

# Independent Reporting Mechanism

Midterm Review:  
Country 20XX-20XX

---

Open  
Government  
Partnership



Independent  
Reporting  
Mechanism

## Key Findings

Summarize the main findings in no more than 150 words. Draft this part last and use plain language. The overview can be similar but not identical to the headlines in the following two sections. Include brief high-level analysis on:

- The process to refresh the action plan
- The extent of changes made to the action plan
- The overall status of implementation at the midpoint

For example: Libertainia's 2023-2027 action plan is making progress, particularly regarding commitments to fight corruption. At the midpoint, the OGP Steering Committee held meetings to identify and agree on amendments to the action plan. The committee amended five commitments to align with Libertainia's 2026-2036 Anti-Corruption Strategy, raising the action plan's overall ambition. While action plan implementation is generally on-track, the committee could prioritize mobilizing resources to ensure that open justice commitments are fulfilled.

## About the Report

The **Open Government Partnership (OGP)** is a multi-stakeholder initiative focused on improving government transparency, ensuring opportunities for citizen participation in public matters, and strengthening mechanisms for public accountability. OGP brings together government and civil society champions of reform who believe governments are more effective and credible when they open their doors to public input and oversight.

The **Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM)** is OGP's accountability arm and the main means of tracking progress in participating countries. Since 2011, the IRM has provided independent, evidence-based, and objective reporting to hold OGP members accountable and support their open government efforts. This is done through reports and timely recommendations during key moments in the action plan cycle.

The IRM provides a **Midterm Review** to countries undertaking four-year action plans, who are expected to undertake a refresh process at the two-year mark. The refresh process is an opportunity for countries to take stock of implementation progress thus far and update the action plan as needed. The Midterm Review analyzes significantly amended or new commitments (Section I), provides a general update on implementation progress (Section II), and evaluates the refresh process (Section III).

## Section I. Action Plan Refresh

Include a headline of 2-3 sentences in bold text summarizing the country’s action plan refresh process and whether they added or significantly amended any commitments.

**For example: Libertainia amended five commitments to align with the government’s 2026-2036 Anti-Corruption Strategy. This raised the ambition for commitments on open contracting and beneficial ownership transparency. The OGP Steering Committee met four times to discuss and reach a consensus on amendments.**

Briefly summarize (1 paragraph max) the refresh process, including how amendments or new commitments were decided and whether the process was participatory. Include any contextual factors (elections, social movements, world events, legal changes, government strategies, etc.) that influenced the refreshed action plan. Note if a country incorporated IRM recommendations from the Action Plan Review into the refreshed action plan.<sup>1</sup>

Provide a brief overview (1 paragraph max) of the changes made to the action plan. Note whether these changes impacted the action plan, for example, changing the overall ambition, measurability, or feasibility. You can include any overarching recommendations for implementation for refreshed commitments. [Note: If a country added any commitments to their action plan before the midpoint, also include those in the table and analysis.]

Guidance: Commitments are considered ‘significantly amended’ if the changes led to new codings in either verifiability, open government lens, or potential for results. Examples of significant amendments could include changes to the commitment’s objective, expected outputs or results, milestones, timeline, implementers, etc. If there were any commitments with major changes to the text but no resulting coding changes, discuss with IRM staff whether to include them in this table and add a citation flagging these commitments.

If there are no new or significantly amended commitments, delete Table 1 and renumber Table 2. Use this section to explain why no new commitments or significant changes were made.

### Table 1. Refresh Commitments Review

**[Do not change]** Table 1 assesses all new or significantly amended commitments in COUNTRY’s refreshed action plan.<sup>2</sup> For information on IRM methodology, see the IRM Procedures Manual.<sup>3</sup>

<b>Commitment [#]: [Short Title—can be edited by staff to make it self-explanatory]</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verifiable: [Yes/No]</li> <li>• Does it have an open government lens? [Yes/No]</li> <li>• Potential for results: [Unclear/Modest/Substantial]</li> </ul> <p>* This commitment was significantly amended during the refresh process. Therefore, the IRM changed this coding from what was initially determined in the Action Plan Review. [Add an asterisk next to any coding that changed due to amendments and include this corresponding note. Delete for new commitments.]</p>
<p>In around 200 words, briefly describe the commitment and the following: If the commitment was amended, explain what changed and how this impacted the commitment coding. If the commitment is new, briefly explain the logic behind the ‘potential for results’ coding. If known, explain why the commitment was amended or added to the action plan. Note if the country</p>

identified it as a Challenge commitment. Highlight any key challenges, possibilities, or recommendations for implementation.

**Commitment [#]: [Short Title—can be edited by staff to make it self-explanatory]**

- Verifiable: [Yes/No]
- Does it have an open government lens? [Yes/No]
- Potential for results: [Unclear/Modest/Substantial]

\* This commitment was significantly amended during the refresh process. Therefore, the IRM changed this coding from what was initially determined in the Action Plan Review. [Add an asterisk next to any coding that changed due to amendments and include this corresponding note. Delete for new commitments.]

Same guidance as above.

**Commitment [#]: [Short Title—can be edited by staff to make it self-explanatory]**

- Verifiable: [Yes/No]
- Does it have an open government lens? [Yes/No]
- Potential for results: [Unclear/Modest/Substantial]

\* This commitment was significantly amended during the refresh process. Therefore, the IRM changed this coding from what was initially determined in the Action Plan Review. [Add an asterisk next to any coding that changed due to amendments and include this corresponding note. Delete for new commitments.]

Same guidance as above.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please cite sources as endnotes at the end of each section throughout the report. The IRM uses the Chicago Manual note style for citations. Sources can be cited as follows: First name Last name (Job title, Organization), interview by/correspondence with researcher, DD Month YYYY. Examples:

- Mia Katan (Senior IRM Research Officer, Open Government Partnership), interview by IRM researcher, 30 April 2024.

Documents and websites can be cited as follows: Author name (if provided), document or website title, date of publication or access for websites, weblink. Examples:

- Carina Paju, "Four Steps towards Fiscal Openness," Open Government Partnership, 5 June 2024, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/stories/four-steps-towards-fiscal-openness>.

<sup>2</sup> [Link to country's refresh action plan](#)

<sup>3</sup> Independent Reporting Mechanism. Procedures Manual. 2025. <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/irm-guidance-overview/>

## Section II. Implementation Update<sup>1</sup>

**Include a headline of 2-3 sentences in bold text summarizing the status of implementation at the midpoint. Note if implementation is progressing or not, particularly for commitments highlighted as promising in the Action Plan Review or [Open Gov Challenge submissions](#).**

**For example: Implementation of Libertainia’s 2023-2027 action plan is progressing across all commitments. Commitments advancing anti-corruption reforms have made the most progress as they align with the government’s anti-corruption agenda. Looking ahead, the OGP Steering Committee can strategize resource mobilization to ensure Libertainia’s justice commitments achieve their potential.**

Guidance: The objective of this section is to provide an informal and high-level overview of the status of implementation. This includes a status update on promising or Challenge commitments, particularly those progressing well or where implementation has not gone as expected. This section is **not** a detailed implementation analysis as done in Results Reports. It can focus on the status of the most important milestones of the most ambitious commitments, complementing the general description of implementation progress as a whole.

This section should not be much longer than a page in length. Language used in this section should make clear that this is a general review, based on light-touch research. Do **not** use IRM indicator language (moderate results, substantial completion, etc.) to avoid confusion with a comprehensive and formal IRM assessment.

The first paragraph should note whether implementation is running on schedule or not, according to the available evidence, and can flag any major delays or accomplishments. Note any significant and overarching obstacles to implementation. For example, have there been any notable changes to the context (i.e., elections, global events) that impacted implementation? State to what extent evidence of implementation is available online (ex: the country’s OGP website, repository, social media, or ministry websites, etc.). Address to what extent is there evidence of implementation progress across commitments.

The following paragraph(s) can highlight commitments considered ‘promising’ in the country’s Action Plan Review and/or Open Gov Challenge submissions. If relevant, it can also address other commitments with notable evidence of progress. For these commitments, include information to the extent there is readily available evidence on:

- The completion status of milestones, particularly the most ambitious activities
- Any significant inhibiting/contributing factors to implementation progress
- If evidence suggests little or no progress for promising or Challenge commitments
- Whether highlighted commitments are indicative of progress across the action plan as a whole or are exceptional
- Any key recommendations for implementation

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: This section provides an informal overview of the action plan’s implementation status at the midpoint. It is based on information available online or, if necessary, on evidence provided by key stakeholders. It focuses on commitments identified as promising in the Action Plan Review, submitted under the Open Gov Challenge, or where there is notable evidence of progress online. The IRM will carry out a formal and comprehensive assessment of commitments’ level of completion and early results in the Results Report at the end of the implementation period.

## Section III. Participation & Co-Creation

**[Do not change]** The IRM uses the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards to assess countries' participatory practices throughout the action plan cycle.<sup>1</sup> Countries are encouraged to aim for the full ambition of the standards and to meet the minimum requirements.<sup>2</sup> As COUNTRY's action plan falls under a grace period, this assessment does not have implications for its status in the partnership.

Guidance: Refer to the IRM Handbook for guidance on assessing compliance for each minimum requirement. Note that the answer must be 'yes' to all the questions below for the minimum requirement to have been met.

**Table 2. Alignment with Minimum Requirements at the Midpoint**

Minimum requirement	Met?
<b>1.1 Space for dialogue:</b> During the first two years of implementation, was there a space for dialogue with basic rules publicly available? Has the space for dialogue met at least once every six months? Highlight any changes since the Action Plan Review and cite evidence.	Yes/No
<b>2.1 OGP website:</b> During the first two years of implementation, was a public OGP website with at least the latest action plan maintained? Highlight any changes since the Action Plan Review and cite evidence.	Yes/No
<b>2.2 Repository:</b> During the first two years of implementation, was there a public repository with at least one piece of evidence on co-creation and one piece of evidence of implementation? Was the repository updated at least every six months? Highlight any changes since the Action Plan Review and cite evidence.	Yes/No
<b>3.1 Advanced notice:</b> Was a timeline and overview of opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the action plan refresh published on the country's OGP website at least two weeks before the start of the refresh process? Cite evidence.	Yes/No
<b>4.1 Reasoned response:</b> During the refresh process, were contributions from stakeholders documented? Did the multi-stakeholder forum or government report back or publish feedback to stakeholders on how their contributions were considered during the action plan refresh? Cite evidence.	Yes/No
<b>5.1 Open implementation:</b> During the first two years of implementation, were meetings held with civil society stakeholders to present implementation progress at least twice a year? Could civil society provide comments at the meetings? Cite evidence.	Yes/No

This brief was written by IRM researcher NAME in collaboration with IRM staff and reviewed by external reviewer NAME.

<sup>1</sup> "OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards," Open Government Partnership. 2021.

<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>; Open Government Partnership National Handbook, <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/ogp-national-handbook-rules-and-guidance-for-participants-2024/>.

<sup>2</sup> "IRM Guidelines for the Assessment of Minimum Requirements," Independent Reporting Mechanism, 2022.

[https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-Requirements\\_20220531\\_EN.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/IRM-Guidelines-for-Assessment-of-Minimum-Requirements_20220531_EN.pdf).