Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): Jordan Design Report 2018–2020

This report was prepared in collaboration with Aida Murad.

Table of Contents

Jordan undertook a highly collaborative co-creation process. This process resulted in an action plan that promises to open new avenues for Jordanians to participate in their government. In particular, Jordan committed to engaging civil society and the public in national dialogues around key legislation. Looking ahead, implementing agencies should publish details about how citizen input was considered and incorporated into legislative reforms.

Executive Summary: Jordan

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) 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. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Jordan joined OGP in 2011. Since, Jordan has implemented three action plans. This report evaluates the design of Jordan's fourth action plan.

Table 1. At a glance
Participating since: 2011
Action plan under review: Fourth
Report type: Design
Number of commitments: 5

Action plan development

Is there a multistakeholder forum: Yes
Level of public influence: Collaborate
Acted contrary to OGP process: No

Action plan design

Commitments relevant to OGP values: 5
Transformative commitments: 0
Potentially starred: 0

General overview of action plan

Jordan undertook a highly collaborative co-creation process. Jordan's OGP multistakeholder forum engaged civil society to design the consultation process. The forum then employed a survey and series of consultations with government, civil society, and development partners. This process resulted in an action plan that reflects civil society and government priorities and open government values.

All five commitments in the action plan advance civic participation in government. Commitments 1 and 3 in particular aim to establish dialogue mechanisms between civil society and the government to amend legislation related to civil society organizations' operating environment, electoral politics, and decentralization, among other vital topics. These commitments are new. The remaining commitments build on previous OGP reforms. Commitments 2 and 5 focus on access to information by strengthening Jordan's open data system and implementation of the Access to Information Law. Commitment 4 promises to promote public accountability by establishing a human rights complaint mechanism.

The IRM recommends that Jordan continue to build on these vital civic space and participation reforms in future OGP action plans. To do so, the IRM encourages the multistakeholder forum to further engage the legislative and judicial branches to ensure successful implementation of legal reforms. Finally, the IRM advises the multistakeholder forum to establish a public mandate and fair and transparent selection process for its members, to ensure procedural transparency.

Table 2. Noteworthy commitments

Commitment description	Moving forward	Status at the end of implementation cycle
1. Public Sector and Civil Society Partnership and Dialogue: Establish a government and civil society dialouge mechanism to jointly reform legislation to improve civil society organizations' (CSOs) operational environment.	The IRM recommends continuing to build on this vital policy area. The IRM suggests that implementers work toward easing CSOs' access to funding, ensuring proportional governance and reporting requirements for differing organizations, and jointly designing a formal strategy for government–civil society collaboration.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*
4. National Human Rights Violations Complaint Mechanism: Create an on- and off-line mechanism for citizens to report human rights violations committed in public institutions.	The IRM recommends that implementers prioritize instituting protections for whistleblowers and witnesses. In particular, their confidentiality should be protected. The IRM also suggests exploring sanctions and administrative procedures for civil servants who commit human rights violations.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*

Recommendations

The IRM recommendations aim to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan.

Table 3. Key IRM Recommendations

Strengthen the OGP multistakeholder forum through a public mandate and fair and transparent selection process for members.
Continue and increase the use of OGP action plans to enhance human rights and civic space protection.
Promote participation in OGP action plans from the legislative and judiciary branches of government.
Improve the design of commitments to address issues of scope and mitigate limitations of in-person collaboration due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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.

Aida Murad, an independent researcher, assisted with the production of this report.

Open
Government
Partnership

I. Introduction

The Open 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 action in an entirely new area. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments complete commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their own progress and determine if actions have impacted people's lives.

Jordan joined OGP in 2011. This report covers the development and design of Jordan's fourth action plan for 2018–2020.

The Independent Reporting Mechanism of OGP has partnered with Aida Murad to conduct this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of IRM's methodology please visit https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism.

II. Open Government Context in Jordan

The Kingdom of Jordan is a constitutional monarchy that benefits from a vibrant civil society and public life. The Kingdom continues to make progress in expanding access to information and anticorruption efforts. Meanwhile, improving civil society organizations' operational environment and protecting freedom of speech offer areas for ongoing reform, as reflected in the commitments of Jordan's fourth OGP action plan.

Jordan joined OGP in 2011 as the first Arab country in the initiative. Jordan's fourth action plan included commitments on policy areas such as access to information, open data, civic engagement, and human rights violations.[1] Below is a snapshot of the open government context in Jordan when the 2018–2020 action plan was developed.

The Kingdom of Jordan faced social and economic turbulence during the co-creation of this action plan. The government had imposed austerity measures—cutting government spending and raising taxes—to address economic challenges.[2] Protests broke out in response to increases in tax rates on food staples and oil prices.[3] Other protests involved teachers demanding higher salaries. [4] These protests contributed to turnover in the Office of the Prime Minister.[5]

According to the Arab Barometer, a large majority of Jordanians (71 percent) consider the state of the economy the country's most pressing challenge, with corruption coming in second, at 17 percent.[6] Unemployment rates also remained high, at around 18 percent,[7] especially among young populations.[8] Therefore, effective integration of Jordanian youth into political, economic, and community life is considered key to improving trust in institutions and ensuring social stability.[9]

Transparency and access to information

In 2007, Jordan passed the Access to Information Law, making the country a pioneer in the Arab world.[10] Since then, Jordan has continued to strengthen and clarify its access to information regime within and outside its OGP action plans. The Global Right to Information Rating ranks Jordan 119th out of 128 countries regarding access to information laws and gives the country a composite score of 56.[11] The ranking notes that Jordan's Access to Information Law defines a broad area of exceptions and provides limited information on procedures.[12]

Previous IRM interviews with civil society for Jordan's 2016–2018 progress report revealed opportunities to further strengthen Jordan's access to information framework. For example, civil society organizations reported that the government released limited information, and responses took a long time to receive.[13] The government of Jordan has also acknowledged tensions between government agencies in implementing the law. Resultantly, Jordan has committed to updating provisions of the Access to Information Law and aligning it with international standards, as demonstrated by Commitment 5 in the fourth action plan.[14]

Civil liberties and civic space

The Kingdom of Jordan is a constitutional monarchy led by King Abdullah II bin Al-Hussein. Under the Jordanian Constitution, power is divided among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. The king holds significant executive powers, including the authority to appoint high-level government leaders, such as the "Senate Speaker and members, Chairman and members of the Constitutional Court, the Chief Justice, the commander of the army, and the heads of Intelligence and the Gendarmerie."[15] Jordan has a bicameral legislature, with senators appointed by the king and members of the Chambers of Deputies directly elected by the public.[16]

Opportunities for citizens to engage government through elections and civil society continue to evolve. The government has taken positive steps to encourage civic participation, for instance, by passing legislation to improve elections and political parties.[17] Despite being a multiparty system, the majority of political candidates run as independents.[18] Therefore, there continues to be room to strengthen political parties' capacity to advocate for the public interest through electoral politics.[19]

Women enjoy equal political rights and have reserved seats in Parliament and on subnational councils through a quota system.[20] However, cultural prejudices still present a barrier for women's full political participation.[21]

The government has invited civil society to engage in policy dialogue. However, many civil society organizations (CSOs) lack the skills and resources to draft policies.[22] In addition to opportunity to strengthen political parties and CSOs' ability to represent citizens' views, there remains opportunity for the government to further engage marginalized groups, such as women, youth,[23] and citizens of Palestinian origin.[24]

Freedom of expression, association, and assembly

Article 15 of the Jordanian Constitution guarantees freedom of expression.[25] However, there remain various opportunities for Jordan to strengthen freedom of speech. As of 2018, Reporters Without Borders ranked Jordan 132nd out of 180 countries evaluated.[26] Jordan's legislation outlines instances in which speech considered offensive can result in penalties. Examples of speech criminalization include defamation and criticism of authorities, such as the king, government representatives, agencies, and foreign governments, and Islam.[27]

Decreasing criminal penalties for speech would significantly broad journalists' and citizens' freedom of speech. Several pieces of legislation present obstacles to open public discourse. Firstly, journalists must be affiliated with the tightly controlled Jordan Press Association.[28] Reporters Without Borders states that the Cyber-Crime Law of 2015 allows the government to sanction citizens and journalists for online publications and posts on social media.[29] Moreover, reduced use of gag orders by the Media Commission would enable journalists to make better use of their right to access information.[30] Finally, the 2012 Press and Publications Laws have led journalists to practice greater self-censorship, as it introduces punishment for broad types of online content, including comments from users.[31] Given this legal framework, there is opportunity for Jordan to collaborate with civil society and the media to continue to address legal obstacles to freedom of speech.

Jordan benefits from a lively civil society. However, there remain opportunities to continue to broaden and strengthen civic space and civil society organizations' (CSOs) operational environment. CSOs must seek approval for foreign funding from the Ministry of Social Development and register such funding with the ministry. CSOs also experience significant regulatory requirements and close government oversight.[32] Admirably, through Commitment 1 in this action plan, Jordan has committed to beginning to address these obstacles and expanding CSOs' operational space.

Accountability and anticorruption

The Kingdom of Jordan has enacted various legislation and established various institutions to combat corruption. The Integrity and Anti-Corruption Commission holds responsibility for investigating corruption allegations. The Financial Disclosure Law and the Jordanian Code of Conduct in the Public Sector also contribute to Jordan's anticorruption legal framework, specifically addressing bribery, extortion, and money laundering.[33] The Kingdom adopted the Financial Disclosure Law in 2006. It requires civil servants to provide income declarations and holds officials accountable in cases where unjustified enrichment is found.[34]

Jordan also launched its National Anti-Corruption Strategy in 2013. However, Freedom House notes that civil society's and the media's full potential to assist in investigating and reporting corruption remains unfulfilled and could be furthered through greater access to information and freedom of speech.[35]

Domestic and international anticorruption organizations mentioned several areas where the Kingdom of Jordan can continue to build on its anticorruption efforts.[36] First, the Kingdom could introduce legislation to require high-level government officials to disclose their assets and incomes. Second, greater autonomy could be legally granted to government bodies responsible for investigating and prosecuting corruption, such as the Audit Bureau. Third, the Kingdom could further strengthen anti–money laundering legislation that addresses politically exposed persons and introduces whistleblower protection initiatives.[37]

Jordan's 2018–2020 action plan includes commitments that address issues within the open government context, such as dialogue with civil society organizations, political reform, human rights, and access to information through law enforcement and open data initiatives. Commitments oriented toward improving political systems, denouncing human rights violations, and enabling access to information reflect the country's challenges. Civic space and civic participation—in the framework of political demonstrations—continue to be areas of opportunity for future action plans.

1 "The Open Government Partnership (OGP)," Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Government of Jordan, http://www.mop.gov.jo/Pages/viewpage.aspx?pageID=30.
2 "Jordan Faces Wave of Public Criticism as Government Issues Arise," The Jerusalem Post, 26 November 2018, https://www.jpost.com/Middle-East/Jordan-faces-wave-of-public-criticism-as-government-issues-arise-572849.
3 Ali Younes, "Jordan's Economic Crisis Threatens Political Stability," Aljazeera, 14 February 2018, https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2018/2/14/jordans-economic-crisis-threatens-political-stability.
4 Tuqa Nusairat, "Teachers' Protest Challenges Jordanian Status Quo," The Atlantic Council, 27 September 2019, https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/menasource/teachers-protest-challenges-jordanian-status-quo/.
5 "The Crisis in Jordan: Political and Economic Implications," Arab Center Washington DC, 14 June 2018, http://arabcenterdc.org/events/the-crisis-in-jordan-political-and-economic-implications/.
6 Nusairat, "Teachers' Protest Challenges Jordanian Status Quo."
7 "The Crisis in Jordan."
8 Younes, "Jordan Faces Wave Of Public Criticism as Government Issues Arise."
9 Beverley Milton-Edwards, "Marginalized Youth: Toward an Inclusive Jordan," The Brookings Institution, 6 June 2018, https://www.brookings.edu/research/marginalized-youth-toward-an-inclusive-jordan/.
10 Right to Information: Recent Spread of RTI Legislation, Right to Information Working Paper Series, World Bank Group. 2014. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/414481468180551330/right-to-information-recent-spread-of-rti-legislation
11 The score assesses the right to access, scope, requesting procedures, exceptions and refusals, appeals, sanctions and protections, and promotional measures. "By Country," Global Right to Information Rating, https://www.rti-rating.org/country-data/.
12 "Jordan," Global Right to Information Rating, https://www.rti-rating.org/country-detail/?country=Jordan.
13 Open Government Partnership, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Jordan Progress Report: 2016–2018, 18 October 2018.
14 Anders Pedersen and Costanza Farina, "Access to Information; a Requirement towards Achieving Sustainable Development," The Jordan Times, 30 September 2019, https://jordantimes.com/opinion/anders-pedersen-costanza-farina/access-information-requirement-towards-achieving-sustainable.
15 "Constitutional History of Jordan," Constitution Net, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, https://constitutionnet.org/country/constitutional-history-jordan.
16 "Constitutional History of Jordan," Constitution Net, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, https://constitutionnet.org/country/constitutional-history-jordan.
17 "Democracy, Rights and Governance," Jordan, US Agency of International Development, https://www.usaid.gov/jordan/democracy-human-rights-and-governance.
18 "Jordan," Freedom in the World 2018, Freedom House, https://freedomhouse.org/country/jordan/freedom-world/2018.
19 Bertelsmann Stiftung, BTI Country Report 2018: Jordan.
20 "Jordan," Freedom in the World 2018.
21 "Political Pluralism and Participation," Jordan, Freedom in the World 2019, Freedom House, https://freedomhouse.org/country/jordan/freedom-world/2019
22 Bertelsmann Stiftung, BTI Country Report 2018: Jordan.
23 "Democracy, Rights and Governance," Jordan, US Agency for International Development.
24 "Political Pluralism and Participation," Jordan, Freedom in the World 2019.
25 The Constitution of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/3ae6b53310.pdf.
26 "Jordan, Reporters Without Borders, https://rsf.org/en/jordan.
27 "Jordan: Events of 2017," Human Rights Watch, https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2018/country-chapters/jordan.
28 "Closely Watched," Jordan, Reporters Without Borders, https://rsf.org/en/jordan.
29 "Closely Watched," Jordan, Reporters Without Borders.
30 "Closely Watched," Jordan, Reporters Without Borders.
31 Bertelsmann Stiftung, BTI Country Report 2018: Jordan.
32 "Jordan," Freedom in the World 2018, Freedom House.
33 "Jordan Corruption Report," Risk & Compliance Portal, GAN, https://www.ganintegrity.com/portal/country-profiles/jordan/.
34 "Financial Disclosure Law," Financial Disclosure Law Library, Legislation and Opinion Bureau, Ministry of Justice of Jordan.
35 "Jordan Corruption Report."
36 JT, "Jordan Ranks 57th out of 176 Countries in Public Sector Corruption," The Jordan Times, 22 February 2018, https://www.jordantimes.com/news/local/jordan-ranks-57th-out-176-countries-public-sector-corruption%E2%80%99.
37 JT, "Jordan Ranks 57th out of 176 Countries in Public Sector Corruption."

III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process

The Open Government Unit at the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation coordinates OGP in Jordan, together with a multistakeholder forum. The multistakeholder forum oversaw a collaborative co-creation process in which civil society helped to design the consultation approach. The forum employed a survey and series of consultations with government, civil society, and development partners to design an action plan that reflected civil society and government priorities and open government values.

3.1 Leadership

This subsection describes the OGP leadership and institutional context for OGP in Jordan.

The Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) acts as the leading government focal point for OGP in Jordan. In January 2018, MOPIC established the Open Government Unit at the ministry. The unit coordinates all key stakeholders—including state actors, civil society, and relevant international institutions—involved in the OGP process. The government appointed a national coordinator to oversee the design and implementation of the OGP action plans. The unit assists the government of Jordan with the open government agenda across ministries.

In addition to the national coordinator, currently, two additional staff work in the unit, but their portfolio includes other responsibilities outside of the OGP. When this report was written, MOPIC was recruiting a new full-time staff person for the unit.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development funds activities related to the unit and supports some civil society organizations that assist government agencies in the implementation of commitments. The Jordanian government financially supports some multistakeholder forum activities.

At international events the minister of planning and international cooperation and the OGP point of contact represent the Jordanian government. In local activities, representation is typically from the point of contact or the staff at MOPIC who oversee the unit. The ministry publishes information on the OGP process on its website.[1]

3.2 Multi-stakeholder process throughout action plan development

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.

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 OGP process. Jordan **did not act** contrary to OGP process.

Please see Annex I for an overview of Jordan's performance implementing the Participation and Co-Creation Standards throughout the action plan development.

Table 3.1: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply to OGP.[2] This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for "collaborate."

Level of public influence		During development 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	

Multistakeholder forum

Jordan established its OGP multistakeholder forum in 2011, upon joining OGP. The forum was established by a prime minister's decree and has gone through several changes. In 2011, the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation headed the forum, and it included four members: the Integrity and Anti-Corruption Commission, the National Centre for Human Rights, and two civil society organizations (CSOs). In 2015, three additional CSOs were added to the forum: the Jordanian National Commission for Women, the All Jordan Youth Commission, and the Civil Society Organizations Coordination Committee, named Himam. The latter represents 15 nongovernmental organizations from the country.

No written guidelines exist for the functioning of the multistakeholder forum. The majority of the members present make decisions. No procedures exist for CSOs outside the forum members to request to join the group. The Jordan OGP team has, however, consulted a wider range of CSOs throughout the development of the plan, as outlined in the action plan document. The forum, according to the action plan, has biannual meetings as well as meetings upon request, held in the capital, Amman.

Participation and engagement throughout action plan development

The development of the fourth national action plan began in mid-May 2018, following the co-creation guidelines of the OGP. Under the guidance of the established multistakeholder forum, the process started with a consultation workshop with 136 participants from governmental and nongovernmental organizations.[3] According to the action plan, participation during the development process was open to the public. The Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) published invitations to all meetings through its website and social media accounts.[4] During the workshop, the Open Government Unit guided a discussion on how to design the consultation process to determine action plan content.[5]

To begin the commitment formation process, the multistakeholder forum reviewed existing strategies and reports relevant to OGP objectives in June and July 2018. The multistakeholder forum also distributed a questionnaire to 170 stakeholders, including civil society organizations (CSOs), chambers of industry and commerce, unions, and academics. The survey sought to receive input on the priority areas to be considered for the fourth national action plan. The forum received 106 responses. The survey surfaced 12 priority areas, which were published on MOPIC website and social media outlets. Top priority areas included public services (31 percent), accountability and anticorruption (17 percent), and economic reform (16 percent).

The multistakeholder forum then held three consultation sessions with government entities, CSOs, and international funding partners in August 2018. Participants discussed potential commitments in response to the priorities highlighted by the stakeholder survey. Participants also requested to include the issues of decentralization and rights for persons with disabilities. During the CSOs' session, participants proposed 18 commitments. A detailed report on this phase and all proposed commitments was published on 25 September 2018 and is found on MOPIC's website.[6]

After consultations with stakeholders, the multistakeholder forum reduced the 18 proposed commitments to five. These were included in the fourth national action plan.[7] The Open Government Unit set the selection criteria, including consistency with OGP values and existing national plans and strategies (e.g., ministerial and departmental plans). The forum captured the reasoning behind the final selection of commitments in meeting minutes, although these were not accessible online at the time this report was written.

The forum formed five working groups to draft each commitment, along with a sixth working group to review commitments from a gender perspective. Women made up 30–50 percent of the working groups.[8]

OGP Jordan then published the draft action plan for a two-week public comment period. The multistakeholder forum considered and integrated public comments. The forum published a report on what public comments were received and how they were integrated. However, this report was no longer accessible online at the time this report was written. The multistakeholder forum met to finalize the commitments, and after receiving formal approval by the Cabinet, the fourth national action plan was submitted to OGP on 31 October 2018.[9] MOPIC published notes of most meetings organized during the development of the action plan on its website.

Co-creation and participation recommendations throughout development

Jordan showed evidence of extensive consultations with multiple stakeholders during the development of its fourth action plan. Civil society and the public were given an opportunity to provide inputs for the content of the action plan through consultations and a survey. Looking forward, the multistakeholder forum should collaboratively develop and publish its mandate and governing rules, including the frequency of meetings and decision-making and membership selection procedures.

The MOPIC website and Open Government Unit Google Drive provided an OGP repository at the time this report was written. However, many links to documents on the MOPIC OGP page are broken, making it more difficult to verify evidence of the co-creation process.[10]

---

[1] In 2019, after the co-creation period, the OGU established a repository for the fourth action plan through a publicly accessible Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1kqYOCQ9Y-I1wwRXISSEQaxvE42Zv44NH
[2] "IAP2 Spectrum," International Association for Public Participation, USA, https://iap2usa.org/resources/Documents/Core%20Values%20Awards/IAP2%20-%20Spectrum%20-%20stand%20alone%20document.pdf.
[3] The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020 under the Open Government Partnership Initiative (OGP), 31 October 2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jordan-action-plan-2018-2020/
[4] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020.
[5] Information provided from the government of Jordan to the IRM during the report's prepublication comment phase.
[6] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020.
[7] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020.
[8] OGP Jordan Point of Contact, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, interview by IRM researcher, 24–27 March 2019.
[9] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020.
[10] "Jordan OGP 4th NAP Progress_Online," Open Government Unit Google Drive, https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1kqYOCQ9Y-I1wwRXISSEQaxvE42Zv44NH.

IV. Commitments

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values detailed in the *OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration* signed by all OGP-participating countries.[1] Indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[2] A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

- **Verifiability:**
    - Not specific enough to verify: Do the written objectives and proposed actions lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment?
    - Specific enough to verify: Are the written objectives and proposed actions sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment?
- **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 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?
    - Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?
- **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.

What makes a results-oriented commitment?
A results-oriented commitment has more potential to be ambitious and to be implemented. It 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 interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries/entities. Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria.

- Potential star: the commitment's design should be **verifiable**, **relevant** to OGP values, and have **transformative** potential impact.
- The government must make significant progress on this commitment during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of **substantial** or **complete** implementation.

These variables are assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the country's Implementation IRM Report.

General Overview of the Commitments

The action plan encompasses five commitments and focuses on the following key areas: access to information, open data, human rights, and enhanced civic participation. The commitments in this action plan were verifiable and include concrete milestones and activities. Key reform areas in this action plan reflect a commitment to take significant leaps toward increased human rights protections and enhanced civic space.

However, numerous adjustments could be made to improve the design of the individual commitments and increase the scope for more impact. It is important to note that three of the commitments (2, 4, and 5) are linked to commitments under the third national action plan. Two commitments (1 and 3) are new.

---

[1] "Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance," OGP, June 2012 (updated March 2014 and April 2015), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/articles-of-governance/
[2] "IRM Procedures Manual," OGP, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

Commitment 1: Public Sector and Civil Society Partnership and Dialogue

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

"The commitment seeks to establish dialogue between the government and CSOs (namely associations, non-profit companies, charities among others) on the mechanisms of approving these institutions to receive foreign funding, on their standards of governance, and on policies to improve their work."

Milestones:

1. "Review of procedures for approvals of receiving foreign funding through dialogue with different target audiences, with a view to adopting uniform, clear, transparent and simplified procedures, in line with best standards.

2. Adopting a set of voluntary and mandatory standards for the development of governance within targeted civil society organizations in consultation with the various target groups mentioned above. This may include the declaration of annual budgets and the enforcement of legal frameworks relating to social security, submission of income tax returns, transfer of employees› salaries (through banks, etc.), and considering the development of clear procedures to monitor the enforcement of these standards.

3. Launching a voluntary, participatory (non-binding) civil society strategy in partnership with governmental agencies and donors that sets development priorities and performance improvement policies for CSOs to be consistent with national priorities, challenges, available resources and best practices."

Start Date: 1 / 9 / 2018
End Date: 30 / 6 / 2020

Editorial Note: the commitment description provided above is an abridged version of the commitment text, please see the full action plan here.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Overall		✓		✓					✓		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Civil society organizations (CSOs) in Jordan are governed by the Law on Societies. This law has gone through numerous changes, including in 2008 and 2009.[1] The latest changes have simplified registration and continued operation of foundations (referred to as "closed societies") and not-for-

profit companies ("private societies"). Civil society organizations register under the Ministry of Social Development and under their relevant ministry, while nonprofit companies register with the Ministry of Industry and Trade and Supply.[2] Despite changes to the Law on Societies, operational barriers for CSOs in Jordan remain.

According to a report by the Phenix Center for Economic and Informatics Studies, some of the challenges CSOs continue to face include the requirement to have government consent for the formation of an organization, limited access to national and international funding, and regulation of public gatherings.[3] The report also highlights the "absence of a regular, ongoing dialogue between the government and CSOs, and a lack of public mechanisms to regulate the relationship and encourage partnership."[4]

In the action plan, the government recognizes the lack of trust between both parties and says it is "the result of poor prior dialogue and participatory practices in decision-making." The government also cites "complaints about the weak governance framework at CSOs."[5] This commitment, then, aims to develop an effective partnership government and civil society.

Originally, the IRM recommended the commitment in the 2016–2018 report, specifically to improve the ability of CSOs to obtain funds.[6] The recommendation emphasized removing the restrictions on pre-approval for foreign funding for civil society organizations. Since the commitment deals with a review of procedures for approval of foreign funding and standards for transparency of CSOs, it is relevant to open civic space.

This commitment includes three milestones that deal with the CSO operating environment. The first milestone aims to review procedures to approve foreign funding for CSOs and is key to facilitating clarity on the approval process. This step is critical, as it impacts CSO operation and functioning.

The second milestone aims to create standards of governance to improve the transparency of CSOs' work. According to the action plan, implementation could include establishment and monitoring of financial transparency standards. Based on interviews with governmental officials, this milestone stems from concern about the lack of transparency and "risks for corruption" within CSOs.

The third milestone aims to launch a voluntary civil society strategy in partnership with government and donors to define development priorities and avoid duplication of efforts. According to a Ministry of Social Development representative, this milestone is meant to encourage CSOs to work closer and to link foreign funding to development goals. This could help avoid duplication, facilitate submission of stronger proposals for receiving foreign funding, and allow better coordination with governmental entities.[7]

While the resulting deliverables are potentially verifiable, some limitations exist to understanding which areas of CSO governance standards will be voluntary and which will be required by law, and the extent to which access to funding will be facilitated. Considering these shortcomings, the potential impact for this commitment is coded as moderate. If implemented, this commitment has the potential to establish a permanent dialogue between both parties to address some of the broader reforms needed to enhance civic space and eliminate CSO barriers to entry.

Next Steps

The IRM views this commitment as an opportunity to establish a permanent dialogue mechanism that strengthens civil society's role in public life and ultimately helps address restrictions on civic space. The IRM suggests that this policy area continue to be included in future action plans. However, in doing so, the IRM also recommends that a "do no harm principle" is observed to ensure that changes in the legal framework and practices do not become more burdensome or inadvertently increase barriers for civil society organizations (CSOs) to operate freely.

In the three areas the current commitment aims to address (funding, governance, and cooperation), the IRM recommends that international best practices and standards are observed:

- Funding:
  - Ensure legal ability to carry out fundraising activities.

- Enable access to international resources without the need for registration, prior government approval of the resource (including through the registration of donors), or the requirement to channel funding through a state-controlled entity.[8]

- Governance and transparency:

  - Foster a safe space for voluntary self-assessments to improve CSO accountability. The IRM suggests considering tools like the Rendir App as a possible approach to this work in the future. Initiatives like the Rendir App are self-assessment resources that aim to improve CSO accountability and align with international standards.[9]

  - Observe principles of proportionality. Ensure that any governance requirements prescribed by law are proportional to the size and scope of different types of organizations.

  - Make reporting requirements proportional to the size and scope of different types of CSOs, and ensure they are not more burdensome than requirements for other legal entities.[10]

- CSO-government dialogue and cooperation:

  - Experts recommend that engagement and cooperation between government and civil society be guided by a strategic framework that enables collaboration across areas such as policymaking, ongoing dialogue, and concerted development initiatives. Countries such as Croatia and Estonia have adopted similar initiatives. Croatia's National Strategy for the Creation of an Enabling Environment for CSO Development included pillars on institutional and legal framework strengthening, improving participatory democracy, and strengthening the role of civil society in social and economic development.[11] Most recently, Croatia included three commitments in its 2018–2020 action plan aimed at strengthening civil society engagement. This work was in line with the national strategy for CSO development.[12]

---

[1] "Jordan," Civic Freedom Monitor, Resources, International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/jordan.html.
[2] "2016 Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index for the Middle East and North Africa," US Agency for International Development, https://www.usaid.gov/middle-east-civil-society/2016.
[3] Ahmad M. Awad and Rania Sarayra, Enabling Environment National Assessment: Jordan (New York: Phenix Center for Economic and Informatics Studies), https://www.civicus.org/images/EENA_Jordan_En.pdf.
[4] Awad and Sarayra, Enabling Environment National Assessment: Jordan.
[5] The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020 under the Open Government Partnership Initiative (OGP), 31 October 2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jordan-action-plan-2018-2020/
[6] Open Government Partnership, Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): Jordan Progress Report 2016–2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Jordan_Midterm_Report_2016-2018_for-public-comment.pdf.
[7] Contacts at Ministry of Social Development and Companies Control Department, interview by IRM researcher.
[8] International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, OGP: The Guide to Opening Government: An Enabling Environment for Civil Society Organizations, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2001/01/OGP-ICNL_Guide-Opening-Government_20180508.pdf
[9] Rendir App homepage, http://app.rendircuentas.org/en/.
[10] International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, OGP: The Guide to Opening Government, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2001/01/OGP-ICNL_Guide-Opening-Government_20180508.pdf.
[11] Government of the Republic of Croatia, National Strategy for the Creation of an Enabling Environment for Civil Society Development from 2012 to 2016, https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/AboutUs/CivilSociety/ReportHC/states/5_Croatia_National%20Strategy-Civil%20Society-Croatia-2012-2016-eng.pdf.
[12] See Croatia's 2018–2020 OGP Design Report for detailed recommendations on Commitments 5, 12, and 14, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Croatia_Design_Report_2018-2020_EN.pdf.

Commitment 2. Government Open Data Policy Development and Enhancement

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

"The commitment seeks to promote the legislative and practical basis for improving the dissemination of governmental open data in Jordan, through issuing binding instructions for institutions to publish their datasets and develop tools to measure their quality. It also raises awareness of the importance of disseminating governmental open data and encourages the adherence to publishing datasets as an evaluation requirement for King Abdullah II Excellence Awards."

Milestones

1. "Issuing instructions by the cabinet for governmental agencies to publish their open datasets through the designated platform, based on a proposal submitted after consultations with civil society and relevant stakeholders.

2. Development of procedural frameworks for classifying, measuring and evaluating the quality of governmental open datasets, based on consultations with civil society and relevant stakeholders, and then publishing the results to inform the public and to receive feedback.

3. Listing governmental Open Data as an evaluation requirement for King Abdullah II Excellence Awards.

4. Preparation and implementation of an awareness-raising plan on the importance of and mechanisms to disseminate governmental open datasets, targeting various sectors of stakeholders in consultation and partnership with representatives of each sector."

Start Date: 1 / 9 / 2018
End Date: 30 / 6 / 2020

Editorial Note: the commitment description provided above is an abridged version of the commitment text, please see the full action plan here.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
2. Overall		✓	✓	✓					✓		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Open data is defined as "data that can be freely used, re-used and redistributed by anyone—subject only, at most to the requirements to attribute and share alike."[1] Jordan ranked 80th out of 178 countries in the 2018 Open Data Inventory.[2] Its overall score was 47.[3] Jordan scored higher than the

regional median for environmental statistics. Its highest levels of coverage and openness are on economic statistics, and its lowest are on social statistics.[4]

According to the action plan, weak dissemination and publication of data affect citizens' right to access information and their understanding of government functions. The legislative and regulatory frameworks—from the perspective of civil society organizations (CSOs)—serve as key limitations in this area.[5]

This commitment is a continuation of Commitment 10 of the third national action plan. That commitment led to the development of the Open Government Data Policy and the training of officials from 45 government entities.[6]

Under the current commitment, the Cabinet would mandate that governmental agencies publish their open datasets and create procedural frameworks to classify, measure, and evaluate the quality of the published datasets. Further, to incentivize governmental entities and to promote a culture of data openness, the commitment would implement an awareness-raising plan and incorporate open data as an evaluation requirement for the King Abdullah II Excellence Awards. The inclusion of these awards is strategic, as they are highly regarded in Jordan. Incorporating open data criteria into the award will help create and foster an open data culture.

In relation to OGP values, the IRM found this commitment relevant to access to information. It is oriented toward making data available to citizens in an open data format. In addition, proposed consultations with CSOs on procedural frameworks make it relevant to civic participation. Its milestones are specific enough to be verifiable.

This commitment is considered to have a moderate potential impact on Jordanians' access to government data. The Cabinet's issuance of binding instructions for government agencies to publish data would represent a significant change from government practice, given existing gaps in publicly available data. Importantly, these instructions would be developed through CSO-government collaboration and allow for a public comment period. The inclusion of a positive incentive through the King Abdullah II Excellence Awards, awareness raising, and procedural framework all promise to bolster the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology's efforts to implement Jordan's Open Government Data Policy across government.

Next Steps

To strengthen this commitment during implementation, the IRM recommends future commitments in this policy area:

- Establish an alternative mechanism that allows government institutions to commit to adopting the resulting instructions for open data publication in conjunction with the King Abdullah II Excellence Awards, even if they are not approved by the Cabinet.

- Define a methodology to provide assistance to government institutions for implementation of open data frameworks, given the complexity of such frameworks.

- Ensure participation of current end users of specific datasets. Such participants can provide an objective assessment of the advantages and limitations of data currently available.

- Make sure the awareness plan includes an educational component on the differences among access to information, open data, and e-government services. These terms can be confusing to the general public. Provide examples of instances in which open data is relevant to citizens' livelihoods, and show how it can positively impact decision-making processes.

---

[1] "What Is Open Data," Open Data Handbook, https://opendatahandbook.org/guide/en/what-is-open-data/.
[2] Open Data Inventory, Country Profile: Jordan, 2018, https://odin.opendatawatch.com/ReportCreator/ExportCountryReport/JOR/2018.
[3] Open Data Inventory, Country Profile: Jordan.
[4] Open Data Inventory, Country Profile: Jordan.
[5] The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020 under the Open Government Partnership Initiative (OGP), 31 October 2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jordan-action-plan-2018-2020/

[6] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Third National Action Plan 2016–2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jordan-third-national-action-plan-2016-2018/.

Commitment 3. National Dialogue for Political Reform

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

"This commitment addresses the weak integration of citizens into public decision-making processes, and achieving consensus on key political legislations in Jordan. It also addresses the social and political challenges faced by citizens during their daily lives, which have not been addressed by legislations relevant to this commitment."

Milestones

1. "Launch of a national dialogue to improve the legal frameworks governing political reform in Jordan, including the Election, Political Parties, Decentralization and Municipalities laws. All relevant stakeholders will be included in the dialogue creation process, particularly political parties, youth institutions, national facilities for women empowerment and CSOs. The activities and agenda of the national dialogue should be pre-publicized and utilize direct approaches (participatory discussion sessions) and indirect approaches (social media and e-government platforms).

2. Timely dissemination of dialogue progress reports and their interim results to the public, through interactive platforms on social media and various e-government platforms, in order to allow for public commenting and feedback by the largest possible number of stakeholders, and in line with citizen participation in the decision-making process.

3. Analysis of the results of the National Dialogue and developing a final set of recommendations to amend existing legal frameworks. Then publishing the analysis and recommendations for public viewing, ahead of submitting them to the Parliament."

Start Date: 1 / 9 / 2018

End Date: 30 / 6 / 2020

Editorial Note: the commitment description provided above is an abridged version of the commitment text, please see the full action plan here.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
3. Overall		✔	✔	✔				✔			Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Fostering national dialogue on major political reform areas has been a declared priority on Jordan's political agenda. On 19 September 2018, King Abdullah II expressed his interest in reviewing electoral legislation to speed up the political reform process.[1] In addition, the minister of political and parliamentary affairs initiated the development of a preliminary National Dialogue Roadmap, to review political reform legislation, including funding procedures for political parties.[2]

The government believes this commitment will contribute to integrating citizens into decision-making processes, allowing them to have a say in social and political changes that affect their daily lives.[3] The commitment involves analyzing the results of the national dialogue to develop a final set of recommendations to amend existing legal frameworks. The government expects this work to result in a final roadmap that lays out time-bound goals and activities regarding the areas covered by the commitment: election laws, municipal law, political parties, funding procedures laws, decentralization law, and a "new social contract."[4]

This commitment is verifiable. Some of the most important outputs involve the quality of dialogue sessions, as captured in the agendas, minutes, reports, and participant feedback. Additionally, participants' creation of comprehensive and representative recommendations—to be considered by Parliament—would indicate implementation of this commitment.

The commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information and civic participation. It seeks to involve groups of civil society to consult them and use their input to provide recommendations for reviewing legislation. This commitment is also relevant to the OGP value of access to information in that the government will publish "dialogue progress" reports on the status of the discussions.

If implemented as written, this commitment has minor potential to increase citizens' participation in national policymaking. This commitment represents an important but incremental step toward greater civic participation in drafting policies of national importance. The potential impact is considered minor because the commitment text is vague about how public and civil society input will be incorporated into the recommendations. The commitment also does not include a guarantee that Parliament will debate, consider, or adopt recommendations. Therefore, as written, commitment activities do not ensure that the national dialogue will result in policy change. If Parliament were to adopt the recommendations that arise from the national dialogue, then this commitment may prove to have a greater open government impact.

Next Steps

The IRM believes this commitment has the potential to allow for the necessary dialogue to achieve long-term changes that contribute to citizen participation and representation in government. However, for this commitment to be successful, the IRM suggests that the government consider the following:

- Promote a participatory process that allows citizens to contribute to determining the areas of legislation that will be subject to the National Dialogue Framework.
- Clarify that Parliament will consider citizen contributions for proposed changes to legislation.
- Ensure participation from underrepresented and excluded groups.
- Include members of Parliament or their delegates, to guarantee support for approval of legislation.

---

[1] European Union, Election Follow-up Mission (EU EFM): The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan: Final Report, September 2018, https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/jordan_efm_final_corrected_23.11.pdf.
[2] European Union, Election Follow-up Mission.
[3] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, The Fourth National Action Plan 2018–2020 under the Open Government Partnership Initiative (OGP), 31 October 2018.
[4] European Union, Election Follow-up Mission.

Commitment 4. National Human Rights Violations Complaint Mechanism

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

"This commitment seeks to promote a citizens' right to submit complaints about violations conducted against them in public sector institutions at no cost. Complaints about HR violations will be available through the traditional methods and via a designated electronic platform. The commitment also seeks to institutionalize the Office of the Governmental Coordinator for Human Rights' legislative and regulatory framework on the jurisdiction to receive human rights violations complaints and subsequent referrals to competent authorities. In addition, the commitment aims to raise public awareness on the use of this mechanism and to share their feedback about it periodically."

Milestones:

1. "Adopting a legislative framework to regulate the work of the Office of the Government Coordinator for Human Rights, and its capacity to receive complaints related to human rights violations and then refer them to the competent authorities.

2. Preparing a regulatory framework for the Office of the General Coordinator for Human Rights to govern its capacity to receive complaints, including, but not limited to:

   A. Forming a team to receive complaints, filing them and referring them to the competent authorities. In addition to preparing a manual for reporting, processing and referring complaints, and coordinating coordination approaches with other governmental and non-governmental bodies that receive complaints related to human rights violations.

   B. Building the team's capacity to properly respond to these complaints in a timely manner and follow-up with the relevant reference accordingly.

3. Launching the e-complaints platform by adding a feature to the e-government platform, where citizens can submit complaints about human rights violations in public sector. This platform is the link between the complainant and the Office of the General Coordinator for Human Rights, and it will provide the following:

   A. Ability to draft and send complaints in an easy manner while ensuring the confidentiality of the complainant, in order to encourage citizens to file complaints while maintaining their identity undisclosed.

   B. Follow-up section for complaints to track their complaint processing electronically at all stages, so that they remain informed.

   C. An option for non-state institutions to submit complaints on behalf of citizens (through one of their employees) and follow up accordingly.

4. Launching a non-electronic platform to enable all groups to file complaints, either through the Public Services Offices and the complaints box or by assigning a hotline for this purpose.

5. Launch a national awareness plan on complaints mechanisms implemented within this commitment.

6. Prepare a periodic report on the complaints received by the Office of the General Coordinator for Human Rights, including the number of complaints and processing outputs, in addition to disseminating reports and undertaking discussions with stakeholders both through direct approaches (participatory discussion sessions) and indirect approaches (social media platforms and various governmental digital platforms)."

Start Date: 1 / 9 / 2018

End Date: 30 / 6 / 2020

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
4. Overall		✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

This commitment is a continuation of Commitment 4 from Jordan's third national action plan. The latter commitment focused on establishing a complaints registration system under the leadership of the government department responsible for managing data gathering.[1] The implementation of that commitment was not started, and it was carried over to the current plan.

A study conducted by Lawyers Without Borders and the Office of the General Coordinator for Human Rights (GCHR) revealed key challenges to launching a national complaints system for human rights violations. For instance, there was no legal instrument establishing cooperation between public agencies and the GCHR and institutions entitled to receive complaints. GCHR did not have an institutional mandate to receive and monitor the status of complaints. Further, there exists no single, harmonized form across government agencies to submit complaints.[2]

The commitment seeks to establish a human rights complaints mechanism through the following process: First, the government would adopt a legal mandate for the GCHR to receive and process complaints. The government would also develop a complaints platform (electronic and non-electronic) Finally, the government would conduct awareness-raising campaigns on complaints mechanisms. It would also provide reports on the status of complaints.

This commitment is verifiable and relevant to the OGP values of access to information, public accountability, and civic participation. The implementation of an awareness-raising plan and periodic reporting on complaints received by the GCHR make it relevant to access to information. This commitment strengthens channels for citizens to hold civil servants accountable for their actions. Policies and protocols will be developed through a multistakeholder working group and public comment period. Moreover, the complaint system will allow citizens to submit general suggestions and comments.[3]

If implemented, the commitment would create the necessary institutional and technological means to provide citizens with a unified platform to submit complaints on human right violations in the public sector.

However, the commitment fails to address the culture of shame, a key obstacle that prevents citizens from speaking up and submitting complains. A study conducted by United Nations Women, for example, found that social stigma prevents women from submitting complaints, and in some cases, stigma can lead to the dropping of charges in cases of sexual crimes.[4] According to Human Rights Watch, this issue is further aggravated by failure to guarantee confidentiality and protect denouncers who submit complaints to the National Centre for Human Rights.[5] The government of

Jordan reports that these cultural obstacles to accountability will be addressed through the advocacy campaign.[6]

Overall, the commitment focuses on adopting a legal framework for the GCHR to manage complaints and coordinate with other government agencies to consolidate a national system for submitting complaints. Yet the commitment does not provide explicit measures to mandate a response to complaints. It is unclear how agencies will ensure accountability or enforce sanctions against civil servants who commit human rights violations in the public sector. The commitment does not describe activities to enforce whistleblowers and witness protection mechanisms. Thus, the potential impact for this commitment is moderate.

Next Steps

This commitment could lead to significant improvements in addressing human rights violations. To ensure future commitments are designed to be stronger, the IRM recommends the following considerations:

- Promote and enforce stronger whistleblower and witness protection mechanisms to encourage effective submission of complaints. Ensuring confidentiality is key.

- Make sure the awareness-raising plan addresses the culture of fear and shame, and promotes trust in the system. Clarify how this plan will be disseminated.

- Consider developing a range of sanctions and prosecutorial procedures against civil servants who commit human rights violations.

- Coordinate with government agencies and civil society organizations to facilitate the use of electronic platforms for submitting complaints, particularly for those living in rural areas across the country's governorates and for those with low access to the internet.

- Clarify how discussions with citizens will take place and how citizens' input will be used to modify and improve use of the system.

- Consider including specific capacity-building activities for civil servants, with special emphasis on those who review the complaints and those with authority across different government agencies to abide by a code of conduct.

---

[1] Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Third Action Plan: 2016–2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jordan-third-national-action-plan-2016-2018/.

[2] "Mechanisms and Procedures for Unification and Institution of the National Complaint System on Human Rights," Lawyers Without Borders and Office of the General Coordinator for Human Rights of Jordan, 19 September 2018, http://www.lwbjo.org/View_ArticleAr.aspx?type=2&ID=1895. Access to this report was provided through email exchanges by Mai Eleimat, Open Government Unit Coordinator, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, 10 September 2019.

[3] Information provided by the government of Jordan to the IRM during this report's prepublication review period.

[4] United Nations (UN) Women, UN Development Programme, UN Population Fund, and UN Econimic and Social Commission for Western Asia, Jordan: Gender Justice Assessment of Laws Affecting Gender Equality and Protection against Gender-Based Violence, 2018, https://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbas/doc/Gender%20Justice/English/Full%20reports/Jordan%20Country%20Assessment%20-%20English.pdf.

[5] "Human Rights and Political Freedom," The Embassy of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Washington DC, http://jordanembassyus.org/politics/human-rights-and-political-freedom.

[6] Information provided by the government of Jordan to the IRM during this report's prepublication review period.

Commitment 5. Access to Information Law Enforcement Measures

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

"This commitment seeks to strengthen the enforcement of the Access to Information law, through participatory efforts by relevant state and non-state actors. It also aims to build a unified system for the classification and management of governmental information, while considering the differences between governmental institutions. Furthermore, the commitment pursues a goal of compliance with the classification of information by the competent agency."

Milestones:

1. "Forming a team of experts from relevant government agencies, non- governmental organizations and institutions concerned with human rights (civil society, journalists, local and international experts, legal specialists, academics, NCHR), to work jointly within the following scope:

   A. Setting a vision for an institutional protocol to enforce access to information, with best practices, especially those related to receiving and handling information requests, and the classification, management and archiving of governmental information. This entails clear procedures and standards to facilitate acquiring and retrieving information in a speedy manner, and the provision of a "fast- track approach" for journalists. The protocol will be unified and will consider the differences between governmental institutions, in order to fill the gaps in current application status, and to promote voluntary pre-disclosure of information to serve public interests.

   B. Developing tools to measure the quality of information granted to applicants, in addition to pre-disclosed information published voluntarily.

   C. Reviewing existing government regulations and instructions concerning the enforcement of the Access to Information law, and comparing them with the protocols and guidelines recommended by the Expert Group (milestones 1, 2 and 3) to prevent any duplication or conflict.

2. Issuing the protocols / instructions and circulating them to all relevant ministries and governmental institutions, and disseminating them on various governmental digital platforms and social media accounts.

3. Developing and implementing an awareness plan on the importance of information classification and pre-disclosure, through direct tools (meetings and awareness sessions), and indirect tools (publishing through governmental platforms, media, social media and billboards in government institutions). This plan is aimed at senior positions in governmental bodies and officials responsible for disseminating information and receiving requests for information (electronic and direct), in addition to reception staff, in order to enhance the understanding and application of approved procedures.

4. Monitoring the compliance of public administration institutions with the classification of information by conducting an evaluation of relevant governmental institutions, issuing a report, then circulating and publishing it, as a prelude to an annual evaluation process that seeks to promote the practices and culture of access to information."

Start Date: 1 / 9 / 2018
End Date: 30 / 6 / 2020

Editorial Note: the commitment description provided above is an abridged version of the commitment text, please see the full action plan here.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
5. Overall		✔	✔	✔					✔		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Jordan passed the Access to Information Law (Act No. 47) in 2007. Observers agree that the law constituted a significant achievement, as it was the first of its kind in the Arab world.[1] However, it has faced implementation challenges. The law lacked explicit provisions encouraging government institutions to proactively disclose information. They do so only upon request.[2] The law did not foresee a mechanism to classify and determine which government documents fell under the jurisdiction of the law and those that were exempt.[3] According to the Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists, the level of awareness of civil servants on the provisions and mechanisms of the law still is low.[4]

This commitment is a continuation of Commitment 1 in the third national action plan. That commitment focused on strengthening the legislative framework related to access to information.[5] Since May 2019, the Legislation and Opinion Bureau has been revising a comprehensive draft and amendments to the Access to Information Law.[6]

The commitment aims to help enforcement of the Access to Information Law. It seeks to strengthen the mechanisms for classifying and managing government information across agencies. It involves review of circulations governing the Access to Information Law and the monitoring of the compliance of government agencies' provisions regulating the classification of information.

This commitment is verifiable. It contains specific milestones and intended outcomes regarding protocols containing clear guidance for agencies, training of civil servants, and an assessment on compliance. The commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information. It intends to improve the current framework governing the classification of information subject to the Access to Information Law. Such work is expected to improve the management of information requests. The commitment is also relevant to the OGP value of civic participation. Members of civil society would be given the opportunity to participate in a government-created forum to inform decision making, in this case, on a protocol to classify public documentation across government agencies.

If implemented as written, the commitment would contribute to enforcing implementation of the Access to Information Law. It would improve institutional standards on information

classification and disclosure. It would also involve awareness-raising activities and review of legislative framework. The commitment, as designed, addresses the lack of procedures for information classification and seeks to reduce inconsistency among multiple legislation governing access to information. However, while the compliance reports are to be published, there is no mention of potential consequences for agencies or officials who fail to comply with the legal requirements to release information. Thus, the potential impact for this commitment is moderate.

Next Steps

This commitment holds a lot of potential, and efforts to advance its implementation should be sustained beyond this action plan. The following considerations are recommended for future commitments designed to strengthen the access to information framework:

- Clarify and consolidate the role of the entity responsible for evaluating compliance across government agencies and for publishing the report. The responsible entity remains unclear from the current commitment's design.

- Place significant emphasis on training for government officials, to make sure they clearly understand the law's requirements and have the necessary tools for its implementation.

- Consider including explicit penalties for civil servants who fail to comply with the provisions of the Access to Information Law. Accountability or oversight mechanisms could be the focus of future iterations of this commitment.

- Ensure that all measures are taken to guarantee consistency among the Access to Information Law and other relevant regulations, especially the Law for Protection of State Secrets.

---

[1] Toby Mendel, Analysis of Law No. 47 for the Year 2007: Guaranteeing the Right to Obtain Information (Paris: UNESCO; Amman; Brussels: European Union, 2016), https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/updatedjordan.rti-analysis.16-05-18ls-1.pdf; and Yahya Shuqeir, Access to Information in the Arab World: "Focusing on Jordan, Tunisia and Yemen" (Al-Shemisani, Amman: Arab Reports for Investigative Journalism; and Friedrich Naumann Foundation, 2018), https://arij.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Freedom-of-Information-in-the-Arab-World_ENG.pdf.
[2] Toby Mendel, Analysis of Law No. 47.
[3] Yahya Shuqeir, Access to Information in the Arab World.
[4] Laila Azzeh, "Initiative Aims to Boost Access to Information in Jordan," The Jordan Times, 10 October 2016, https://www.jordantimes.com/news/local/initiative-aims-boost-access-information-jordan.
[5] The Government of Jordan's Third Open Government Partnership National Action Plan, 2016-2018, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/jordan-third-national-action-plan-2016-2018/
[6] Email exchanges by Mai Eleimat, Open Government Unit coordinator, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, 10 September 2019; and comment from the government of Jordan, received by the IRM during the report's prepublication review stage: "The draft of Amended Law was forwarded to the Parliament in January 2020 and the legal committee started its discussion in March 2020."

V. General Recommendations

This section aims to inform development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. It is divided into two sections: 1) IRM key recommendations to improve OGP process and action plans in the country and, 2) an assessment of how the government responded to previous IRM key recommendations.

5.1 IRM Recommendations

1. **Strengthen the OGP multistakeholder forum through a public mandate and fair and transparent selection process for members.**

The government and civil society need to jointly define clear rules for participation in the multistakeholder forum and improve how the forum engages with the public. Such action would allow for participation from civil society organizations (CSOs) other than "the usual suspects"—including youth and women organizations—under fair and equal conditions.

Closing feedback loops is essential to building trust in the forum and the OGP process. The forum needs to improve how it provides the reasoning behind the criteria for selection of commitments and the use of inputs from CSOs and the general public into action plans. One helpful approach would be to develop a communication strategy that both increases awareness of the OGP process and is centered more on proactive communication with the public (not only on the public's opportunity to provide feedback to the forum).

2. **Continue and increase the use of OGP action plans to enhance human rights and civic space protection.**

This action plan includes several commitments that depend on effective dialogue with and trust of civil society for successful implementation. Ongoing efforts in areas of civic space and human rights, such as Commitments 1 and 4, offer Jordan a key opportunity to establish permanent dialogue between the government and civil society organizations to address issues that have prevented partnerships in the past (such as funding and corruption concerns). The IRM encourages using OGP action plans to continue this dialogue at the highest level. A sustained focus on human rights and civic space is a strategic way to use OGP action plans and the shared civil society and government forum.

To pursue this agenda, OGP offers many resources that can inform the design of commitments. For example, the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law's OGP: Guide to Opening Government presents several recommendations (from initial to more advance steps) to meet international standards and good practices on freedoms of association, assembly, and expression.

In light of the recent COVID-19 crisis, OGP also introduced a set of recommendations and examples to ensure civic space is not restricted by emergency measures.[1]

Using an open government lens to increase whistleblower protections for reporting human right abuses and participatory, community-based approaches is key to improving monitoring efforts. Monitoring tools, such as the ones proposed by the Advocates for Human Rights, use citizen engagement and incident mapping data to support effective monitoring and accountability regarding human rights protections.[2]

3. **Promote participation in OGP action plans from the legislative and judiciary branches of government.**

All of the commitments included in the action plan require approval of some type of regulation by the legislative branch — or enforcement by the judiciary branch. The potential impact has, in some cases, been undermined by the lack of clarity in key legislation. Understanding and promoting the OGP agenda as a statewide initiative would not only allow for participation from all relevant actors during the co-creation process, but also help identify key agencies or branches of government that need to be involved for successful implementation.

Cross-country IRM analysis has found that institutional coordination has been one the main challenges in commitment completion.[3] That said, there is strategic value in creating space for the legislative and judiciary branches of government to engage in Jordan's next action plan. Such involvement also increases the opportunities for successful implementation and sustainability of reforms across time.

4. **Improve the design of commitments to address issues of scope and mitigate limitations of in-person collaboration due to the COVID-19 pandemic.**

Jordan's fourth action plan includes interesting and significant commitments in key areas. However, the ambition and design of commitments can be improved. As Jordan prepares for its next action plan under a new normal brought on by the global pandemic, it will be important to consider the increasing role of multistakeholder collaboration in writing and drafting commitments. Jordan has established a strong foundation by using consultations to gather ideas, understand where priorities lie, identify objectives, and prioritize reform areas. To continue to further strengthen Jordan's co-creation process, recommendations can be drawn from OGP's guide:[4]

- Define roles and responsibilities, clearly articulating what policy decisions are made jointly by collaborators and what decisions need formal government approval.

- Write commitments in a large group, though this can be challenging. Appoint a moderator to facilitate the process for each commitment, and ensure there is a safe space for collaborators to provide input without fear of intimidation.

- Prepare and share policy evidence, baseline information, and expert inputs that can inform the discussions on potential commitments.

- Agree on tools and process for collaboration, establishing clear deadlines and accessible channels for inputs.

The OGP guide also provides a list of online and offline tools for collaborative drafting.

Table 5.1: IRM Key Recommendations

1	Strengthen the OGP multistakeholder forum through a public mandate and fair and transparent selection process for members.
2	Continue and increase the use of OGP action plans to enhance human rights and civic space protection.
3	Promote participation in OGP action plans from the legislative and judiciary branches of government.
4	Improve the design of commitments to address issues of scope and mitigate limitations of in-person collaboration due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

[1] "A Guide to Open Government and the Coronavirus: Civic Space," Documents, Open Government Partnership, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/a-guide-to-open-government-and-the-coronavirus-civic-space/#examples.

[2] The Advocates for Human Rights, Chapter 4: Additional Monitoring Tools, https://www.theadvocatesforhumanrights.org/uploads/ch_4_2.pdf.

[3] Renzo Falla, Independent Reporting Mechanism: Why OGP Commitments Fall Behind (Washington, DC: Open Government Partnership, 2017), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2001/01/IRM_Technical-Paper_Failure_Dec2017.pdf.

[4] "Taking the OGP Co-Creation Process Online: Developing and Drafting Commitments," Documents, Open Government Partnership, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/taking-the-ogp-co-creation-process-online-developing-drafting-commitments/.

5.2 Response to Previous IRM Key Recommendations

Table 5.2: Previous IRM Report Key Recommendations

	Recommendation	Responded to?	Integrated into Current Action Plan?
1	Strengthen the consultation and co-creation process	✘	✔
2	Ensure adequate implementation of access to information	✘	✔
3	Improve the operating environment for the media	✘	✘
4	Include commitments that strengthen public accountability through citizen audits	✘	✘
5	Ensure financial transparency and budget disclosure	✘	✘

Previous IRM recommendations have been integrated partially into the fourth action plan. Participation in the consultation and co-creation process by both civil society organizations and citizens has increased, compared to participation in the past three actions plans. This is the case for both digital interactions (for example, for public commenting) and in-person meetings.

Additionally, the potential for citizens to participate in working groups related to commitments has been strengthened. In the fourth action plan, the government incorporated the second IRM recommendation as a stand-alone commitment dedicated to ensuring adequate implementation of access to information initiatives. Other commitments have also embodied elements to strengthen public accountability and ensure financial transparency and budget disclosure. All commitments of Jordan's fourth action plan adhere to OGP values and address a wide range of challenges.

VI. Methodology and Sources

IRM reports are written in collaboration with researchers for each OGP-participating country. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, observation, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholders. The IRM report builds on the evidence available in Jordan's OGP repository (or online tracker), website, findings in the government's own self-assessment reports, and any other assessments of process and progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organizations.

Each IRM researcher conducts stakeholder interviews to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested parties or visit implementation sites. Some contexts require anonymity of interviewees and the IRM reserves the right to remove personal identifying information of these participants. Due to the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary during the pre-publication review period of each report.

Each report undergoes a quality-control process that includes an internal review by IRM staff and the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP). Each report also undergoes an external review where governments and civil society are invited to provide comments on the content of the draft IRM report.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual.[1]

Interviews and stakeholder input

The research strategy for collecting stakeholder views and inputs has been built on the past research and was premised on reaching out to and addressing tailored sets of semi-structured questions to three different stakeholder groups: involved civil society (set 1), potentially interested civil society (set 2), and government (set 3). The researcher traveled to Jordan for one week to meet with a balanced number of government and nongovernment entities and representatives. The researcher made sure to interview at least one relevant organization per commitment.

Outreach to numerous government and nongovernment individuals already engaged in the OGP process was kindly facilitated by the OGP Jordan coordinator, Mai Eleimat. She provided the contact information and facilitated numerous introductions.

- The researcher conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews in person in Jordan (between 30 minutes and 1.5 hours) with the following:

  - Mai Eleimat, OGP coordinator
  - Lama Qutaishat and Awad Aladdouss, Companies Control Department
  - Nada Khater, Ministry of Information and Communications Technology
  - Dr. Nahla AbdelQader Mawtine, National Centre for Human Rights
  - Dr. Khalil Al Abdallat, Prime Ministry, Office of the Governmental Coordinator for Human Rights
  - Noor Dweiri, Prime Ministry, Office of the Governmental Coordinator for Human Rights
  - Four additional members from the Prime Ministry, Office of the Governmental Coordinator for Human Rights
  - Waleed Elshatarat, Ministry of Social Development
  - Nidal Mansour, Center for Defending Freedom of Journalists

- o   Muath Almawtini and Saddam Abu Azzam, Lawyers Without Borders
- o   Hilda Ajeilat, Jordan Transparency Center
- o   Two local activists (who requested to be anonymous)
- o   Two local entrepreneurs (who requested to be anonymous)
- o   Government official (who requested to be anonymous)

- The researcher also observed event as a participant.
  - o   Participant observation and various conversations with participants at the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology

It was agreed with all interviewees not to attribute information received to individuals, to create a more open conversation environment. Several participants opted for higher levels of confidentiality and are thus only listed with general reference to their organization or type of organization. For the same reasons, aural interviews were not recorded but captured through extensive note-taking.

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) is a key means by which all stakeholders can track OGP progress in participating countries and entities. The International Experts Panel (IEP) oversees the quality control of each report. The IEP is comprised 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

A small staff based in Washington, DC, shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researchers. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org.

---

[1] RM Procedures Manual, V.3 : https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual

Annex I. Overview of Jordan's performance throughout action plan development

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

Multistakeholder Forum	
1a. Forum established: There is a forum to oversee the OGP process.	Green
1b. Regularity: The forum meets at least every quarter, in person or remotely.	Green
1c. Collaborative mandate development: Members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership, and governance structure.	Yellow
1d. Mandate public: Information on the forum's remit, membership, and governance structure is available on the OGP website/page.	Yellow
2a. Multistakeholder: The forum includes both governmental and nongovernmental representatives.	Green
2b. Parity: The forum includes an even balance of governmental and nongovernmental representatives.	Green
2c. Transparent selection: Nongovernmental members of the forum are selected through a fair and transparent process.	Red
2d. High-level government representation: The forum includes high-level representatives with decision-making authority from government.	Green
3a. Openness: The forum accepts inputs and representation on the action plan process from any civil society or other stakeholders outside the forum.	Yellow
3b. Remote participation: There are opportunities for remote participation in at least some meetings and events.	Yellow
3c. Minutes: The OGP forum proactively communicates and reports back on its decisions, activities, and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders.[1]	Yellow

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 Development	
4a. Process transparency: There is a national OGP website (or OGP webpage on a government website) where information on all aspects of the national OGP process is proactively published.	Green
4b. Documentation in advance: The forum shares information about OGP to stakeholders in advance to guarantee they are informed and prepared to participate in all stages of the process.	Green
4c. Awareness-raising: The forum conducts outreach and awareness-raising activities with relevant stakeholders to inform them of the OGP process.	Green
4d. Communication channels: The government facilitates direct communication with stakeholders to respond to action plan process questions, particularly during times of intense OGP activity.	Green
4e. Reasoned response: The multistakeholder forum publishes its reasoning behind decisions and responds to major categories of public comment.	Green
5a. Repository: Government collects and publishes a document repository on the national OGP website/webpage, which provides a historical record and access to all documents related to the national OGP process, including (but not limited to) consultation documents, National Action Plans, government self-assessments, IRM reports, and supporting documentation of commitment implementation (e.g., links to databases, evidence of meetings, publications).	Green

Editorial note*: If a country "meets" the six standards in bold IRM will recognize the country's process as a* <u>*Starred Process.*</u>

---

[1] During the prepublication review of this report, meeting minutes were not available on the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation's OGP page (https://www.mop.gov.jo/En/Pages/The_Open_Gov_Partnership) or its Google Drive.