, Independent Reporting Mechanism, Open Government Partnership, publication forthcoming.

Section III. Methodology and IRM Indicators

The purpose of this review is not an evaluation as with former IRM reports. It is intended as an independent and quick technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process. This approach allows the IRM to highlight the strongest and most promising commitments in the action plan based on an assessment of the commitments per the key IRM indicators, particularly commitments with the highest potential for results, the priority of the commitments for country stakeholders and the priorities in the national open government context.
To determine which reforms or commitments the IRM identifies as promising, the IRM follows a filtering and clustering process:

Step 1: Determine what is reviewable and what is not based on the verifiability of the commitment as written in the action plan.
Step 2: Determine if the commitment has an open government lens. Is it relevant to OGP values?
Step 3: Commitments that are verifiable and have an open government lens are reviewed to identify if certain commitments need to be clustered. Commitments that have a common policy objective or commitments that contribute to the same reform or policy issue should be clustered and its "potential for results" should be reviewed as a whole. The clustering process is conducted by IRM staff, following the steps below:

a. Determine overarching themes. They may be as stated in the action plan or if the action plan is not already grouped by themes, IRM staff may use the thematic tagging done by OGP as reference.
b. Review commitment objectives to identify commitments that address the same policy issue or contribute to the same broader policy or government reform.
c. Organize commitments by clusters as needed. Commitments may already be organized in the action plan under specific policy or government reforms or may be standalone and therefore not clustered.

Step 4: Assess the potential for results of the cluster or standalone commitment.

The filtering process is an internal process and data for individual commitments is available in Annex I below. In addition, during the internal review process of this product, the IRM verifies the accuracy of findings and collects further input through peer review, the OGP Support Unit feedback as needed, interviews and validation with country stakeholders, and sign-off by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP).

As described in the filtering process above, the IRM relies on **three key indicators** for this review:

I. Verifiability

- "Yes": Specific enough to review. As written in the action plan, the objectives stated and actions proposed are sufficiently clear and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation.

- "No": Not specific enough to review. As written in the action plan, the objectives stated and proposed actions lack clarity and do not include explicit verifiable activities to assess implementation.

*Commitments that are not verifiable will be considered "not reviewable," and further assessment will not be carried out.

II. Does it have an open government lens? (Relevant)

This indicator determines if the commitment relates to open government values of transparency, civic participation or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration and the OGP Articles of Governance by responding to the guiding questions below.
Based on a close reading of the commitment text, the IRM first determines whether the commitment has an open government lens:

- **Yes/No:** Does the commitment set out to make a policy area, institution or decision-making process more transparent, participatory or accountable to the public?

The IRM uses the OGP Values as defined in the Articles of Governance. In addition, the following questions for each OGP value may be used as a reference to identify the specific open government lens in commitment analysis:

- **Transparency:** Will the government disclose more information, improve the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improve the transparency of government decision-making processes or institutions?
- **Civic Participation**: Will government create or improve opportunities, processes or mechanisms for the public to inform or influence decisions? Will the government create, enable or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities or underrepresented groups? Will the government enable a legal environment to guarantee freedoms of assembly, association and peaceful protest?
- **Public Accountability**: Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions? Will the government enable a legal, policy or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of public officials?

III. Potential for Results

Formerly known as the "potential impact" indicator, it was adjusted taking into account the feedback from the IRM Refresh consultation process with the OGP community. With the new results-oriented strategic focus of IRM products, this indicator was modified so that in this first review, it laid out the expected results and potential results that would later be verified in the IRM Results Report, after implementation. Given the purpose of this Action Plan Review, the assessment of "potential for results" is only an early indication of the potential the commitment has to yield meaningful results based on its articulation in the action plan in contrast with the state of play in the respective policy area.

The scale of the indicator is defined as follows:

- **Unclear:** the commitment is aimed at continuing ongoing practices in line with existing legislation, requirements or policies without indication of the added value or enhanced open government approach in contrast with existing practice.

- **Modest:** a positive but standalone initiative or changes to process, practice or policies. Commitments that do not generate binding or institutionalized changes across government or institutions that govern a policy area. For example, tools like websites, or data release, training, pilot projects.
- **Substantial:** a possible game changer to the rules of the game (or the creation of new ones), practices, policies or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector and/or relationship between citizens and state. The commitment generates binding and institutionalized changes across government.

This review was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Aicha Blegbo and Ana Revuleta and overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP). The current IEP membership includes:

- César Cruz-Rubio
- Mary Francoli
- Brendan Halloran
- Jeff Lovitt
- Juanita Olaya

For more information about the IRM, please refer to the **"About IRM" section of the OGP website** available here.

Annex I. Commitment-by-Commitment Data[83]

Commitment 1: Participatory Budgeting in Local Authorities

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- This commitment has been clustered as: Open Budget (Commitments 1 and 2 of the action plan
- Potential for results: Substantial

Commitment 2: Civil Society Participation in the Multi-Year Budget and Economic Program Document

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- This commitment has been clustered as: Open Budget (Commitments 1 and 2 of the action plan)
- Potential for results: Substantial

Commitment 3: National Strategy for the Fight Against Corruption

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- Potential for results: Modest

Commitment 4: Public Official and Civil Servant Asset Transparency

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- This commitment has been clustered as: Asset Transparency (Commitments 4 and 5 of the action plan)
- Potential for results: Substantial

Commitment 5: Asset Declaration Legal Framework

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- This commitment has been clustered as: Asset Transparency (Commitments 4 and 5 of the action plan)
- Potential for results: Substantial

Commitment 6: Teleworking

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? Yes
- Potential for results: Modest

Commitment 7: Teleworking Tools

- Verifiable: Yes
- Does it have an open government lens? No

• Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 8: Purchase of Contraceptive Products
• Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? No • Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 9: Contraceptives Transparency
• Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest
Commitment 10: Canteen Food Provision
• Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? No • Potential for results: Unclear

[83] Editorial notes:
1. For commitments that are clustered: the assessment of potential for results is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitments.
2. Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see Côte d'Ivoire's 2020-2022 national action plan: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Cote-dIvoire_Action-Plan_2020-2022_FR.pdf

Annex 2: Minimum Requirements for Acting According to OGP Process

According to OGP's Procedural Review Policy, during the development of an action plan, OGP participating countries must meet the "Involve" level of public influence per the IRM's assessment of the co-creation process.

To determine whether a country falls within the "Involve" category on the spectrum, the IRM assesses different elements from OGP's Participation & Co-creation Standards. The IRM will assess whether the country complied with the following aspects of the standards during the development of the action plan, which constitute the minimum threshold:

1. **A forum exists:** There is a forum to oversee the OGP process.
2. **The forum involves multiple stakeholders:** Both government and civil society participate in it.
3. **Reasoned response:** The government or multi-stakeholder forum documents or is able to demonstrate how they provided feedback during the co-creation process. This may include a summary of major categories and/or themes proposed for inclusion, amendment or rejection.

The table below summarizes the IRM assessment of the three standards that apply for purposes of the procedural review. The purpose of this summary is to verify compliance with procedural review minimum requirements, and it is not a full assessment of performance under OGP's Co-creation and Participation Standards. A full assessment of co-creation and participation throughout the OGP cycle will be provided in the Results Report.

Table 2. Summary of Minimum Requirements to Act According to OGP Process

OGP Standard	*Was the standard met?*
A forum exists. The Technical Committee for OGP (CT-OGP), which includes government and non-governmental members in conjunction with the Civil Society Platform (PSCI-OGP), operate as the multistakeholder forum.[84]	**Green**
The forum is multi-stakeholder. CT-OGP includes 11 government, 3 private sector, and 8 civil society representatives.[85] PSCI-OGP includes around 38 CSOs.[86]	**Green**
The government provided a reasoned response on how the public's feedback was used to shape the action plan. CT-OGP held formal and informal meetings, and frequent exchanges with civil society members of PSCI-PGO.	**Green**

Minutes from formal meetings were taken and shared with participants but are not publicly available. Commitment proposals and civil society input was considered and included in the plan or received a reasoned response.[87]	

[84] Côte d'Ivoire's OGP website and the PSCI-OGP website do not contain updated information on the composition or activities of OGP structures in Côte d'Ivoire. However, the IRM confirmed through interviews and documents that the Technical Committee includes government, civil society, and private sector members. Civil society members of the Technical Committee also serve on the civil society platform (PSCI-OGP). PSCI-OGP and the Technical Committee discussed commitment proposals through email exchanges viewed by the IRM that were then validated at a 25 November 2020 workshop hosted by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.
[85] Decree Number 516/MCI 11 May 2020, "Appointing the Members of the Technical Committee (CT-OGP) of the Interministerial Committee for the Implementation of Open Government Partnership Processes in Côte d'Ivoire," Ministry of Commerce and Industry.
[86] Civil society representatives from PSCI-OGP, email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021.
[87] Civil society representatives from PSCI-OGP, email exchange with IRM researcher, May 2021; Summary of the national action plan validation workshop, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, CT-OGP, 25 November 2020. Mrs. Mariama Koné, Chair of the CT-OGP and technical advisor at the Ministry of Trade and Industry, chaired the workshop, which was attended by 24 civil society and government participants. The objective was to discuss policy areas and proposed commitments for the 2020-2022 national action plan. The discussion was then extended to the wider civil society platform PSCI-PGO, before the documents were validated by the Technical Committee in December and sent to the government for final adoption.