Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): [Name of Country/Entity] Transitional Results Report [2018]–[2020]

This report was prepared in collaboration with [Name of Researcher], [Affiliated Organization/Independent Researcher]
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***Editorial Note: This template includes the theme (colors) and styles (font sets) to be used for all future IRM reports.***

Paragraphs that are preceded by “**[Do not revise:]**” indicate boilerplate text that should not be revised/edited. The “Do not revise” notes should be deleted when writing the report. Highlighted text indicates text that should be replaced with an exact replacement (e.g., author name, country name, action plan year span).

Green textindicates guidance notes on content and should later be deleted when the report is written.

Be sure to put it in the “Normal” (Gill Sans 11) Word style.

# I. Introduction

**[Do not revise:]** TheOpen Government Partnership is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. Action plan commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate an entirely new area. OGP’s Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their progress and determine if efforts have impacted people’s lives.

The IRM has partnered with [name of researcher and organization] to carry out this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around the development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of the IRM’s methodology, please visit <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism>.

This report covers the implementation of [country/entity’s] [ordinal number] action plan for [action plan cycle years]. In 2021, the IRM will implement a new approach to its research process and the scope of its reporting on action plans, approved by the IRM Refresh.[[1]](#footnote-0) The IRM adjusted its Implementation Reports for 2018-2020 action plans to fit the transition process to the new IRM products and enable the IRM to adjust its workflow in light of the COVID-19 pandemic’s effects on OGP country processes.

# II. Action Plan Implementation

**[Do not revise]** The IRM Transitional Results Report assesses the status of the action plan’s commitments and the results from their implementation at the end of the action plan cycle. This report does not re-visit the assessments for “Verifiability,” “Relevance” or “Potential Impact.” The IRM assesses those three indicators in IRM Design Reports. For more details on each indicator, please see Annex I in this report.

## 2.1. General Highlights and Results

This subsection should include a 1-3 paragraph summary of the implementation highlights for this action plan. Include the following in your narrative:

* + What was the overall level of progress in commitment implementation?
	+ How many commitments had “substantial” or “complete” implementation? Is this an improvement from the performance of the previous action plan?
	+ What were some of the factors that contributed to the positive progress in implementation? Or, what were some of the factors that limited progress in implementation? If they are COVID-related, mention here, but details in section 2.2 below.
	+ If any of the “noteworthy commitments” were not implemented, incorporate an explicit mention regarding the implementation barriers specific to the commitment.
	+ How does the implementation of this plan compare to the previous plan?
* What are the results or tangible changes in open government practice?
* Provide a general description of the type of commitments that yielded better results (for example, commitments that: relate to a specific theme, are led by a particular agency, counted with resources for their implementation, etc.).
* What are the substantial changes in government practice? What has improved, and how? Please use examples.

**2.2. COVID 19 Pandemic impact on implementation**

This subsection should include a 1-2 paragraph summary of how COVID impacted implementation, how did it affect the continuity of activities or availability of resources? Did the COVID response tap into frameworks or tools developed by previous action plans, or open government practices in response or recovery efforts? Did it change OGP priorities in the country or engagement with CSOs?

## 2.3. Early results

**[Do not revise:]** The IRM acknowledges that results may not be visible within the two-year time frame of the action plan and that at least a substantial level of completion is required to assess early results. For the purpose of the Transitional Results Report, the IRM will use the “***Did it Open Government?***” (DIOG) indicator to highlight early results based on the changes to government practice in areas relevant to OGP values. Moving forward, new IRM Results Report will not continue using DIOG as an indicator.

Section 2.3 focuses on outcomes from the implementation of commitments that had an ambitious or strong design, per the IRM Design Report assessment or that may have lacked clarity and/or ambition but had successful implementation with “major” or “outstanding” changes to government practice.[[2]](#footnote-1) Commitments considered for analysis in this section had at least a “substantial” level of implementation, as assessed by the IRM in Section 2.4.[[3]](#footnote-2) While this section provides the analysis of the IRM’s findings for the commitments that meet the criteria described above, Section 2.4 includes an overview of the level of completion for all the commitments in the action plan.

|  |
| --- |
| **Commitment 1: Increase budget transparency** |
| **Aim of the commitment**  | Write the commitment’s aim, public problem being addressed and status quo prior to the implementation of the commitment. This section should briefly and clearly describe the starting point against which you are measuring the results of the commitment. Please use the “Context and Objectives” section of the Design Report to draw 1-2 sentences here. Please cite the report or action plan if you are using direct quotes or text from either. This needs to be consistent with the aim, public problem and status quo described in your Design Report. Check that you are writing in the correct tense, past if you are referring to how the commitment was designed. |
| **Did it open government?****Did not change/Marginal/ Major/ Outstanding** | The narrative should be clear and concise. The flow should allow the reader to understand what the results (or lack thereof) are and why it justifies the´did it open government´ assessment. Remember to cite additional perspectives as needed, not only the government or your own view. For assessments of “outstanding” a perspective from a third party or expert is necessary.To write the narrative please follow the guiding outline and questions below (1-2 paragraphs):* The information you should include is:
	+ - What are the results? What changed? Is this positive or negative?
		- How much of a stretch is the change from the starting point?
		- What factors contributed to successful (or weak) implementation?
		- How do early results contribute to the public problem addressed by the commitment? Did it exceed the ambition of the commitment or fall short?
* Finally, provide a 1- 2 sentence conclusion of the “Did it Open Government?” assessment (please reference the OGP values that were advanced)
 |

**(delete after draft is completed) For IRM Researchers, further guidance on Did it Open Government?**

The DIOG is not an assessment of impact, we look for changes in government practice as a result of the commitment’s implementation. Concretely, we compare the situation before the action plan vs. situation at the end of action plan in the areas of OGP values.

When identifying what changed or the early results please consider the following:

* + - Did the government disclose more information, improve the quality of the information (new or existing), improve the value of the information, improve the channels to disclose or request information or improve accessibility to information?
		- Did the government create new opportunities to seek feedback from citizens/enable participation/ inform or influence decisions? How was the input incorporated into decision making? How were decisions that resulted from citizen input implemented? Did the government improve existing channels or spaces to seek feedback from citizens/enable participation/ inform or influence decisions? Did the government create or improve capabilities in the government or the public aimed to improve how the government seeks feedback from citizens/enables participation/ or allows for the public to inform or influence decisions?
		- Did the government create or improve channels, opportunities or capabilities to hold officials answerable to their actions? How robust are the mechanisms? How important are the areas over which accountability is being enabled, to the country’s context? To what extent can the public influence and leverage these accountability mechanisms?

***Important Note:***

*Not every commitment needs to deliver changes in all three areas, nor is one*

*more important than the other. It depends on which value it was coded relevant to in the Design*

*Report. In some cases, unclear relevance commitments yield results that end up having*

*relevance to OGP values. If this is the case, you should state that although it had unclear*

*relevance, as implemented it did change government practice in the OGP value area. Explain*

*which one.*

## 2.4. Commitment implementation

**[Do not revise:]** The table below includes an assessment of the level of completion for each commitment in the action plan.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Commitment** | **Completion:***(no evidence available, not started, limited, substantial or complete)* |
|
| **1.xxxx** | **Limited**:The Technology Agency created the portal, but data on beneficial ownership is not available for any company.[[4]](#footnote-3) According to the government point of contact, the Extractive Ministry did not have resources to generate the data. Environment Now, a CSO actively involved in the EITI MSF is working with the Extractive Ministry to create an internal standard for data collection. The Ministry aims to deliver the data in November 2021 to update the portal. |
| **2. Guidance for commitments included in analysis in section 2.3: only add short title here. Example:****Beneficial Ownership Transparency** | **Guidance for commitments included in analysis in section 2.3: only add completion coding here with the reference, *“*For details regarding the implementation and early results see section 2.3*”******Example:*****Complete. For details regarding the implementation and early results of this commitment see section 2.3.** |
| **3.nnnj** |  |
| **4.ccc** |  |
| **5.bbbb** |  |
| **6.sss** |  |
| **7.sssss** |  |

# III. Multi-stakeholder Process

## 3.1 Multi-stakeholder process throughout action plan implementation

**[Do not revise:]** In 2017, OGP adopted the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards intended to support participation and co-creation by civil society at all stages of the OGP cycle. All OGP-participating countries are expected to meet these standards. The standards aim to raise ambition and quality of participation during development, implementation, and review of OGP action plans.

**[Do not revise:]** OGP’s Articles of Governance also establish participation and co-creation requirements a country or entity must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to the OGP process. [Country/entity] [**acted**/**did not act**] contrary to OGP process.[[5]](#footnote-4) (Country/entity) did not (add what requirement they did not complete).

Please see Annex I for an overview of [country’s/entity’s] performance implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan implementation.

Table [3.2]: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) “Spectrum of Participation” to apply it to OGP.[[6]](#footnote-5) In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire to “collaborate.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level of public influence | During development of action plan | During implementation of action plan |
| Empower | The government handed decision-making power to members of the public. |  |  |
| Collaborate | There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda. |  |  |
| Involve | The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered. |  |  |
| Consult | The public could give inputs. |  |  |
| Inform | The government provided the public with information on the action plan. |  |  |
| No Consultation | No consultation |  |  |

In a short narrative, describe the level of government-civil society engagement during implementation of the action plan. Provide an analysis on how engagement changed (improved or worsened) compared to the co-creation process to develop the action plan. Please make sure your narrative justifies the coding for the table above and reflects your assessments in Annex 1**. Keep narrative 1 – 2 paragraphs.**

# 3.2 Overview of [country’s/entity’s] performance throughout action plan implementation

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Multi-stakeholder Forum** | During Development | During Implementation |
| **1a. Forum established: (Add a sentence to state if there is an MSF established for example: “The OGP National Steering Committee oversees the creation process of the action plan, it is established by decree” and cite your source/evidence )** | Green |  |
| 1b. Regularity: How often did the forum meet? E.g., “The OGP National Steering Committee met once during the six months of the co-creation process. OGP standards require that the forums meet at least once every quarter.[1]” | Yellow |  |
| 1c. Collaborative mandate development: State whether members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership, and governance structure. |  | NA |
| 1d. Mandate public: State whether or not information on the forum’s remit, membership, and governance structure is available on the OGP website/page. |  |  |
| **2a. Multi-stakeholder: Does the forum include both governmental and non government representatives?**  | Red |  |
| 2b. Parity: State whether or not the forum includes an even balance of governmental and nongovernmental representatives. |  |  |
| **2c. Transparent selection: State whether or not nongovernmental members of the forum are selected through a fair and transparent process. process.** |  |  |
| 2d. High-level government representation: State if the forum includes high-level representatives with decision-making authority from government. |  |  |
| **3a. Openness: State if the forum accepts input and representation on the action plan implementation from any civil society and other stakeholders outside the forum.** |  |  |
| 3b. Remote participation: State whether there are opportunities for remote participation in at least some meetings and events. |  |  |
| 3c. Minutes: State whether the OGP forum or the government proactively communicates and reports back on its decisions, activities, and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders. |  |  |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Plan Implementation**  |  |
| 4a. Process transparency: State if there is a national OGP website/webpage regular updates (i.e. at least every six months) on the progress of commitments, including progress against milestones, reasons for any delays, next steps. This is in addition to publishing a self-assessment report. | P |
| 4b. Communication channels: State if the website/web page has a feature to allow the public to comment on action plan progress updates. | I |
| 4c. Engagement with civil society: State if the government holds at least two open meetings with civil society (one per year) to discuss the implementation of the NAP. | PM |
| 4d. Cooperation with the IRM: State if the government shares the link to the IRM report with other government institutions and stakeholders to encourage input during the public comment phase. | M |
| 4.e MSF engagement: State if the multi-stakeholder forum monitors and deliberates on how to improve the implementation of the NAP. |  |
| 4.f MSF engagement with self-assessment report: State if the government submitted its end of term self-assessment report to the national multi-stakeholder forum for comments and feedback on the content of the report |  |
| **4.g. Repository: Explain if the forum or the government documented, collected, and published a repository on the domestic OGP website in line with** [**IRM guidance**](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/IRM-Guidance-for-Repositories_to-share.pdf)**.** |  |

# IV. Methodology and Sources

**[Do not revise]:** Research for the IRM reports is carried out by national researchers. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control led by IRM staff to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

The International Experts Panel (IEP) of the IRM oversees the quality control of each report. The IEP is composed of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

Current membership of the International Experts Panel is

● César Cruz-Rubio

● Mary Francoli

● Brendan Halloran

● Jeff Lovitt

● Juanita Olaya

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual[[7]](#footnote-6) and in (Country’s) Design Report (years).

**About the IRM**

|  |
| --- |
| **The Open Government Partnership (OGP)** aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP’s Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.**[Researcher’s name]** 2 - 3 sentences biography. |

#

# Annex I. IRM Indicators

The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[[8]](#footnote-7) A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

* **Verifiability:**
	+ Not specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, do the objectives stated and actions proposed lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
	+ Specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, are the objectives stated and actions proposed sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
* **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment’s relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
	+ Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
	+ Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions or policies?
	+ Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve public facing opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
* **Potential impact:** This variable assesses the *potential impact* of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
* Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
* Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
* Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.
* **Completion:** This variable assesses the commitment’s implementation and progress. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *IRM Implementation Report.*
* **Did It Open Government?:** This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice, in areas relevant to OGP values, has changed as a result of the commitment’s implementation. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the IRM Implementation Report.

**Results oriented commitments?**

A potentially starred commitment has more potential to be ambitious and to be implemented. A good commitment design is one that clearly describes the:

1. **Problem:** What is the economic, social, political, or environmental problem? Rather than describing an administrative issue or tool (e.g., ‘Misallocation of welfare funds’ is more helpful than ‘lacking a website.’).
2. **Status quo:** What is the status quo of the policy issue at the beginning of an action plan (e.g., “26 percent of judicial corruption complaints are not processed currently.”)?
3. **Change:** Rather than stating intermediary outputs, what is the targeted behavior change that is expected from the commitment’s implementation (e.g., “Doubling response rates to information requests” is a stronger goal than “publishing a protocol for response.”)?

**Starred commitments**

One measure, the “starred commitment” (✪), deserves further explanation due to its particular interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries/entities. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

* The commitment’s design should be **Verifiable**, **Relevant** to OGP values, and have **Transformative** potential impact. As assessed in the Design Report.
* The commitment’s implementation must be assessed by IRM Implementation Report as **Substantial** or **Complete.**

This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the IRM Implementation Report.

1. For more information, see: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/process/accountability/about-the-irm/irm-refresh/> [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. IRM Design Reports identified strong commitments as “**noteworthy commitments**” if they were assessed as verifiable, relevant and “transformative” potential impact. If no commitments met the potential impact threshold, the IRM selected noteworthy commitments from the commitments with “moderate” potential impact. For the list of [country]'s noteworthy commitments, see the Executive Summary of the 2018-2020 IRM Design Report: [link to Design Report]. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. (**If this isn’t the case delete this footnote**) The following commitments assessed as noteworthy in [country]'s IRM Design Report are not included in this section because their limited implementation means there is not enough progress to assess results:

Commitment #: ---

Commitment #: --- [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. Centralized portal available here xxxxxx [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. Acting Contrary to Process - Country did not meet (1) “involve” during the development or “inform” during implementation of the action plan, or (2) the government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. “IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum,” IAP2, 2014. <https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum_8.5x11_Print.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. IRM Procedures Manual, V.3: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. “IRM Procedures Manual,” OGP, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)