

# **OGP Action Framework**

---

**Updating OGP's Action  
Framework to be Future  
Ready and Fit-for-Purpose**

**February 4, 2026**

**Open  
Government  
Partnership**



# **Table of Contents**

<b>Background of the Action Framework Review Process</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive summary of changes and the rationale for them</b>	<b>4</b>
Snapshot of changes to the Action Framework	5
<b>Updates to the Action Framework</b>	<b>7</b>
1. Separate assessment of minimum required levels of activity from the assessment of the Participation and Co-Creation Standards	7
Maintaining active status in OGP	7
Procedures for members who do not maintain the minimum level of activity required: support measures and progressive consequences	8
Exploring the introduction of an observer category	9
2. Introduce flexibility in process and timelines to enable members to maximize the Action Framework in ways that best fit their own contexts	9
Single flexible framework for co-creating open government action commitments	10
Core expectations of co-creation for all national members	10
3. Introduce proportional consequences for not meeting minimum requirements for co-creation and to update the current minimums.	12
Standards and minimum requirements	12
Proportional consequences for technical and fundamental concerns	13
Approach and processes to address concerns in co-creation and participation	13
<b>Reviewing implications of the changes for the IRM</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Suggested approach for transitioning members to the new action framework</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex</b>	<b>16</b>
OGP’s Participation and Co-creation Standards and corresponding Minimum Requirements	16

# Background of the Action Framework Review Process

---

OGP is approaching its 15th year at a time when open government is both more needed and more challenged than ever. Over the past decade, the OGP model has proven it works: [meaningful participation through co-creation](#), i.e. working in the spirit of OGP’s Co-Creation and Participation Standards with multistakeholder spaces, high-quality dialogue, and government responsiveness, leads to more ambitious reforms, better implementation, and stronger results for governments and citizens. However, while this model has enabled thousands of reforms across more than 70 countries and hundreds of local governments, it has also revealed limitations. Members face diverse political realities, policy and institutional cycles, and feedback from the community shows that OGP’s processes can sometimes feel rigid, difficult to align with national priorities, or not fully fit in certain contexts.

In response, the OGP Steering Committee created the [Action Framework Task Force](#) to review and update the rules, guidance, and communications around the National Action Plans. The goal of this process was to make OGP’s processes more user-friendly, adaptable to diverse national contexts, and aligned with current and future political realities. It focused on the action framework coordinated at the national level and did not propose changes to the OGP Local framework. It supports greater collaboration across multiple levels of government, and more closely aligns the national and OGP Local frameworks.

The review was designed in three phases. Phase one introduced a [temporary moratorium](#) on elements of OGP rules. Phase two focused on developing proposals to update the Framework, informed by stakeholder input, while ensuring that core principles of co-creation, action, and accountability remain intact and that changes can be implemented with current resources. Phase three addressed further necessary adjustments, with the timing determined by the urgency, scope, and expected impact of the changes.

To ensure the review and its outcomes reflected the perspectives of the OGP community, stakeholders were engaged in multiple ways:

- Input gathered during the development of the OGP 2023–2027 strategy and Steering Committee discussions throughout 2024 and 2025 served as the foundation for the review.
- Between May and August 2025, the Task Force conducted surveys and virtual consultations with OGP Points of Contact and key civil society organizations from a diverse set of countries representing the range of political, economic, and social contexts across the partnership—as well as different income levels, maturity levels of open government agendas, and OGP process experience. Their perspectives were essential to shaping an improved Framework and informing an initial proposal.
- Additional consultations were held on the proposals, including: in-person discussions at the OGP Camp in October 2025 focused on the flexibility introduced in the action options; an online survey and open virtual consultation sessions led by the Task Force Chairs between October and November 2025, covering all aspects of the proposal. The Independent Experts’ Panel, which oversees the IRM, was also briefed on the proposed changes and provided input.

The Action Framework Task Force and the Support Unit & IRM reviewed all consultation feedback to update the Action Framework. A summary of the feedback is provided in the [What We Heard Report](#). The Action Framework Updated was discussed and endorsed by the Criteria and Standards (C&S) Subcommittee and was approved by the full Steering Committee on February 4, 2026.

# Executive summary of the changes and the rationale for them

---

Across the first phase of consultations, stakeholders told us that while OGP's current system has important strengths—especially National Action Plans, which many see as helpful for organizing reforms—the overall framework is too rigid, complex, and difficult to adapt to different national contexts. They felt timelines do not always match political and budget cycles, rules can be confusing, and the process can become overly procedural rather than genuinely strategic. Co-creation spaces were valued, but many warned that without clear political backing, they risk becoming symbolic rather than influential. Stakeholders also underlined the need for clearer communication, more practical guidance, better resourcing, and more accessible reporting through the IRM.

In the second phase, upon review of a concrete set of suggested changes, stakeholders were broadly supportive of the direction proposed. They strongly supported introducing more flexibility in how countries can participate (such as allowing different ways to submit reforms, outside of a single fixed action plan cycle), provided they come with strong guardrails, consistent expectations, and simple guidance. Participants welcomed the proposal to separate the assessment of whether a member is active (engaged in implementing commitments) from the assessment of how well they perform on co-creating commitments with civil society. They broadly endorsed proportional consequences for meeting the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards and their minimum requirements, where technical or procedural issues trigger support and guidance, while fundamental breaches or repeated failures lead to stronger and more visible accountability measures. At the same time, they stressed that any consequences must be fair, consistent, and sensitive to difficult political contexts.

Across both phases, a few overarching messages stood out. Stakeholders want an Action Framework that is simpler, clearer, and easier to navigate, but still maintains high standards for participation, transparency, and accountability. They want OGP to provide more support, guidance, and peer learning, while ensuring that governments remain accountable for meaningful co-creation and implementation in the spirit of the Participation and Co-creation Standards. Overall, what we heard is a call for a modernized Action Framework that balances flexibility with accountability and sustainability, enabling countries to work in ways that fit their context while still upholding the core values of open government.

The updated Action Framework consequently aims to address the feedback received, trying to strike a balance between flexibility, enabling ambition, and ensuring accountability. It does this by:

- Replacing a focus on action plans with action commitments that can be organized in different ways but must all be co-created, time-bound, and regularly reviewed. Commitments are promises for reform co-created by governments and civil society. Commitments typically include a description of the problem, concrete actions that will be taken to address the problem, and individual milestones that will be completed as part of the commitment. Commitments need to be verifiable and relevant to open government values.
- Separating activity and performance: one track assesses whether members stay active in OGP; a different track assesses whether they meet the Participation and Co-Creation Standards.
- Introducing flexible timelines and formats so members can sync OGP with domestic political, budget, and reform cycles.

- Moving to proportional, staged consequences for not meeting minimums, with clear public signals and stronger implications for governance roles, voting rights, and awards.
- Triggering corresponding changes to the IRM, which will adapt its products and review cycles to reflect the new framework and to address feedback received since the introduction of the last IRM Refresh.

Ultimately, the updated Action Framework furthers [OGP's theory of change](#). It aims to strengthen the mechanisms and processes for enabling collaborative co-creation between governments, civil society, and other stakeholders in the pursuit of open government reforms, alongside independent monitoring, to foster a virtuous cycle of iterative dialogue and learning, built on country ownership and core principles of transparency, accountability, and participation. By introducing greater clarity, flexibility, and proportional, escalating consequences for failure to meet co-creation and participation standards, the Framework seeks to better align OGP commitments with national priorities and processes, strengthen ownership and sustainability of reforms, prioritize genuine dialogue and collaboration over externally imposed timelines and processes, and safeguard OGP's credibility and governance against openwashing.

## Snapshot of changes to the Action Framework

Area	From	To	What It Means
<b>Core unit of action</b>	Fixed national action plans as the primary unit of action	Flexible action commitments (which can be grouped into plans, submitted individually, in batches, or on a rolling basis), including those from different branches of government	Members choose the approach that best fits their context, as long as commitments are co-created, time-bound, and the choices are made in consultation with their OGP multistakeholder forum or participants in their regular, ongoing space for dialogue and are clearly communicated to OGP.
<b>Timelines &amp; delivery</b>	Fixed plan cycles and narrow windows for development, implementation, and review	Flexible timelines and delivery windows for introducing, adjusting, and reviewing commitments	Easier alignment with national planning, electoral, and budget cycles; emphasis on ongoing dialogue rather than one-off cycles; emphasis on quality/substance over getting things done by an arbitrarily set deadline.
<b>Procedural review</b>	Single procedural review that blends commitment activity and co-creation performance	Separate tracks: minimum activity assessment and co-creation/participation assessment. Both of these are defined further in this document.	Clearer, fairer reviews that distinguish between different issues and allow support and consequences to be applied appropriately.

<b>Area</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>What It Means</b>
<b>Activity status and review</b>	Less clear progression of review.notification → under review → inactive → withdrawal.Limited visibility and differentiation of disincentives: Inactive members cannot stand for governance roles.	Clearer progression of activity review: notification → inactivity watch list → inactive status → withdrawalGreater visibility and more disincentives: members on inactivity watch list cannot stand or hold governance roles without a plan to resume activity. Inactive members cannot stand for or hold governance roles, lose voting rights, and are ineligible for awards. Lists are public and status noted on member pages.	Clear expectations to maintain at least one active commitment, with visible, escalating, and expanded consequences for prolonged inactivity. Easy transition back to active status.
<b>Consequences for not meeting minimum requirements for co-creation</b>	Largely uniform consequences regardless of type or severity of non-compliance	Proportional consequences distinguishing technical issues from fundamental concerns.	Technical issues trigger prompt notification, support and are published; fundamental concerns trigger staged review, probation, and ultimately withdrawal.
<b>Co-creation &amp; participation review</b>	Less clear progression of review: notification → under review → inactive → withdrawalLimited visibility and differentiation of disincentives: Members under review cannot stand for governance roles.	Clearer & better aligned progress of performance review: review → probation → withdrawalGreater visibility and more disincentives: members under review cannot stand or hold governance roles without a plan to resume activity. Members under probation cannot stand for or hold governance roles, lose voting rights, and are ineligible for awards. Lists are public and status noted on member pages.	Stronger incentives to remediate and clearer public signaling of status and seriousness of concerns.
<b>IRM role &amp; products</b>	IRM products tightly linked to the traditional action plan cycle.	IRM re-examining the frequency and timing with which OGP Standards, commitment implementation, and outcomes of a members' open government efforts would be assessed under the new Framework.	Aiming for more focused assessment of both process quality and impact, aligned with the new flexible Action Framework. Details to follow.
<b>Observer category</b>	Does not exist.	Exploring the introduction of an observer category for near-eligible countries that meet the Values Check	Opens a track for committed near eligible countries to make concrete commitments to become eligible and access support.

# Updates to the Action Framework

There are three main updates to the Action Framework:

1. Separate assessment of minimum required levels of activity from the assessment of the Participation and Co-Creation Standards.
2. Introduce flexibility in process and timelines to enable members to maximize the Action Framework in ways that best fit their own contexts.
3. Introduce proportional consequences for not meeting minimum requirements for co-creation, and to update the current minimums.

## 1 Separate assessment of minimum required levels of activity from the assessment of the Participation and Co-Creation Standards

The current [Procedural Review](#) conflates member activity with performance in meeting OGP's Participation and Co-creation Standards, obscuring the rationale for a member's OGP standing and review status. The updated Action Framework separates the assessment of members maintaining a minimum level of activity in OGP from the assessment of whether or not they meet the minimum requirements for co-creation and participation.

This section outlines the expectations for members in maintaining active status in OGP and the approach to be taken when they are unable to do so.

### MAINTAINING ACTIVE STATUS IN OGP

Members are expected to pursue ambitious open government reforms and demonstrate a minimum level of activity in OGP to maintain membership. Under the updated Action Framework, to maintain the minimum level of activity, no more than 12 months should pass without having at least one active commitment from the national executive under implementation, submitted by the Point of Contact (PoC) as part of the country's portfolio of commitments (including any Open Gov Challenge Commitments that are co-created with civil society which are submitted by, in communication or coordination with the PoC).

- An active commitment is understood as a commitment that has been officially submitted to OGP, is under implementation, and has not yet been completed or closed according to the commitment timeline. Activity is therefore not limited to the launch of new commitments; continued implementation of existing commitments with remaining milestones can also satisfy activity requirements.
- Responsibility for maintaining the minimum level of activity and active status rests with the national executive, which holds OGP membership and signs up to the Partnership. For this reason, at least one active commitment must be led or coordinated through the national executive and included as part of the member's portfolio of OGP commitments.

When the minimum level of activity is not met, four stages of support and consequences follow. These are described in the next section.

## PROCEDURES FOR MEMBERS WHO DO NOT MAINTAIN THE MINIMUM LEVEL OF ACTIVITY REQUIRED: SUPPORT MEASURES AND PROGRESSIVE CONSEQUENCES

There are four stages between a member being assessed for the first time as not maintaining the minimum level of activity and eventual withdrawal, if remedial actions are not taken. The progression is set up to be automatic, fair, and transparent, while still encouraging support and re-engagement at every stage. Please note, in stage 1, it is possible that a member may not have an active commitment under implementation but could be actively co-creating new commitments. Therefore stage 1 actions are not designed to be punitive and are limited to notification and offers of support, as needed.

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
Member is notified about the lack of activity at the 12 month mark of not having active commitments	Member is placed under an inactivity watch list after 2 years of not having active commitments	Member is designated as inactive after 3 years of not having active commitments	Membership is automatically withdrawn after 4 years of not having active commitments
The OGP Support Unit notifies the government that no commitments have been received or are currently active at the 12 month mark, inquiring plans for co-creation and encouraging action. The Support Unit and Criteria & Standards Subcommittee offer support and outreach to encourage activity. Notification is sent to the OGP point of contact and/or to the Ministerial POC, based on the reasons for delay.	The member is placed under an inactivity watch list. The Support Unit and Criteria & Standards Subcommittee offer support and outreach to encourage activity. During this time, the country cannot hold or stand for governance roles within OGP, unless the government communicates a clear timeline for restoring activity. The inactivity watch list is published on the OGP website and maintained. Notification is sent to the Ministerial POC.	The member is automatically designated as inactive. The Support Unit and Criteria & Standards Subcommittee continue to offer support and outreach to encourage re-engagement. Inactive countries cannot stand for or hold governance roles, lose voting rights and are not eligible for awards. A list of countries with inactive status is published on the OGP website and maintained. Notification is sent to the Ministerial POC.	Membership is automatically withdrawn. To rejoin, the country would need to reapply as a new member and meet OGP's eligibility criteria, including the Values Check. Notification is sent to the Ministerial POC.

**Reactivation:** Countries in stage 1, 2, or 3 can return to active status at any time by demonstrating that they have launched implementation of at least one new active OGP commitment. Countries in stage 4 are automatically withdrawn and would need to reapply to join the partnership and submit new commitment(s) to be reinstated as a member.

**Application to other branches and levels of government engaged in OGP:** Under the proposed framework, commitments developed by other branches of government, autonomous institutions, or subnational governments may be included as part of a member's portfolio of commitments to OGP, in coordination with the national POC or submitted as standalone commitments from those institutions. When a member is undergoing activity review or co-creation performance review process, commitments from other branches and levels of government can continue to be submitted to OGP, but these do not affect the review processes, since the national executive bears responsibility for maintaining a minimum level of activity as outlined above.

Should a member be withdrawn from OGP for failure to meet the minimum levels of activity or failure to address fundamental concerns in their co-creation process (stages and process for how these will be reviewed are described later in this document), then commitments from other branches and levels of government will no longer be accepted by OGP. This does not apply to OGP Local members that are governed by OGP Local rules.

Reformers working on open government across any level and branch of government, and civil society are welcome to remain part of the global OGP community, even upon a member's withdrawal from OGP.

## EXPLORING THE INTRODUCTION OF AN OBSERVER CATEGORY

In addition to the action framework flexibility, an observer category may be introduced for those countries that are near-eligible to join OGP (meeting at least 50% of core eligibility requirements and the Values Check) and make commitments towards achieving eligibility. This track will need to be further developed, if there is Steering Committee consensus to explore this further. This includes specifying thresholds at which observer status may be granted, the associated expectations and support provided, the role and involvement of civil society, duration and timelines for observer status to be accorded. Further development of this track is subject to OGP Steering Committee approval as a separate item.

## 2 Introduce flexibility in process and timelines to enable members to maximize the Action Framework in ways that best fit their own contexts

Action on open government is at the heart of the OGP model, and the action plan has been a valuable tool for advancing open government and engaging stakeholders. However, there is a recognition of the need for flexibility in process and timelines so that members can use the Action Framework in the way that best fits their political, institutional, and budgetary contexts. This flexibility is intended to help members align OGP processes with their national planning and reform cycles, focus on substance over procedure, and advance their open government aims more effectively while maintaining strong co-creation and accountability standards.

This section sets out the framework, which entails a shift from action plans to action commitments, which may be presented as action plans with defined start and end dates or in different ways.

## SINGLE FLEXIBLE FRAMEWORK FOR CO-CREATING OPEN GOVERNMENT ACTION COMMITMENTS

All OGP members are expected to develop open government action commitments through a process of regular, ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogue, adhering to OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards and subject to accountability. A member's approach to co-creating action commitments should be able to fit with their domestic policy planning, budget and political cycles.

OGP provides national members with a flexible action framework that allows them to plan, develop, and report open government reforms in the way that best fits their reality.

They can choose to:

- Develop and submit all commitments co-created through a centrally co-ordinated process at the same time, presented within a national action plan with defined start and end dates for the plan. Commitments may have different start and end dates within the plan's duration.
- Develop and submit commitments co-created through independent processes one by one or in batches as opportunities arise, with varying implementation dates within a fixed period.
- Combine both of the above approaches.
- Develop and submit commitments one by one or in batches as opportunities arise, with varying implementation dates within a rolling action plan. Note: this option will be piloted in 2026 with select members and will be rolled out as an option for others once the OGP SU and the IRM develop guidelines for the same.

No matter the approach and format chosen, all commitments must be co-created, clearly communicated to OGP, and regularly reviewed. All commitments must have clear, targeted start and end dates.

**Note:** Commitments may be co-created through decentralized or standalone processes, which involve stakeholders beyond those that are part of the OGP multistakeholder forum. The onus of sharing evidence that an OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards' compliant process happened, including meeting the minimum requirements, is on the member.

## CORE EXPECTATIONS OF CO-CREATION FOR ALL NATIONAL MEMBERS

### Developing action commitments

Members develop concrete open government action commitments through co-creation with civil society and other stakeholders.

- Commitments can be developed together as part of a single plan with fixed start and end dates (like the current National Action Plan), introduced individually or as opportunities arise or a combination of approaches.
- Decisions on what approach will be undertaken by a member should be taken in consultation with members of the OGP multistakeholder forum or participants in the space used for regular, ongoing dialogue.

- A set of commitments, when introduced within an action plan, should last at least one year and no longer than six years (note: this is the longest possible term of an elected government/parliament among OGP members). Members can determine start and end dates of their commitments and/or action plans, based on what works for their electoral and budgetary cycles or other domestic planning processes. Action plans and commitments may be amended through a co-review process during the period of implementation, which allows for changes to be made should there be any unanticipated changes in a government's tenure or other processes that impact the continuity of the plan or commitments contained within it. Commitments from one plan can be continued into the next to ensure reform continuity. More information on adding, modifying and reviewing commitments is in the section below.
- Each commitment must include key information required such as: lead institution, the problem being addressed, the proposed solution, milestones, and timeline for implementation.
- The PoC shares information about the country's overall approach and all active commitments with the OGP Support Unit and the IRM.
- Commitments co-created by other branches or agencies through processes separate from the centrally coordinated process must be communicated through or shared with via the POC to be considered part of the country's OGP action commitments.
- Commitments developed entirely outside this central process and intended to serve as standalone plans from national parliaments, judiciaries, and autonomous institutions will also be accepted by OGP and presented on a country's member page. However, the review of a member's adherence to the OGP Activity and Participation and Co-creation Standards focuses on the centrally coordinated national process, led/co-led by the executive branch. This is to ensure a basic level of political ownership and accountability for the country's participation in OGP through the national executive which signs up to join OGP.

## **Adding, modifying and reviewing commitments**

- Members can add, extend, shorten, modify, and drop commitments or amend their scope or ownership as needed, provided these changes are co-reviewed and agreed with members of the OGP multistakeholder forum, relevant multistakeholder working groups or alternative spaces for dialogue and clearly communicated to OGP.
- The process for any changes due to co-review should be held to the same standard of co-creation. All these decisions must be clearly communicated with the Support Unit at the time of submitting updated commitments.
- At least every two years, members should take stock of their open government action commitments, reviewing progress, identifying next steps with stakeholders, following processes similar to those established for the mid-term refresh of the current four-year national action plans.

Illustrative examples of how members may benefit from the flexibility offered whilst maintaining ongoing dialogue and collaboration between stakeholders and remaining accountable will be provided in updated guidance materials to be developed by the Support Unit, upon the approval of this proposal.

# 3

## Introduce proportional consequences for not meeting minimum requirements for co-creation and to update the current minimums

Collaboration between government, civil society, and other stakeholders is at the heart of the OGP process and is referred to as co-creation. The [OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards](#) guide this collaboration throughout all stages of the OGP process. The Standards are structured in a way that encourages members to strive for ambition. Each Standard also has minimum requirements that members must meet and are encouraged to exceed where possible.

The section below outlines updates to the text of the Standards and their minimum requirements based on changes introduced in the updated Action Framework. It also outlines the changes to consequences for not meeting the minimums, including the approach applied to members who are unable to meet them.

### STANDARDS AND MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

All OGP participating countries are expected to adhere to the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards. There are five Standards and each Standard includes clear and measurable minimum requirements that all OGP participating countries must meet.

The text of the Standards and the minimum requirements will be updated to reflect the following changes:

- Update the language to reflect the flexibility introduced in the updated action framework, including replacing references to action plans with action commitments, which encompass action plans, while allowing for the different approaches offered under the updated framework.
- Revise the minimum requirements for the Standards so that compliance with each Standard can be assessed during the development, implementation, and biennial refresh of action commitments/plans, as relevant. This will also include updating the timebound elements of the minimum requirements and references to specific formats/channels for information sharing and gathering.

See [Annex 1](#) for details on the current Participation and Co-Creation Standards with an annotation of the indicative updates required. The precise changes needed will be made under the guidance and oversight of the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee of the Steering Committee.

The IRM assesses all minimum requirements when it conducts its assessments of the co-creation and participation process, which will cover both the development and implementation of action commitments. A fundamental concern arises when a member does not meet at least one of the Standards (e.g. establishing a space for ongoing dialogue or providing a reasoned response during the co-creation of commitments). In contrast, technical concerns relate to how minimum requirements under a given standard are met, for example, issues related to timing, format, documentation or frequency of engagement.

Both types of concerns, once assessed by the IRM, are published and notified to the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee (C&S) by the Support Unit. C&S will have the authority to consider further contextual information before determining whether to place a member under the co-creation and participation review process detailed below.

Additionally, if the IRM assesses that a country has made no progress on the implementation of any of its commitments, this would also be notified to the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee as a fundamental concern.

## PROPORTIONAL CONSEQUENCES FOR TECHNICAL AND FUNDAMENTAL CONCERNS

The IRM will assess whether or not a country meets minimum requirements of the Participation and Co-creation Standards. Members are required to provide evidence for meeting the Standards and the minimum requirements, regardless of the approach and format they choose for their action commitments.

Findings of the IRM reviews are published, and all countries are encouraged and supported to make continual progress, with support extended from the Steering Committee, peer countries, and the OGP Support Unit.

There are proportionate consequences based on whether a co-creation process is found to have technical or fundamental concerns:

- If a concern is assessed to be a procedural or technical issue, the member is notified that the requirement has not been met, and advice is provided to the member along with an offer of support from the Support Unit or a peer country to help them address the issue. Whether or not a member meets each of the requirements is noted and published.
- If a concern is assessed to be fundamental, amounting to serious issues in the co-creation process, the member is notified and placed in a participation and co-creation review process. Members then progress through stages of the review process.

The C&S subcommittee is responsible for assessing whether countries found to have fundamental concerns with their process must be placed under review. In doing so, it considers any contextual information further to the initial assessment of the IRM. These considerations could include any information to suggest if there are any extraneous, one-off, or timing related challenges that are responsible for resulting in the fundamental concerns. In the absence of such additional information, Criteria and Standards places the country under co-creation and participation review.

## APPROACH AND PROCESSES TO ADDRESS CONCERNS IN CO-CREATION AND PARTICIPATION

**Technical concerns:** When technical concerns are found in the IRM's assessment of a member, the Support Unit and Criteria & Standards Subcommittee offer support and outreach to encourage remediation. Technical concerns with a members' process are listed on the member pages.

**Fundamental concerns:** The following stages of review follow in cases where Criteria and Standards confirms the IRM assessment of a fundamental concern. This applies each time one or more fundamental concerns are identified in the IRM's assessment of co-creation and participation, that are confirmed by Criteria and Standards. The consequences are progressive if members are found to have fundamental concerns for consecutive assessment periods.

**Note:** Section 4 outlines changes to when and how the IRM might assess co-creation and participation moving forward, however, the final products, their scope, and timing will be developed and agreed upon during the first half of 2026.

<b>First instance of a fundamental concern</b>	<b>Second consecutive instance of a fundamental concern</b>	<b>Third consecutive instance of a fundamental concern</b>
<b>Member is placed under co-creation and participation review.</b>	<b>Member is placed under probation.</b>	<b>Membership is withdrawn.</b>  C&S may choose to extend probation if a member is able to present sufficient evidence and plans for timely remediation.
<p>The member enters a co-creation and participation review.</p> <p>The Support Unit and Criteria &amp; Standards Subcommittee offer support and outreach to encourage remediation. The country cannot hold or stand for governance roles within OGP, unless the government submits a plan or roadmap for remediation. Countries under review are listed as such on the OGP website. A list of countries under co-creation review is published and maintained.</p>	<p>The member is placed under probation.</p> <p>The Support Unit and Criteria &amp; Standards Subcommittee continue to offer support and outreach to encourage remediation. Countries under probation cannot hold or stand for governance and voting rights and are not eligible for awards. Countries under probation are listed as such on the OGP website. A list of countries under probation is published and maintained.</p>	<p>Membership is automatically withdrawn.</p> <p>To rejoin, the country would need to reapply as a new member and meet OGP's eligibility criteria, including the Values Check, and present a plan for how it intends to remedy the causes for previous withdrawal.</p>

## Reviewing implications of the changes for the IRM

The IRM is not directly within the scope of the Action Framework Review, and changes to its methodology or charter are governed by the Independent Experts' Panel (IEP). However, any changes to the Action Framework inevitably require the IRM to respond.

To prepare for this transition, the IRM is commissioning an options paper to examine potential changes to IRM products, their scope and timing in light of the updates to the Action Framework. Inputs and changes from the Action Framework review alongside further consultation will inform this paper. Further consultations will be held with members of the IEP, Criteria & Standards Subcommittee, IRM researchers and OGP members on these options, before they are approved by the IEP and the Steering Committee. This work is due to be carried out between January - June 2026.

The updated Action Framework already highlights some questions the IRM may need to address as it considers how best to align its approach. For example, the introduction of more flexible timelines and modalities for submitting commitments may require revisiting how IRM assessments are organized and sequenced. Such flexibility complicates the current IRM model in which adherence to the Participation and Co-Creation Standards is assessed alongside the implementation and results of reforms. As a result, the IRM has noted the need to re-examine the frequency and timing with which co-creation standards, commitment implementation, and outcomes of a member's open government efforts are assessed under the new Framework. The review process will also take into account feedback received to date on improving the IRM's effectiveness as a learning and accountability mechanism.

To manage the development and transition to the new approach, in 2026 the IRM decided the following:

- The production of Action Plan Reviews for any action plans received after 4 February 2026 (date of approval of the proposal) will be paused.
- The production of Co-Creation Briefs after 4 February 2026 will be similarly paused, but recommendations for co-creation from the IRM can be provided upon request.
- Results Reports and Midterm Reviews for four year plans will continue to be published throughout 2026.

The IEP and Criteria and Standards Subcommittees will work closely together to transition the IRM to its new model and methodology, after which the IRM will develop and publish products on the approved schedule.

## **Suggested approach for transitioning members to the new action framework**

---

The adoption of the updated Action Framework requires updating OGP's rules, guidance, and other documents and the transition of members for full implementation of the framework. It is important that the process is not disruptive to members' ongoing or planned efforts and that the transition is applied simultaneously to all members, to avoid a situation in which different members are governed by different rules and guidelines, creating confusion. The change process that will need to be managed by the Support Unit and the IRM needs to be feasible from a capacity and resourcing perspective. Therefore, the following plan will be implemented:

- The updated action framework does not prevent any OGP member from continuing to operate with their current approach to co-create action plans should they wish to continue to do so in 2026 or beyond. This will ensure minimal disruption to ongoing processes.
- The FAQs and guidance to support the new rules will be developed by the OGP Support Unit and the IRM, under the guidance of C&S and IEP respectively.
- Consequently, the Support Unit and the IRM will implement a clean transition to the new framework, its rules, and consequences, without adopting a grace period for implementation and starting the slate clean for members. Note: this does not cover or impact ongoing Response Policy cases that will continue to be governed by the Response Policy procedures.

- As noted above, to allow the IRM to develop and transition to the new approach, in 2026 the IRM will pause Action Plan Reviews for any action plans received after 4 February 2026. Co-Creation Briefs (CCBs) will be similarly paused after 4 February 2026, but recommendations for co-creation from the IRM can be provided upon request. Results Reports and Midterm Reviews for four-year plans will continue to be published throughout 2026.
- Open Gov Challenge Commitments that have already been submitted will be considered as part of a country’s portfolio of active commitments, unless communication is received to not do so from the member. Moving forward, this process would take place automatically as long as the commitments are submitted by, or in coordination or communication with the Point of Contact, noting that commitments that count towards maintaining activity in OGP must be co-created. Other eligible Challenge commitments submitted independently will continue to be accepted while the Challenge remains open. FAQs with more details on how the Challenge commitments are folded into the updated framework will be developed.

## **Annex**

### **OGP’s Participation and Co-creation Standards and corresponding Minimum Requirements**

The full text of the OGP Participation and Co-creation Standards can be found here: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>. The minimum requirements that will be assessed to identify technical and fundamental concerns with the process are listed in the table below, including information on the updates that are required to reflect the approved Action Framework.

Overall, the text of the Standards and the minimum requirements will be updated to reflect the following changes:

- Update the language to reflect the flexibility introduced in the updated Action Framework, including replacing references to *action plans* with *action commitments*, which encompass action plans, while allowing for the different approaches offered under the updated framework.
- Revise the Standards’ minimum requirements so that compliance with each Standard can be assessed during the development, implementation, and biennial refresh of action commitments/plans, as relevant. This will also include updating the timebound elements of the minimum requirements and references to specific formats/channels for information sharing and gathering. See the box below for indicative changes to follow.

#### **MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF STANDARD 1**

**Establishing a space for ongoing dialogue and collaboration between government, civil society and other non-governmental stakeholders.**

1.1 A space for ongoing dialogue with participation from both government and civil society members, and other non-governmental representatives, as appropriate, that meets regularly (at least every six months) is established. Its basic rules on participation are public.

**Notes on potential updates needed in light of the Action Framework changes:**

- Define “regularly” as meets at least twice a year.
- Move rules on participation to guidance and recommendations.

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF STANDARD 2

### Providing open, accessible and timely information about activities and progress within a member's participation in OGP.

2.1 A public OGP website dedicated to the member's participation in OGP is maintained.

2.2 A publicly available document repository on the OGP online site, which provides access to documents related to the OGP process, including, at a minimum, information and evidence of the co-creation process and of the implementation of commitments, is maintained and regularly updated (at least twice a year).

#### Notes on potential updates needed in light of the Action Framework changes:

- Update to reflect that the website and repository are not required to be distinct platforms.
- Update to reflect that a dedicated website is not required so long as information is available in the public domain and easy to find.

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF STANDARD 3

### Providing inclusive and informed opportunities for public participation during co-creation of the action commitments.

3.1 The multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) where established, or the government where there is no MSF, publishes on the OGP website/webpage the co-creation timeline and overview of the opportunities for stakeholders to participate at least two weeks before the start of the action plan development process

3.2 The MSF where established, or the government where there is no MSF, conducts outreach activities with stakeholders to raise awareness of OGP and opportunities to get involved in the development of the action plan.

3.3 The MSF where established, or the government where there is no MSF, develops a mechanism to gather inputs from a range of stakeholders during an appropriate period of time for the chosen mechanism.

#### Notes on potential updates needed in light of the Action Framework changes:

- Update to replace action plans with action commitments (which are inclusive of action plans).
- Update to reflect that co-creation timeline and process should be available before the start of the development of action commitments (include timeline recommendations in guidance).
- Update to reflect outreach and mechanisms to gather input/feedback both during the development and implementation of action commitments.

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF STANDARD 4

**Providing a reasoned response and ensuring ongoing dialogue between government and civil society and other non-governmental stakeholders as appropriate during co-creation of the action plan.**

4.1 The MSF, where established, or the government where there is no MSF, documents and reports back or publishes written feedback to stakeholders on how their contributions were considered during the development of the action plan.

### **Notes on potential updates needed in light of the Action Framework changes:**

- Update to replace action plans with action commitments (which are inclusive of action plans).
- Update to reflect reasoned response both during the development and refresh of commitments.

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF STANDARD 5

**Providing inclusive and informed opportunities for ongoing dialogue and collaboration during implementation and monitoring of the action plan.**

5.1 The MSF where established, or the government where there is no MSF, holds at least two meetings every year with civil society to present results on the implementation of the action plan and collect comments.

### **Notes on potential updates needed in light of the Action Framework changes:**

- Update to replace action plans with action commitments (which are inclusive of action plans).