

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Results Report:
[Country] [20XX-20XX]

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Executive Summary

Write a 2–3 sentence headline highlighting the main takeaways on level of completion, early results, and/or key observations across the action plan. The headline could also include a key message on the quality of participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle.

Early Results (5–7 sentences):

- How many commitments achieved moderate or significant early results? How many were identified as “promising” in the Action Plan Review? How does this level of early results compare with previous action plans?
- What are the main early results (if any) achieved through implementation of the action plan? What (if any) are the common characteristics or contributing factors across these commitments?
- If there were promising commitments that did not achieve notable early results, what factors inhibited their implementation?

Completion (5–7 sentences):

- What were some of the main topics covered in the action plan’s commitments?
- What was the overall level of progress in commitment implementation?
- How many commitments had “substantial” or “complete” implementation? Is this an improvement or decrease from the performance of the previous action plan?
- What were some of the factors that contributed to positive progress in implementation, or what were some of the factors that limited progress in implementation?
- Please describe which policy or commitment areas had the most completion and why.
 - Are the “Promising” commitments complete?
 - Which commitment areas had limited or no progress? Discuss why.

Participation and Co-Creation (5–7 sentences):

- What bodies/institutions oversee the Open Government Partnership (OGP) process in the country?
- What were the main achievements, innovations, and/or challenges regarding participation and co-creation throughout the action plan cycle?
- How did the country’s participation and co-creation practices impact the quality of stakeholder dialogue and the co-creation and implementation of commitments?
- How did participation and co-creation practices compare to previous cycles?
- If the country acted contrary to OGP process, note where they fell short.

Implementation in context (5–7 sentences):

Highlight the main domestic or international factors that positively or negatively impacted implementation of the action plan and how they were addressed (or not)—for example, increase

IMPLEMENTATION AT A GLANCE

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

10/14

Complete or substantially complete commitments

EARLY RESULTS

9/14

Commitments with early results

1/14

Commitments with moderate or significant early results

COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

Not acting/Acting according to OGP process.

Commented [AK1]: Guidance for researchers: the Executive Summary aims to highlight the most important messages that the IRM wishes to convey to all country stakeholders. Keep this in mind while you draft each subsection, thinking about how the IRM analysis led to these main messages. They should reflect the ideas in the Key Lessons section.

Commented [AK2]: Guidance for researchers: This headline summarizes the IRM’s main and most prominent message to national stakeholders. It is often the only message that sticks. Therefore, it is very important to think strategically about how and what to convey in this message.

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

IRM Results Report: [Country] [action plan years as 20XX-20XX]

or decrease in funding (such as grants), elections, reorganization or conflict in the multi-stakeholder forum (MSF), change in government leading institutions, pandemic, natural disasters or social movements or unrest, etc.

Table of Contents

Section I: Key Observations..... 1

Section II: Implementation and Early Results 3

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation 5

Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators7

Annex I. Commitment Data 9

Section I: Key Observations

Distill 3–5 takeaways from the action plan cycle that provide lessons for reflection in the country’s open government efforts. They should provide analytical insight into factors that contributed and/or hindered reforms. Key Observations should discuss what has worked/not worked in implementation of the action plan, and why this is the case. It might look at why things worked better/worse than the last action plan cycle. The observation might address/give credit to smaller cultural changes inside institutions that are otherwise not captured in IRM reports. Key Observations should be attached to at least one specific example that should be referenced in the narrative.

These Key Observations might be taken from suggestions by stakeholders during your interviews when they reflect on what worked well or not, what they would have done differently, or the lessons they have learned from the action plan cycle. From Key Observations, a recommendation could be distilled but is not explicit. Often, a recommendation might best be expressed through the use of an example from another country. Take into consideration the timing of this report’s publication in the country’s action plan cycle when identifying the key observations to highlight. (Many countries will be at the stage of beginning to implement their next action plan.)

Before listing the Key Observations, you can have a short paragraph that briefly lists them. It should be no longer than four or five lines.

Guiding questions to inform this section:

Looking broadly across the action plan, which good practices were introduced and/or which factors accelerated results or change towards improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state?

- *What worked?*
 - *Which factors contributed (e.g., OGP Support Unit, civil society organization, or international partners)?*
 - *Did the country act on previous IRM recommendations?*
 - *How has the continuation of reforms (or lack of) across multiple action plans helped or hindered the implementation of open government reforms?*
 - *Did domestic and/or international contextual factors influence implementation?*
- *What were the key barriers to implementation? What were the common factors across commitments that didn’t achieve early results? In particular, are there factors that were not anticipated in the Action Plan Review that arose during implementation?*
- *Are there lessons that can be learned from other countries or positive successes in these commitments or in the action plan design/implementation here that can be models for other countries?*

Commented [AK3]: Note for IRM Staff: Review Salesforce data on Support Unit engagement and information on OGP domestic institutions to inform this section.

Observation 1: *(Heading in the format of a short statement.)*

Narrative—No more than half a page.

Observation 2: (Heading)

IRM Results Report: [Country] [action plan years as 20XX-20XX]

Observation 3: (Heading)

Observation 4: (Heading)

Observation 5: (Heading)

Section II: Implementation and Early Results

[Do not change] The following section looks at the **X** commitments or clusters that the IRM identified as having the strongest results from implementation. To assess early results, the IRM referred to commitments or clusters identified as promising in the Action Plan Review as a starting point. After verification of completion evidence, the IRM also took into account commitments or clusters that were not determined as promising but that, as implemented, yielded predominantly positive or significant results.

Guidance for researchers: 1–2 pages max per cluster or commitment as structured in the Action Plan Review.

All commitments with significant results coding should be in the early results section.

In reports that have only one commitment with significant results coding, or none, commitments with moderate results coding can be included in the early results section if they address a policy area that is particularly important to stakeholders or the national context (This is a similar consideration as that for APR Promising Commitments).

Commitment [#]: [Short Title] [Implementing Agency]

Context and Objectives:

- *In a few sentences, note the commitment or cluster's overall objective and how it is significant within the national context. Make sure to draw from the IRM's Action Plan Review for this action plan, which already explains the context and objectives of this commitment.*

Early Results: (Add coding: Moderate Results or Significant Results):

Start your analysis with a summary of the main findings regarding the commitment or cluster's early results. Clearly state the reason for coding early results as moderate or significant. Use the coding definitions of the indicator in the Methods Section (IV) and any additional guidance as provided by the IRM. Remember that your analysis must be based on the evidence collected through your research and on government, civil society, and expert opinions. It may help to write this part last.

- *If the commitment was not identified in the Action Plan Review as "promising" but as implemented had strong results, explain what made the implementation meaningful and describe the unexpected results.*

The analysis must clearly articulate the depth of changes that occurred due to implementation. To do so, address the following questions in your analysis:

- *Compared to the baseline at the time of co-creating this commitment, to what extent was there improvement in the practices, policies or institutions governing the commitment's policy area or public sector?*
- *And/or how did implementation contribute to enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state? Examples of this could include changes in relationships, incentives, behavior ect. not captured in the question above.*

- ☐ *How do the implementation results compare to the commitment's stated objective in the action plan and the baselines and indicators of change highlighted in the Action Plan Review?*
- ☐ *If the commitment achieved 'significant results,' explain how implementation changed the way an influential sector is organized and carries out its work or had significant effects on society, the economy, or the environment.*
- ☐ *Which milestones were completed, are ongoing, or not started? Be sure to state the commitment's coding for level of completion: no evidence available, not started, limited, substantial, or complete. Note if implementation included activities not previously stated in the action plan and how they influenced the results.*
- ☐ *How did the commitment's open government lens come into play (transparency, civic participation, public accountability)? If the aim of the commitment was to advance open government directly, to what extent was this achieved? If the commitment used open government mechanisms to advance a policy area, to what extent did they contribute to the results?*
- ☐ *How did the change happen and what were the enabling factors or constraints (internal or external) to achieve results?*
- ☐ *Did the opportunities and roadblocks foreseen in the Action Plan Review impact implementation of the commitment or cluster?*

The analysis must state to what extent the evidence suggests that the reform will be sustained after the implementation period.

- ☐ *To what extent has there been formal or informal institutionalization of the changes brought about by implementation? (For example, through changes in laws, regulations, decrees, institutions, incentives, budgets, relationships, behavior, processes, etc.) What do these changes suggest for the longevity of this reform?*
- ☐ *If this commitment is part of an ongoing reform within or outside of previous action plans, note how this commitment builds on prior efforts. If known, include information on expected next steps or if the reform will be included in future action plans.*
- ☐ *Where possible, based on the current trajectory and progress, what are the prospects for the expected longer-term outcomes of this reform?*

Looking Ahead:

- ☐ *This text should serve as a concluding paragraph to the commitment analysis, offering information for the reader regarding what is expected of the commitment looking ahead. For instance, include here information on whether the commitment is being taken forward on the next action plan or if this policy area is being prioritized in future actions within or beyond the action plan framework.*
- ☐ *You can also consider adding here any major recommendations that the country could consider moving forward in this policy area. These recommendations can draw from OGP and external guidance for the policy area or can cite lessons from other countries undertaking similar reforms.*

Section III. Participation and Co-Creation

2-3 sentence headline on the overall quality of participation and co-creation throughout the action plan cycle. The headline could highlight any significant innovations or challenges that impacted the quality of collaboration. If the country acted contrary to OGP process, note how they fell short.

Write a brief narrative that addresses the following (5–7 sentences):

- What is the agency or office in charge of OGP? If OGP is led by multiple entities, explain how offices or agencies coordinated.
- [If applicable, include and fill out the following paragraph:] There was a change in OGP leadership [and/or point of contact] during the action plan cycle. [2–3 sentences on what the change was and whether it affected the ability of the government to convene/work with or engage civil society during co-creation or implementation.]
- Were there any resource constraints (e.g., financial, cross-governmental coordination, or human resources) that affected the ability of the government to convene/work with or engage civil society during co-creation or implementation? If an OGP mini-grant was provided, note how it impacted the action plan process.

Provide a general analysis of the main highlights (3–4 paragraphs):

- **During co-creation**, what was the role of the MSF or non-governmental actors?
 - Were non-governmental members of the forum selected through a fair and transparent process during action plan development? To what extent were **diverse groups** represented? How do they compare to previous action plans?
 - Did the government engage in an iterative dialogue with non-government actors?
 - Did members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership, and governance structure during action plan development?
 - Did non-government actors help to set the co-creation agenda?
 - In what ways, if any, did the forum accept inputs and representation on the action plan process from any civil society or other stakeholders outside the forum?
- What was the role of the MSF or non-governmental actors during the implementation period?
 - To what extent was the MSF engaged in implementation? To what extent was civil society beyond the MSF engaged in implementation?
- Across the entire action plan period, how did engagement, dialogue, or joint decision-making improve or decline compared to previous action plans?
- What are good practices or innovative approaches for decision-making or engaging non-governmental stakeholders throughout the action plan cycle?
- What were the challenges and weaknesses in engagement or decision-making throughout the action plan cycle?
- How did the development process impact the action plan or the individual commitments? How was the action plan shaped by who participated in the development process? How did the final commitment selection respond to the country's and consulted stakeholders' policy priorities?

Commented [AK4]: Guidance for researchers: Please explicitly acknowledge the answer to each of these questions in your narrative.

Commented [AK5]: Guidance for researchers: Base your analysis on what 'diverse groups' looks like in the particular country context. For example, for countries with a large rural/urban divide, were consultations held outside the capital city? Was there an effort to ensure gender parity in participation? Ect.

Compliance with the Minimum Requirements

[Do not change] The IRM assesses whether member countries met the minimum requirements under OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards for the purposes of procedural review.¹ During co-creation, [COUNTRY did not act/acted] according to the OGP process. The two minimum requirements listed below must achieve at least the level of 'in progress' for a country to have acted according to OGP process.

Key:

Green= Meets standard

Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)

Red= No evidence of action

Acted according to OGP process during the implementation period?	
The government maintained an OGP repository that is online, updated at least once during the action plan cycle, and contains evidence of development and implementation of the action plan.	Green/Yellow/Red
The government provided the public with information on the action plan during the implementation period.	Green/Yellow/Red

Commented [AP6]: Guidance for researchers: Check back with the previous report (Design Report/Action Plan Review) to determine how to adjust this sentence.

Commented [AK7]: Guidance for researchers: Refer to the IRM Guidance for Repositories to assess whether the country met this requirement: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/IRM_Guidance-for-Repositories_Updated_2020.pdf

¹ Please note that future IRM assessment will focus on compliance with the updated OGP Co-Creation and Participation Standards that came into effect on 1 January 2022: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>.

Section IV. Methodology and IRM Indicators

[Do not change] This report supports members' accountability and learning through assessment of (i) the level of completion for commitments' implementation, (ii) early results for commitments with a high level of completion identified as promising or that yielded significant results through implementation, and (iii) participation and co-creation practices throughout the action plan cycle. The IRM commenced the research process after the first year of implementation of the action plan with the development of a research plan, preliminary desk research, and verification of evidence provided in the country's OGP repository.²

In 2022, OGP launched a consultation process to co-create a new strategy for 2023–2028.³ The IRM will revisit its products, process, and indicators once the strategy co-creation is complete. Until then, Results Reports continue to assess the same indicators as previous IRM reports:

Completion

The IRM assesses the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan, including commitments clustered in the Action Plan Review.⁴ The level of completion for all commitments is assessed as one of the following:

- ☐ *No Evidence Available*
- ☐ *Not Started*
- ☐ *Limited*
- ☐ *Substantial*
- ☐ *Complete*

Early Results

The IRM assesses the level of results achieved from the implementation of commitments that have a clear open government lens, a high level of completion or show evidence of achieving early results (as defined below). It considers the expected aim of the commitment prior to its implementation, the specific country context in which the commitment was implemented, the specific policy area and the changes reported.

The early results indicator establishes three levels of results:

- ☐ **No Notable Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.), the implementation of the open government commitment led to little or no positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes (if any), the IRM did not find meaningful changes towards:
 - improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector,
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.
- ☐ **Moderate Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.) the implementation of the open government commitment led to positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes, the IRM found meaningful changes towards:

IRM Results Report: [Country] [action plan years as 20XX-20XX]

- improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.
- **Significant Results:** According to the evidence collected (through desk research, interviews, etc.) the implementation of the open government commitment led to significant positive results. After assessing the activities carried forward during the period of implementation and its outcomes, the IRM found meaningful changes towards:
- improving practices, policies or institutions governing a policy area or within the public sector, or
 - enhancing the enabling environment to build trust between citizens and the state.
- Significant positive results show clear expectations for these changes (as defined above) will be sustainable in time.

This report was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with [RESEARCHER] and was reviewed by [EXPERT REVIEWER], IRM external expert. The IRM methodology, quality of IRM products and review process is overseen by the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP). The current IEP membership includes:

- Snjezana Bokulic
- Cesar Cruz-Rubio
- Mary Francoli
- Maha Jweied
- Rocio Moreno Lopez

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual⁵ and in [COUNTRY'S ACTION PLAN REVIEW YEAR-YEAR]. For more information, refer to the "IRM Overview" section of the OGP website.⁶ A glossary on IRM and OGP terms is available on the OGP website.⁷

² [COUNTRY NAME]. OGP Repository. Date accessed: XX: LINK

³ See OGP, "Creating OGP's Future Together: Strategic Planning 2023–2028," <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/creating-ogps-future-together/>.

⁴ The IRM clusters commitments that share a common policy objective during the Action Plan Review process. In these instances, the IRM assesses "potential for results" and "Early Results" at the cluster level. The level of completion is assessed at the commitment level. For more information on how the IRM clusters commitments, see Section IV on Methodology and IRM Indicators of the Action Plan Review.

⁵ Independent Reporting Mechanism, *IRM Procedures Manual*, V.3, 16 September 2017, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>.

⁶ Open Government Partnership, *IRM Overview* <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>

⁷ Open Government Partnership, *OGP Glossary*, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/glossary/>

Annex I. Commitment Data⁸

Commitment 1: [SHORT TITLE]	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: (delete if not clustered) • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: (No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete) • Early results: (No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results)
<p><i>This space is for briefly (3–5 sentences) outlining the level of completion for commitments that are not coded for early results. If the commitment is described in detail in Section II for early results, simply state, "This commitment is assessed in Section II above."</i></p> <p><i>If the commitment is not described in detail in Section II, start with a short sentence summarizing the objective of the commitment. Explain the completed activities and outline any obstacles to implementation. State the reason why the commitment does not yet have early results to show (this might be due to limited implementation, internal or external changes or influences, etc.). If the commitment has moderate early results, but is not included in Section II above, then include a brief explanation why it has moderate early results. Use the coding definitions in Section IV above and the Early Results indicator guidance document.</i></p>	
Commitment 2: [SHORT TITLE]	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: • Does it have an open government lens? • This commitment has been clustered as: (delete if not clustered) • Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion: (No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete) • Early results: (No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results)
<p><i>Same guidance as above.</i></p>	
Commitment 3: [SHORT TITLE]	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Verifiable: □ Does it have an open government lens? □ This commitment has been clustered as: (delete if not clustered) □ Potential for results: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Completion: (No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete) □ Early results: (No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results)
<p><i>Same guidance as above.</i></p>	
Commitment 4: [SHORT TITLE]	

Commented [AK8]: Guidance for researchers: Include an entry for every commitment in the action plan.

Commented [9]: Guidance for researchers: copy the codings from the Action Plan Review for this column

Commented [10]: Guidance for researchers: Refer to the following to determine the level of completion for each commitment:

No evidence available: There was not sufficient evidence to determine the commitment's level of completion.
 Not started: There was no progress under any of the milestones within the commitment during the implementation period.
 Limited: There was some progress made under a few milestones, which did not significantly contribute towards the commitment's overall objective.
 Substantial: There was notable progress made under some milestones, which significantly contributed towards the commitment's overall objective.
 Complete: All activities foreseen under this commitment were completed.

<input type="checkbox"/> Verifiable:	<input type="checkbox"/> Completion: <i>(No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Does it have an open government lens?	<input type="checkbox"/> Early results: <i>(No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Potential for results:	
Same guidance as above.	
Commitment 5: [SHORT TITLE]	
<input type="checkbox"/> Verifiable:	<input type="checkbox"/> Completion: <i>(No Evidence Available, Not Started, Limited, Substantial, or Complete)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Does it have an open government lens?	<input type="checkbox"/> Early results: <i>(No Notable Results, Moderate Results, Significant Results)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> This commitment has been clustered as: <i>(delete if not clustered)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Potential for results:	
Same guidance as above.	

⁸ Editorial notes:

1. For commitments that are clustered: The assessment of potential for results and “Early Results” is conducted at the cluster level, rather than the individual commitment level.
2. Commitments’ short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, please see [COUNTRY’S] action plan: [LINK].
3. For more information on the assessment of the commitments’ design, see [COUNTRY’S] Action Plan Review: [LINK].