

Independent Reporting Mechanism

Action Plan Review:
Israel 2023–2025

Open
Government
Partnership



Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Table of Contents

Section I: Overview	2
Section II: Promising Commitments	4
Section III. Methodology and IRM Indicators	6
Annex 1. Commitment by Commitment Data	8
Annex 2: Action Plan Co-Creation	9

Section I: Overview

The development of Israel's fourth action plan restarted its OGP process after its last action plan ended in 2019. Political instability and a lack of high-level political support negatively affected the ambition of the action plan. The Israel–Gaza war disrupted implementation of the plan and led to its revision in August 2024.

This report evaluates the design of Israel's fourth OGP action plan, which restarted Israel's OGP process after the last plan ended in 2019. The original action plan was submitted in August 2023 and included seven commitments. Israel submitted an updated plan to OGP in July 2024, nine months after the start of the Israel-Gaza war. The government added a commitment about information on Israelis impacted by the war and removed a commitment on making government data accessible and usable as this had already been completed. Two commitments from the updated plan have modest potential for open government results.

The co-creation process saw some improvements compared to the previous action plan. It was co-led by the Israel National Digital Agency and Joint Distribution Committee Institute for Leadership and Governance (JDC Elka). For the first time, the government launched an OGP website and repository, offering new access to information on the process. Following initial outreach events on OGP, a call for proposals elicited 114 commitment ideas from the public.

Five multi-stakeholder working groups led the development of commitments, marking a new approach to co-creation. The final commitments were based on the working groups' internal discussions. Over the course of the process, the Israel National Digital Agency and JDC Elka consulted with the multi-stakeholder Accompanying Forum of key civil society and government stakeholders. In 2024, the Israel National Digital Agency and JDC Elka revised the action plan with input from Hasadna (Workshop for Public Knowledge), a civil society organization.

Civil society participants observed that it was not easy for public officials to engage civil society organizations in co-creation.¹ They noted that some were unwilling to engage in the OGP process because of a lack of a minister or high-ranking civil servant responsible for open government. Others cited the ongoing political crisis linked to a proposed reform that allegedly threatened the independence of the judicial system.² Widespread protests have criticized the proposed legal amendments as a threat to the balance of powers between the executive and the judiciary.³ Snap elections at the end of 2022 also disrupted the development of the action plan.

However, Israel's OGP process included participants from new fields, such as on gender and climate along with more academics and private sector stakeholders. While organizations representing Arab Israelis did not participate in development of the action plan, the government

AT A GLANCE

Participating since: 2011
Number of commitments: 7

Overview of commitments:

Commitments with an open government lens: 6 (86%)

Commitments with substantial potential for results: 0

Promising commitments: 0

Policy areas:

Carried over from previous action plans:

Open Data
Climate Change
Legislative Transparency
Public Participation

Emerging in this action plan:

Gender Equality
Access to Information

Compliance with OGP minimum requirements for co-creation: No

point of contact and JDC Elka made efforts to include them. Between 2019 and 2022, Israel's governing parliamentary coalition dissolved five times, also disrupting the co-creation process.⁴ Ministerial-level government stakeholders did not participate in the co-creation process. This contributed to difficulty budgeting commitments and passing them as formal government decisions. Overall, lack of high-level political support for OGP in Israel limited the potential for more ambitious commitments.

Implementation of the action plan was significantly disrupted as individuals from the civil service and civil society were seconded to emergency response roles or military service due to the October 7th attack and onset of the Israel-Gaza war. Restrictions to civic space also have been recorded. Civil society organizations (CSOs) noted restrictions of freedoms of expression and association. There are examples of arrests, use of disproportionate force, and administrative restrictions affecting the right to protest. There have been hundreds of arrests related to social media posts. In 2024, the government blocked broadcasts of Al-Jazeera for security reasons, sanctioned news organization Haaretz, and taken steps towards greater involvement in the broadcasting corporation's content and financial management.⁵

Submission of this action plan ends a period of procedural review of Israel for repeated failure to deliver an action plan after the previous plan ended in 2019.⁶ However, the process for developing this action plan did not meet the minimum requirements of OGP's Participation & Co-Creation Standards. The government did not provide reasoned response to commitment proposals received from the public. OGP instituted a 24-month grace period to ensure a fair and transparent transition to the updated standards. As this action plan was co-created and submitted by 31 December 2023, it falls within the grace period.

¹ Roy Peled (College of Management Academic Studies), interview by IRM researcher, 16 January 2024.

² Racheli Edri (Movement for Freedom of Information), interview by IRM researcher, 17 January 2024; Mor Rubinstein (Open Heroines), interview by IRM researcher, 13 August 2024; Adam Kariv (Open Data Consultant), interview by IRM researcher, 16 August 2024.

³ "Freedom in the World 2024: Israel," Freedom House, 2024, <https://freedomhouse.org/country/israel/freedom-world/2024>

⁴ "Timeline: Israel's election cycle," Reuters, 30 October 2022, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/israels-election-cycle-2022-10-30>.

⁵ "Israel," Civicus, accessed 25 November 2024, <https://monitor.civicus.org/country/israel/>; [המלחמה בעת מחאות דיכוי] "Suppression of protests during the war," Association for Civil Rights in Israel, 11 April 2024, https://www.acri.org.il/post/_1015; [מפגנים של שווא מעצר], "False arrests of protesters," Association for Civil Rights in Israel, 9 September 2024, https://www.acri.org.il/post/_1125; "The Judicial Overhaul in the Shadow of the War: Attack on Democracy and Human Rights Continues," Association for Civil Rights in Israel, 20 December 2023, <https://www.english.acri.org.il/post/the-constitutional-coup-in-the-shadow-of-the-war-attack-on-democracy-and-human-rights-continues>.

⁶ "Israel – Update to Status (August 2023)," Open Government Partnership, 6 September 2023, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/israel-update-to-status-august-2023>.

Section II: Promising Commitments

The IRM typically focuses this section of an action plan review on commitments that the IRM identifies as promising, analyzing the plan's challenges and opportunities, and recommending options to facilitate the learning and implementation of the plan. Promising commitments address a policy area that is important to stakeholders or the national context. They must be verifiable and have a relevant open government lens as well as modest or substantial potential for results.

The onset of the Israel-Gaza war disrupted implementation of the action plan and led to it being updated in August 2024. In the revised plan, the government added a commitment about data transparency for Israelis impacted by the war and removed a commitment on making government data accessible and usable since it had already been implemented. Since this Action Plan Review was produced over halfway into the implementation period, the IRM decided to provide a general analysis of all the commitments, and would focus deeper analysis of commitments with the strongest early results in the upcoming Results Report.

Commitment 1 focuses on improving the transparency and quality of government budget and expenditure information, as well as on social procurement i.e., the provision of outsourced social services. The commitment has modest potential for results as it would be implemented through a first-of-a-kind partnership model between government and civil society that could be extended to other ministries.

In terms of budget and social procurement transparency, the commitment would largely continue ongoing practices. It intends to enhance and improve access to government budget and procurement data for the public via the Budget Key Project run by the civil society organization (CSO) Hasadna.⁷ The Budget Key Project is an online open budget portal publishing both government budget and social procurement information.⁸ It has unlocked public access to government budget information since its launch in 2014⁹ and already been publishing social procurement information for the past five years, including tender, budget, and spending data.¹⁰

The assessment of modest potential for results, however, stems from the new partnership model being piloted. This formal approach for government and civil society collaboration ensures funding for at least two years (possibly up to four years) for the Budget Key Project.¹¹ The government funding may help to improve data quality and is expected to help provide analysis with insights derived from the published data. Plans to publish information in Arabic and English would also help to improve access to information and social services for minorities. This model could be adopted by other ministries in collaboration with civil society, albeit not guaranteed.

The commitment may only be able to provide limited improvements where there are broader deficiencies with fiscal transparency. Civil society representatives commented that Israelis face significant barriers to accessing detailed information on budget implementation.¹² Furthermore, while budget information is usually published, amendments are sometimes not publicly available and spending by outsourced contractors and municipalities is not consistently or systematically published or available at all. For more ambitious results in fiscal transparency, the government could take steps to publish relevant information including real-time budget amendments and ensuring detailed access to municipality budgets, the Settlement Division budget, and the Ministry of Education's division of funds to different categories of schools.¹³ The Government Procurement Administration could also consider opening government contracts using the Open Contracting Data Standard. Future efforts could also engage journalists and civil society on reusing budget information, train government directors and officials responsible for freedom of information on their responsibilities and encourage political leadership on the issue.¹⁴

Led by a multi-stakeholder advisory committee, **Commitment 2** plans to pilot improvements to green transportation options in the city of Herzliya. It follows a related training program for municipalities run by the CSO 15 Minutes.¹⁵ The commitment has unclear potential for results as the make-up of the advisory committee and influence of civic participation in decision making is not yet defined as written. This commitment could have stronger early results potential by, for example, institutionalizing opportunities for civil society and the public to participate in planning and overseeing the city's climate change mitigation efforts. The plans to expand this pilot to other municipalities would also strengthen reforms beyond Herzliya, including the use of open

government mechanisms to address disparities in access to public transportation, such as for Arab Israelis.¹⁶ Civil society stakeholders consider Herzliya well-positioned to pilot this effort, and suggested that the municipality could consider further open government initiatives in the future. For implementation, they recommend widening the breadth of stakeholders participating, making efforts to build trust, and incorporating support from the Ministry of Transportation.¹⁷

Commitment 3 plans to standardize employers' reports on wage gaps and launch an online platform to centralize and enable public access to this data. The Israel National Digital Agency noted that standardization was no longer feasible during this action plan cycle and expected information to be published in portable document format (PDF).¹⁸ Moving forward, it could be beneficial to pursue the goal of standardization,¹⁹ drawing from the United Kingdom's gender pay gap service model.²⁰ This commitment could support greater inclusion in the economy.

Commitments 4 on improving legislative management systems between the Knesset and the government, **Commitment 5** on improving public access to the text of laws, and **Commitment 6** on improving the government's ability to connect with businesses have unclear potential for results. Interviewed stakeholders did not expect them to be implemented.

Commitment 7 intends to collect and publish data for Israeli civilians impacted by the war through two platforms: Emun (for government) and Mabat (for the public, civil society and local municipalities). In 2024, this commitment was added to the action plan by the Israel National Digital Agency and JDC Elka with input from Hasadna. Mabat would include government data on health, mental health, employment, environment, education, social services, displaced populations, casualties, and hostages. Having this data available and centralized for the first time in this way is intended to support service delivery to Israeli citizens by local governments and aid organizations.²¹ The new information made publicly available and the expected influence it would have on service delivery means the commitment has modest potential for results. The government stated that already, some cities adjusted their provision of services when they were presented with the data for the first time. The platforms should ensure the widest possible access with timely translation of the data for linguistic minorities.

⁷ Dorit Hizi (Hasadna), interview by IRM researcher, 26 August 2024; Keren Katsir Stiebel (Israel National Digital Agency) and Lihi Raviv (JDC Institute for Leadership & Governance), interview by IRM researcher, 6 August 2024.

⁸ "Budget Key," Hasadna, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://next.obudget.org/?lang=en>.

⁹ Mushon Zer Aviv, "The Keys to the Israeli Budget," TAI Collaborative, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://taicollaborative.org/follow-the-money-mushon-zer-aviv-the-keys-to-the-israeli-budget>.

¹⁰ Adam Kariv (Open Data Consultant), interview by IRM researcher, 16 August 2024; [החברתי לרכז מפתח], "Social Procurement," Hasadna, accessed 15 November 2024, https://www.socialpro.org.il/i/units/gov_social_service_unit/main?theme=soproc.

¹¹ Mor Rubinstein (Open Heroines), interview by IRM researcher, 13 August 2024.

¹² Jafar Farah and Naim Mousa (Mossawa Center), interview by IRM researcher, 13 August 2024.

¹³ Kariv, interview.

¹⁴ Rubinstein, interview, 13 August; Kariv, interview; Farah and Mousa, interview.

¹⁵ Sivan Shmuelovich (15 Minutes), interview by IRM researcher, 29 February 2024.

¹⁶ Jafar Farah (Mossawa Center), correspondence with IRM researcher, 7 August 2024.

¹⁷ Mor Rubinstein (Open Heroines), interview by IRM researcher, 16 January 2024; Shmuelovich, interview.

¹⁸ Stiebel and Raviv, interview.

¹⁹ Rubinstein, interview, 13 August.

²⁰ "Gender pay gap service," Cabinet Office of the United Kingdom, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://gender-pay-gap.service.gov.uk>.

²¹ Stiebel and Raviv, interview.

Section III. Methodology and IRM Indicators

This product is a concise, independent, technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process. The IRM highlights commitments that have the highest potential for results, represent a high priority for country stakeholders, acknowledged as a priority in the national open government context, or a combination of these factors.

The IRM products provided during a national action plan cycle include:

- **Co-Creation Brief:** A concise brief that highlights lessons from previous IRM reports to support a country's OGP process, action plan design, and overall learning.
- **Action Plan Review:** A technical review of the characteristics of the action plan and the strengths and challenges the IRM identifies to inform a stronger implementation process.
- **Midpoint Review:** A review for four-year action plans after a refresh at the midpoint. The review assesses new or significantly amended commitments in the refreshed action plan, compliance with OGP rules, and an informal update on implementation progress.
- **Results Report:** An overall implementation assessment that focuses on policy-level results and how changes happen. It also checks compliance with OGP rules and informs accountability and longer-term learning.

In the Action Plan Review, the IRM reviews commitments using three indicators:

1. Verifiability: The IRM determines whether a commitment is verifiable as written in the action plan. The indicator is assessed as:

- **Yes/No:** Are the stated objectives and proposed actions sufficiently clear and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation?
- Commitments that are not verifiable are considered not reviewable, and no further assessment is carried out.

2. Open Government Lens: The IRM determines if the commitment relates to the open government values of transparency, civic participation, and/or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration and the OGP Articles of Governance. Based on a close reading of the commitment text, the indicator is assessed as:

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

The following questions for each OGP value may be used as a reference to identify the specific open government lens in commitment analysis:

- **Transparency:** Will the government disclose more information, improve the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improve the transparency of government decision-making processes or institutions?
- **Civic Participation:** Will the government create or improve opportunities, processes, or mechanisms for the public to inform, influence or co-create policies, laws and/or decisions? Will the government create, enable, or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities, marginalized or underrepresented groups?

Will the government improve the enabling environment for civil society (which may include NGO laws, funding mechanisms, taxation, reporting requirements, et cetera)? Will the government improve legal, policy, institutional or practical conditions related to civic space such as freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly that would facilitate participation in the public sphere? Will the government take measures which counter mis- and disinformation, especially online, to ensure people have access to reliable and factual information (which may include digital and media literacy campaigns, fact-checking or fostering an independent news media ecosystem)?

- **Public Accountability:** Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions? Will the government enable legal, policy, or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of public officials?

3. Potential for Results: The IRM analyzes the expected results and potential that would be verified in the IRM Results Report after implementation. Potential for results is an early indication of the commitment’s possibility to yield meaningful results based on its articulation in the action plan in contrast with the state of play in the respective policy area. The indicator is assessed as:

- **Unclear:** The commitment is aimed at continuing ongoing practices in line with existing legislation, requirements, or policies without indication of the added value or enhanced open government approach in contrast with existing practice.
- **Modest:** A positive but standalone initiative or change to processes, practices, or policies. The commitment does not generate binding or institutionalized changes across government or institutions that govern a policy area. Examples are tools (e.g., websites) or data release, training, or pilot projects.
- **Substantial:** A possible game changer for practices, policies, or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector, or the relationship between citizens and state. The commitment generates binding and institutionalized changes across government.

This review focuses its analysis on promising commitments. Promising commitments are verifiable, have an open government lens, and at least a modest potential for results. Promising commitments may also be a priority for national stakeholders or for the particular context. The IRM may cluster commitments with a common policy objective or that contribute to the same reform or policy issue. The potential for results of clustered commitments is reviewed as a whole.

This review was prepared by the IRM in collaboration with Brendan Halloran as external expert reviewer. During the internal review process of this product, the IRM verifies the accuracy of findings and collects further input through peer review, OGP Support Unit feedback as needed, interviews and validation with country stakeholders, an external expert review, and oversight by IRM’s International Experts Panel (IEP).²² The IRM methodology, product quality, and review process are overseen by the IEP.²³

²² “International Experts Panel,” Open Government Partnership, accessed 15 July 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/international-experts-panel>.

²³ For more information, see: “Overview – Independent Reporting Mechanism,” Open Government Partnership, accessed 15 July 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview>.

Annex 1. Commitment by Commitment Data²⁴

Commitment 1: Establishing a joint government-civil society venture
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest
Commitment 2: Smart, green transportation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 3: Reducing gender wage gaps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 4: Creating interfaces of legislative management systems
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 5: Accessibility of bills and laws on the National Legislation Database
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 6: Establishing a digital connection infrastructure between government and SMEs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Unclear
Commitment 7: Data transparency in emergency/recovery for the public sector, civil society, and citizens
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable: Yes • Does it have an open government lens? Yes • Potential for results: Modest

²⁴ **Editorial note:** Commitment short titles may have been edited for brevity. For the complete text of commitments, see: “Israel Open Government National Action Plan 2023–2025,” Israel National Digital Agency, 29 August 2023, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/israel-action-plan-2023-2025-june>.

Annex 2: Action Plan Co-Creation

OGP member countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards that came into force on 1 January 2022.²⁵ The IRM assesses all countries that submitted action plans from 2022 onward under the updated standards. Table 2 outlines the extent to which the countries' participation and co-creation practices meet the minimum requirements that apply during development of the action plan.

OGP instituted a 24-month grace period to ensure a fair and transparent transition to the updated standards. Action plans co-created and submitted by 31 December 2023 fall within the grace period. The IRM will assess countries' alignment with the standards and their minimum requirements.²⁶ However, countries will only be found to be acting contrary to process if they do not meet the minimum requirements for action plans co-created in 2024 and onwards.

Table 2. Compliance with minimum requirements

Minimum requirement	Met during co-creation?	Met during implementation?
1.1 Space for dialogue: A multi-stakeholder Accompanying Forum comprises 4 government as well as 8 civil society and academia representatives. Its mandate and operating procedures are available online. ²⁷ Civil society members did not consider it a formal multi-stakeholder forum that has any decision-making power. It met twice on Zoom, with the first meeting in March 2022 or six months after co-creation began. ²⁸ Five multi-stakeholder working groups on justice, climate, gender, public participation, as well as data and technology developed the commitments. ²⁹ The groups met 3–7 times between July 2022 and June 2023. ³⁰ While the broader co-creation process included efforts to encourage minorities to participate, no organizations representing Arab Israelis participated in the spaces for dialogue. ³¹	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
2.1 OGP website: Israel launched a new publicly accessible OGP website that contains Israel's OGP action plans. The website also includes information on OGP Israel, the multi-stakeholder forum, the co-creation process, and outreach events. It is available in Hebrew, Arabic, and English. ³²	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
2.2 Repository: The new OGP website published information on the co-creation process, including stakeholders' commitment proposals and meeting minutes from working groups. ³³ It updated meeting minutes from working groups more than twice a year during the co-creation period. ³⁴	Yes	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>
3.1 Advanced notice: The OGP website published a co-creation timeline ³⁵ less than two weeks before the start of the co-creation process. It was first publicly shared on 6 October 2021. ³⁶ The call for proposals for the action plan launched on 10 October 2021 and ended on 20 December 2021. ³⁷ Civil society representatives considered that this was long enough for scheduling, preparing, and drafting proposals. In this instance, the IRM considers it aligned with the minimum requirement.	Yes	Not applicable

3.2 Outreach: In October 2021, OGP Israel held three hybrid outreach events for civil society ³⁸ and government ³⁹ with opportunities to get involved. Information on how to join the working groups were then disseminated on Facebook and LinkedIn. ⁴⁰	Yes	Not applicable
3.3 Feedback mechanism: Israel opened a call for proposals for the action plan from October to December 2021, ⁴¹ receiving 114 responses. Of these, 18 were from government representatives, and the remainder were from associations, companies, academia, and others. ⁴² Meetings in 2022 and 2023 gathered further stakeholder input through the working groups that developed the action plan's final commitments. ⁴³	Yes	Not applicable
4.1 Reasoned response: The 114 commitment proposals were published on the OGP website. ⁴⁴ They received an official response on whether they were approved for working group discussions or rejected, but this did not meet the minimum requirement to address how the feedback informed development of the action plan. ⁴⁵ Suggestions from members of the working groups were documented in meeting minutes. ⁴⁶	No	Not applicable
5.1 Open implementation: The IRM will assess whether meetings were held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation results and enable civil society to provide comments in the Results Report.	Not applicable	<i>To be assessed in the Results Report</i>

²⁵ "OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards," Open Government Partnership, 24 November 2021, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards>.

²⁶ "IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements," Open Government Partnership, accessed 15 August 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-guidelines-for-the-assessment-of-minimum-requirements>.

²⁷ "Accompanying Forum Document," Israel National Digital Agency, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://govextra.gov.il/ict-authority/ogp-en/home/forum>.

²⁸ Roy Peled (College of Management Academic Studies), interview by IRM researcher, 16 January 2024; Racheli Edri (Movement for Freedom of Information), interview by IRM researcher, 17 January 2024; Mor Rubinstein (Open Heroines), interview by IRM researcher, 17 January 2024.

²⁹ "Accompanying Forum Document," Israel National Digital Agency.

³⁰ "List of Action Plan Teams, Israel National Digital Agency, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://govextra.gov.il/ict-authority/ogp/%d7%99%d7%a9%d7%a8%d7%90%d7%9c-ogp/teams>.

³¹ According to Edri, interview Rubinstein, interview, there have been Arab Israelis present at the Accompanying Forum since the co-creation process.

³² "Open Government in Israel," Israel National Digital Agency, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://govextra.gov.il/ict-authority/ogp-en/home>.

³³ "Open Government in Israel," Israel National Digital Agency.

³⁴ "List of Action Plan Teams, Israel National Digital Agency.

³⁵ "Open Government in Israel," Israel National Digital Agency.

³⁶ Keren Katsir Stiebel (Israel National Digital Agency) and Lihi Raviv (JDC Institute for Leadership & Governance), interview by IRM researcher, 11 January 2024.

³⁷ "Israel Open Government National Action Plan 2023–2025," Israel National Digital Agency, 29 August 2023, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/israel-action-plan-2023-2025-june>.

³⁸ Israel Government ICT Authority, "Civil society outreach event of the Open Government Partnership," YouTube, 19 October 2021, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8hXx-Ne4sOw>.

³⁹ Israel Government ICT Authority, "Government outreach event of the Open Government Partnership," YouTube, 12 October 2021, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I9A8iMd3mk0>.

⁴⁰ Stiebel and Raviv, interview.

⁴¹ "Open Government in Israel," Israel National Digital Agency.

⁴² "Overview: Summary of the survey's proposals for the action plan for the years 2023–2025," Israel National Digital Agency, accessed 30 September 2024, <https://govextra.gov.il/ict-authority/ogp-en/home/ogp-plan-22-24>.

⁴³ "List of Action Plan Teams, Israel National Digital Agency.

⁴⁴ "Overview - Summary of the survey's proposals for the action plan for the years 2023–2025," Israel National Digital Agency.

⁴⁵ Stiebel and Raviv, interview; "List of Action Plan Teams, Israel National Digital Agency.

⁴⁶ “List of Action Plan Teams, Israel National Digital Agency.