

What We Heard Report

**Consultation on the OGP
Action Framework Review**

May 2025 - February 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Phase I. September 2025	4
Who we heard from	4
How we consulted	4
What we heard	4
<i>Theme 1: Making the framework clearer and easier to use</i>	6
<i>Theme 2: Making action plans more relevant and better integrated</i>	7
<i>Theme 3: Strengthening co-creation and dialogue</i>	8
<i>Theme 4: Improving learning and accountability (IRM)</i>	9
<i>Theme 5: Clarifying rules and ensuring fairness</i>	10
<i>Theme 6: Looking ahead</i>	11
Phase II. November 2025	12
Who we heard from	12
How we consulted	12
What we heard	13
<i>Views on the flexibility and design of the action options</i>	14
<i>Expectations for standards, compliance, and consequences</i>	16
<i>Perspectives on member activity, performance, and accountability</i>	18
<i>Reflections on the IRM and implications for the Action Framework</i>	20
<i>Cross cutting reflections on political will, strategic direction, and support for reformers</i>	20

Introduction

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 moments. The first introduced a [temporary moratorium](#) on elements of OGP rules. The second 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. The third 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:

- Phase 0: 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.
- Phase I: 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.
- Phase II: 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.

Phase I. September 2025

Who we heard from

The consultation brought together a diverse group of voices from across the OGP community. In total, 37 stakeholders from 23 countries contributed their perspectives.

- **Constituencies:** Responses were evenly split between government officials and civil society representatives (50/50).
- **Regions:** Participation was broad, with Europe (24%), the Americas (14%), Africa & the Middle East (14%), and Asia-Pacific (8%) represented.
- **Experience:** Most respondents were highly experienced in OGP processes; 65% had taken part in three or more action plan cycles, while only a small share (16%) were participating for the first time.

This balance of regions, sectors, and levels of experience ensured that feedback captured both long-standing perspectives and fresh insights.

How we consulted

The consultation combined several channels:

- An online survey with open-ended questions to allow detailed feedback.
- One-on-one interviews with OGP stakeholders, led by Support Unit and Steering Committee members.
- Feedback provided during meetings and events, where the OGP Support Unit used existing spaces to raise these questions and channel responses into the review.
- Additional discussions through the Action Framework Task Force and the Steering Committee.

This mix helped capture diverse perspectives, from in-depth country experiences to broader reflections on how OGP should evolve globally.

What we heard

The consultation generated a wide range of perspectives on how the Action Framework is working and where it could be improved. While there was broad alignment in most contexts on the continued importance of National Action Plans, multi-stakeholder dialogue, and the IRM as an accountability mechanism, stakeholders approached the issues from different angles depending on their roles, contexts, and experiences. Civil society respondents often emphasized the need for greater ambition, stronger accountability, and the protection of civic space. Government respondents placed more weight on feasibility, staff capacity, and the need for flexibility in rules and processes. While some focused on process design, alignment with existing governance practices, and integration with other international frameworks, others stressed the need for resources, political will, technical assistance, and visible impact on citizens' lives.

Taken together, what we heard reflects both the diversity and complexity of a global partnership. The feedback revealed not only areas of consensus but also real tensions that OGP must navigate. Some of these tensions can be addressed through the Action Framework Review, while others fall outside its scope but remain vital for the Partnership to continue to deliberate on for the long-term health of the partnership.

Across regions and sectors, some cross-cutting insights emerged most clearly:

- Stakeholders want action plans that are simultaneously more ambitious or meaningful in embedding/mainstreaming open government practice and more flexible, able to stretch goals while adapting to political and budget cycles.
- Co-creation spaces are valued, but without real political buy-in they risk becoming symbolic — a forum for dialogue that rarely shifts decisions.
- Rules and reviews need to be tough enough to protect credibility, but also fair and proportional to the context and capacity of each member, and that recognize extenuating circumstances.

The sections that follow summarize what stakeholders told us under each theme of the Action Framework Review, illustrating both areas of consensus and the nuances that reflect OGP's diverse membership. The summary is illustrated by anonymous quotes; to ensure confidentiality no identifiers are provided.

THEME 1: MAKING THE FRAMEWORK CLEARER AND EASIER TO USE

National Action Plans (NAPs) remain the cornerstone of OGP and many respondents see them as vital to OGP and open government. One respondent described NAPs as the “skeleton for all our open government work”. Respondents emphasized their value in setting priorities, structuring reforms, and creating accountability.

Yet beyond NAPs, the wider Action Framework is less clear. Some respondents admitted they had little awareness of options like the Open Gov Challenge or standalone plans for parliaments, judiciaries, and oversight bodies. One respondent stated that “the options regarding standalone plans are not clear” and another stated that “without proactive outreach from OGP, these options remain dormant.”

Others warned that overlap between NAPs and the Open Gov Challenge creates duplication. For smaller teams, the framework can feel heavy: “Undertaking a NAP absorbs all our capacity and resources.” Another respondent said that “it is not evident how to introduce options beyond NAPs without excessive additional burden.”

Participants called for practical tools to make the framework easier to navigate: visual maps, case-based examples, dedicated online guidance, and clearer communication on how different pathways complement each other: “it is important to clearly understand how these processes complement one another and contribute collectively to advancing open government across all levels of the country”. As another respondent noted, “The framework is comprehensive, but this can sometimes lead to confusion, especially for new stakeholders.”

The message is clear: NAPs are highly valued, but the overall framework needs to be simplified, made more user-friendly, and better aligned with local realities.

Stakeholders suggested several ways to make the Action Framework simpler, more flexible, and more impactful:

- **Simplify and adapt processes:** Streamline the number of options and allow more flexible timelines that align with national political, budget, and planning cycles. Use NAPs as an umbrella to integrate broader reforms, and pair clearer rules with training and guidance for stakeholders.
- **Improve clarity and accessibility:** Create clearer descriptions of all options (NAPs, Challenges, Local, etc.) on the OGP portal, complemented by practical examples, visual maps, and proactive communication with stakeholders, especially civil society and parliaments/judiciaries.
- **Build enabling conditions:** Strengthen capacity-building and awareness-raising on open government principles, ensure adequate resources and funding, and embed OGP objectives into civil servant training.
- **Encourage cooperation and peer learning:** Provide toolkits for local governments, promote multi-level governance, and enable regional and cross-border collaboration through peer networks and shared commitments.
- **Increase ambition over time:** Encourage higher ambition from members with multiple cycles by setting expectations for more transformative commitments.

THEME 2: MAKING ACTION PLANS MORE RELEVANT AND BETTER INTEGRATED

For many, NAPs play a vital role in national reform agendas: “The plans are the backbone of cultural change towards open government”. One respondent described the plan as “our national mirror, it reflects our priorities and helps us bring everyone on board.”

But others said the most important reforms often happen outside the OGP process, through national strategies or sectoral reforms. This risks making NAPs feel disconnected or secondary. One respondent observed that action plans often sit “on top of” government work rather than integrated into it, and another stated that “much of what is included in NAPs is work that is already work underway in government.”

A recurring theme was timing. Many called for action plan cycles to be aligned with elections, budget processes, or national development plans: “to fully realise its potential, our NAP needs to be better aligned with national priorities, planning cycles, and existing reform agendas” Greater integration with global agendas such as the SDGs and anti-corruption frameworks was also encouraged.

Stakeholders stressed that action plans work best when they are anchored in strong political leadership and clear institutional ownership: “[OGP NAPs] can be further enhanced through stronger political commitment”. Without these, even well-designed plans risk being sidelined.

To make action plans more strategically relevant and better embedded in national priorities, stakeholders recommended:

- **Flexibility in timing:** Allow NAP cycles to align with national political and budget calendars. This would help ensure ownership by incoming administrations and better resource allocation.
- **Integration with existing frameworks:** Link OGP commitments and processes with national development plans, sectoral strategies, and government action plans. Use NAPs as an umbrella framework to connect policy and legislative initiatives and reduce duplication.
- **Stronger institutionalization and ownership:** Assign clear institutional responsibilities for open government, embed open government objectives in civil servant training, and create policy-specific networks across countries to strengthen collaboration and identify priorities.

THEME 3: STRENGTHENING CO-CREATION AND DIALOGUE

Most respondents agreed that co-creation and multi-stakeholder forums (MSFs) are important to OGP's value, for example, "by providing a structured space focused on co-creation and concrete commitments; which distinguishes it from other forums". They were described as spaces that "encourage more than consultation, as it allows for continuous, open dialogue and genuine collaboration" and different from "other platforms that are either narrowly sectoral or lack follow-through mechanisms".

But effectiveness varies. In some contexts, MSFs are inclusive and influential. In others, they risk being formalistic or unbalanced. Some respondents highlighted cases where ambitious proposals were excluded because they did not align with government priorities. Other respondents noted that forums often serve as "matchmaking" spaces rather than channels for influencing political leadership. And a few respondents highlighted the "limited participation of other stakeholders CSOs, media and the private sector".

Respondents agreed that for co-creation to be meaningful, governments must not only invite participation but also respond to input and ensure a diversity of voices. One respondent emphasised the need for participants in the co-creation process to "reflect the diversity of the country's population, including age groups, ethnicity and income levels." Other participants emphasised the need to follow through with implementation as part of the co-creation process: "sustained engagement... during the execution of commitments shows that the process is genuine and inclusive."

Stakeholders stressed that co-creation is central to OGP and offered concrete suggestions to make it more inclusive, effective, and impactful:

- **Protect the role of co-creation:** Maintain structured spaces for collaboration, keep MSFs as keystone platforms, ensure their independence, and make their work more visible.
- **Strengthen political will and decision-making:** Involve decision-makers directly in co-creation, clarify mandates and authority, and ensure issues on the table are genuinely open for discussion.
- **Promote inclusiveness and representation:** Engage diverse and underrepresented groups, build participants' capacity to contribute effectively, fund civil society participation, and designate OGP liaisons across government.
- **Enhance MSF structure and continuity:** Ensure clear mandates, balanced participation, resources, and sustained engagement beyond NAP cycles.
- **Integrate with broader governance spaces:** Link MSFs to existing platforms such as anti-corruption bodies, EITI, or digital governance forums to strengthen relevance and reduce duplication.
- **Measure and improve process quality:** Track diversity, responsiveness, trust, and adoption of inputs. Use OGP rules and guidance as practical tools to strengthen collaboration rather than as procedural formalities.

THEME 4: IMPROVING LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY (IRM)

The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) is widely valued for providing independent assessments and accountability: “IRM is valued... for its independent, empirical assessment, especially in a context where little independent monitoring exists.” Respondents credited it with setting standards, offering visibility, and helping to measure progress.

Still, concerns surfaced around how it communicates its findings. One respondent explained: “From my experience, the IRM’s analysis provides a critical accountability function, but there is room for improving how it communicates both the ambition and outcomes of commitments” and another said that “while the IRM reports are helpful in providing structure and accountability, I do find that they are not always easily accessible to a broader audience.”

Reports are sometimes considered too technical, and there is a need for context-sensitive assessments and plainer language that civil society and government actors alike can easily use: “The IRM could improve by using more accessible language and visual summaries. Highlighting context-specific challenges and enablers would also help readers better understand performance.” Another respondent highlighted that “current terms [used by the IRM]... can be abstract, overly technical, or misinterpreted.” Several suggested that IRM recommendations should be more actionable, sharper, and better tailored to national contexts.

While these inputs highlight strong demand for improvements, members of the SC task force also noted the need to balance such expectations with the sustainability of the IRM itself, ensuring it remains rigorous, independent, and feasible within available financial and human resources.

Stakeholders see the IRM as essential for accountability and learning but stressed the need for improvements in how findings are framed, communicated, and applied:

- **Improve clarity and accessibility:** Use plainer language, visual summaries, and concrete examples to make reports more useful for non-experts and senior leadership. Provide clearer justifications for ratings.
- **Contextualize findings:** Consider tailoring assessments to country-specific realities, recognizing political context and the long-term nature of reforms.
- **Increase engagement of national actors:** Consult local stakeholders earlier in the review process and incorporate independent monitoring by CSOs to improve accuracy and credibility of findings.
- **Expand scope where relevant:** Consider assessing broader open government reforms and democratic backsliding, not just NAP commitments. Adjust timelines so governments are not penalized for reforms that take longer to show results.
- **Refine rating terminology:** Use more constructive terms like “transformative potential” (instead of “ambition”) or “tangible progress”/“foundational change” (instead of “early results”) to better reflect reform pathways and contextual challenges.

THEME 5: CLARIFYING RULES AND ENSURING FAIRNESS

OGP's rules are generally seen as clearer and consistent, but respondents expressed mixed views on how well they are enforced and whether they are fit for purpose. For some, the rules are "quite lax" and "too vague and easy for the government to sidestep". Others emphasized that "consequences lack weight", and called for stronger enforcement to protect OGP's credibility and for additional consequences for persistent non-compliance.

At the same time, a significant share of respondents stressed the need for proportionality and context sensitivity. They warned against treating minor procedural lapses the same as serious democratic backsliding, and suggested that "rules should be made more flexible and better adapted to the context of the country, especially countries which encounter challenges.". Several also urged OGP to investigate the causes of non-compliance and provide support before applying sanctions.

A large group of respondents felt the rules are already clear and adequate. They affirmed that the current system provides appropriate guidance, though some suggested minor improvements such as simplifying language or pairing enforcement with positive incentives: "what could help is making [the rules] a bit easier to understand and... adding more positive incentives, not just rules and warnings."

Overall, we heard that while rules are broadly valued, there is a tension between calls for stricter enforcement to uphold credibility and demands for flexibility and context-sensitive application to ensure fairness.

Stakeholders suggested several ways to make OGP's rules clearer, fairer, and more effective:

- **Clarify and strengthen enforcement:** Communicate more transparently how rules are applied, make remediation processes more collaborative, and raise standards in cases of democratic backsliding. Some suggested stronger consequences for persistent non-compliance, including public accountability measures.
- **Apply proportionality and context sensitivity:** Adapt rules and timelines during political transitions or crises, distinguish between minor procedural lapses and more serious violations, and provide support where challenges are structural.
- **Align with resources and sustainability:** Require commitments to have secured budgets before adoption, adjust expectations to account for staff capacity, and encourage sustainable, domestically funded reforms instead of reliance on donors.
- **Balance rules with incentives:** Simplify language, pair compliance with positive incentives, and ensure rules encourage ambition and participation rather than becoming a burden.

THEME 6: LOOKING AHEAD

Stakeholders strongly value OGP's role in bringing together government and civil society to the table. But they also warned that unless the framework evolves, OGP risks becoming too procedural and disconnected from real-world challenges: "To remain relevant and effective, the OGP process must evolve from a compliance-oriented framework into a dynamic, strategic, and deeply integrated driver of reform."

Respondents from both government and civil society emphasized that OGP needs to be better integrated into national policy frameworks and have more tangible impact to be truly relevant: "The OGP process must be more country-driven, impact-driven and owned and integrated into the national development planning process". They felt that without greater political buy-in, the OGP process risked becoming an "on-top" or externally driven activity. As one respondent noted, more engagement with high-level executives is crucial to gaining buy-in and creating "open government champions." and another explained that "high-level political support is fundamental to open government, granting it the legitimacy and direction needed."

Looking forward, respondents called for more ambition, especially in countries with multiple cycles of experience. "Flexibility is important, but we also need accountability mechanisms to ensure quality," said one respondent. As another noted, the absence of real consequences for non-compliance could lead to complacency.

Across the board, participants highlighted the need for more capacity building, financial support, and peer learning opportunities: "Practical training and peer support can make a big difference." We heard that for OGP to have a more sustainable and impactful future, it must shift from a process-driven framework to one that is more flexible, locally relevant, and focused on demonstrating clear results.

In summary, looking into the future, stakeholders suggested to:

- **Elevate political engagement:** To move beyond an "external" initiative, the OGP needs high-level political support to mainstream its principles, ensure proper funding, increase government accountability and ownership (from all participating agencies), and drive real reform.
- **Embrace a flexible framework:** The current process is seen as too rigid. The OGP should adopt a more flexible, locally driven approach that prioritizes tangible impact over procedural compliance.
- **Provide practical support:** The OGP must offer more tailored, context-specific guidance, tools, and capacity-building resources to help members overcome challenges and effectively implement reforms.
- **Strengthen engagement of civil society and the public:** Emphasize the role of CSOs in co-creation and meaningful participation.

Phase II. November 2025

Who we heard from

Across all consultation mechanisms, we heard from a diverse group of stakeholders representing different regions, roles, and levels of experience in OGP processes. Contributors included participants at an in-person session at the OGP Summit in Spain (OGP Camp), respondents to an online survey, attendees of three virtual open consultation sessions led by the Task Force Co-Chairs, and members of the IRM and International Experts Panel through dedicated feedback sessions (see details on consultation mechanism below).

Based on the compiled input in the PDF (Summary of OGP Camp Feedback) we heard from:

- Over 100 people from all regions and sectors through the OGP Camp session
- 17 survey respondents
- Participants in three open consultation sessions, including government points of contact, civil society representatives, and Steering Committee task force co chairs
- Current and former IRM and IEP members, who provided technical and evaluative perspectives

Participants represented both government and civil society stakeholders. The survey included a majority of government respondents, alongside civil society, other sectors, and one private sector participant. Contributors came primarily from the Americas and Europe, with additional participation from Africa, and Asia during the open sessions and OGP Camp.

This mix of roles and regions ensured that input reflected a broad range of practical, political, and technical experiences with OGP processes.

How we consulted

To gather feedback on the first draft of the proposal, we used four complementary consultation mechanisms. These are described in detail in the Summary of OGP Camp Feedback PDF, and are summarized here.

In person discussions at OGP Camp

We hosted a dedicated consultation session at OGP Camp during the Global Summit. This allowed participants to react in real time to one of the core elements of the proposal and have facilitated discussions on how the options would work in different national contexts. This format captured a high volume of practical insights and scenario based reflections.

Online survey

We launched a survey open for one month that invited written feedback on the entire draft proposal. This mechanism allowed stakeholders who could not attend in person or online sessions to reflect individually and provide structured input at their own pace.

Open virtual consultation sessions

We held three virtual sessions after the Summit to invite broader participation. These sessions created space for discussion with Steering Committee task force co chairs and allowed participants to raise questions, share country experiences, and explore concerns in a dialogue format. This helped us understand nuances that do not always appear in written responses.

Targeted conversations with key technical actors

We also met with members of the IRM and the International Experts Panel to gather deeper reflections from those who work closely on evaluation, learning, and open government reforms. These conversations helped us understand methodological and implementation considerations that arise when operationalizing new elements of the Action Framework.

Together, these mechanisms allowed us to collect feedback from a wide range of voices, in depth and across different formats, helping us understand both high level reactions and detailed technical concerns.

What we heard

This second phase of consultation generated a rich and detailed set of reflections on the first full draft of the Action Framework proposal. Unlike the first phase of the consultation, which focused on diagnosing challenges with the current framework, this round invited stakeholders to react to a concrete set of options and ideas. Government representatives, civil society actors, multistakeholder forum members, and technical experts approached the proposal from different angles depending on their responsibilities, political contexts, and the maturity of their OGP processes. As a result, the feedback was more specific, more grounded in practical experience, and more focused on how the proposed changes would work in real country contexts.

This section summarizes what stakeholders told us on each major aspect of the draft proposal. They reflect both the areas of convergence and the nuances that illustrate the diverse realities and motivations across the partnership.

VIEWS ON THE FLEXIBILITY AND DESIGN OF THE ACTION OPTIONS

Stakeholders expressed strong support for greater flexibility in how members can take action. This reflects a shared understanding that political calendars, institutional capacity, and reform timelines vary widely across countries. Many felt that flexibility is necessary for OGP to remain relevant and accessible in a changing global context.

At the same time, stakeholders were clear that flexibility must be accompanied by strong guardrails that preserve ambition and co-creation. The recurring message was that the framework should offer choice, but not at the expense of clarity or standards.

Why stakeholders value flexibility

Participants appreciated the ability to:

- Align action cycles with political and budget timing
- Maintain engagement during instability or transitions
- Support long term reforms that do not fit neatly into fixed cycles

This flexibility was seen as essential for helping more members succeed and for creating more realistic pathways through the OGP process.

Conditions and guardrails stakeholders want

Almost all contributors stressed that flexibility must not dilute expectations. They emphasised the importance of:

- Avoiding overly complex or bureaucratic frameworks for action and ensuring clear criteria for choosing among the options
- Strong participation and co creation standards across all formats
- Transparent rules and monitoring
- Avoiding the risk of fragmentation or uneven ambition

Stakeholders also asked that guidance be simple, navigable, and not overly technical or burdensome.

Comparative reflections on each option (Standalone Commitments, National Action Plans and Rolling Action Plans)

Standalone commitments

Stakeholders saw standalone commitments as a potentially valuable tool, especially in contexts where political instability, limited capacity, or tight timelines make developing a full action plan difficult. Many felt they could help sustain momentum by allowing governments and civil society to co create targeted reforms when a NAP is not feasible. They were viewed as a practical entry point for newer members, a way to keep dialogue active in transitional periods, and a mechanism that could enable deeper focus or innovation on specific issues. Some also noted that standalone commitments could complement existing plans by providing space for experimental or situational reforms outside the main cycle.

At the same time, standalone commitments attracted the greatest concerns of all the options. Stakeholders worried that multiple, uncoordinated processes could dilute civil society engagement, fragment MSF oversight, and weaken overall coherence. Many feared they could lead to lower ambition, be used to avoid the accountability pressures of a national plan, or enable minimal compliance without meaningful reform. There were also questions about long term sustainability, the role of the point of contact, and potential overlap with the Open Gov Challenge. Taken together, the feedback indicated that if standalone commitments are included in the revised framework, they would require strong guardrails, clear criteria, and careful integration to avoid undermining the broader goals of the partnership.

National Action Plans

Stakeholders generally reaffirmed national action plans as the most trusted and stabilizing format in the Action Framework. They valued NAPs for their ability to bring government and civil society together around a coordinated set of reforms, provide clear engagement moments, and anchor open government work within a predictable cycle. Many highlighted that NAPs help concentrate attention and resources, clarify responsibilities, and reinforce the visibility and political ownership needed to advance reforms. The flexibility introduced in the proposal, such as choosing when a cycle begins or adjusting duration, was welcomed as a practical improvement that could help accommodate national political calendars while preserving the structure that makes NAPs effective.

At the same time, stakeholders noted the limitations of fixed term plans. For some countries, rigid timelines can feel restrictive, especially when reforms require longer implementation horizons or when political instability disrupts coordination. Participants also cautioned that rushed or overly ambitious development processes can undermine the quality of co-creation. While NAPs remain widely supported, the feedback suggested that their value depends on retaining clear structure while allowing enough adaptability to reflect real reform timelines and domestic contexts.

Rolling Action Plans

Rolling action plans generated significant interest among stakeholders who saw them as a way to provide continuity, accommodate varied reform timelines, and onboard different agencies when they are ready. Many appreciated that this model could better align with departmental policymaking cycles, support long term reforms that extend beyond a typical NAP cycle, and maintain momentum through political transitions. Rolling plans were also viewed as a promising option for more experienced members with established coordination mechanisms and a clear open government agenda.

However, stakeholders also emphasized that rolling plans could become complex and administratively heavy if not carefully designed. Without clear timelines, checkpoints, and expectations, they risk creating uncertainty around accountability and generating continuous pressure on civil society to engage in an open ended process. Participants also questioned whether the added complexity was necessary for all members or whether similar benefits could be achieved through more flexible NAPs. Overall, the feedback indicated that while rolling plans offer valuable opportunities, they would require strong criteria, predictable review points, and sufficient capacity to ensure they strengthen rather than complicate the open government process.

Key takeaways for the Action Framework on flexibility and design of options

Stakeholders want an updated Action Framework that preserves flexibility while avoiding unnecessary complexity. It should:

- Allow for flexibility so countries can align their approach to their context without increasing bureaucracy or complexity
- Retain clear and consistent expectations for co creation and accountability
- Provide enough structure to sustain momentum, ensure predictability, and maintain coordinated and accountable reform processes

EXPECTATIONS FOR STANDARDS, COMPLIANCE, AND CONSEQUENCES

Across all feedback mechanisms, stakeholders showed strong support for clearer, more proportional consequences for OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards minimum requirements. They expressed concerns with the current system, where procedural/technical issues and fundamental breaches can sometimes be treated similarly. Participants valued the proposal's intention to distinguish between the two and apply consequences that match the nature of the issue.

Support for proportionality

Stakeholders welcomed an approach that:

- recognises good faith effort
- supports improvement for minor issues through guidance and corrective plans
- applies visible accountability for fundamental breaches that undermine the integrity of the process

They felt this strengthens both fairness and credibility.

What stakeholders see as procedural/technical versus fundamental issues

Participants generally distinguished procedural or technical issues from more fundamental breaches based on whether the core participatory nature of co creation was affected. Procedural or technical issues were described as administrative challenges that occur despite good faith effort and do not undermine transparency or participation. These include delays, incomplete documentation, adjustments to consultation timelines, or temporary capacity constraints.

Fundamental breaches, by contrast, were understood as actions or omissions that directly compromise the integrity of co creation. These include the absence of meaningful spaces for dialogue, the deliberate exclusion of civil society, manipulation of the process, serious transparency failures, or repeated non compliance with minimum standards. In these cases, stakeholders emphasized that the co creative spirit is effectively broken.

Concerns around fairness and consistency

Stakeholders cautioned that any system of consequences must be:

- transparent and predictable
- applied fairly across regions and political contexts
- supported by clear communication with governments and civil society

They also emphasised the need for consequences that encourage course correction, not disengagement.

Risks and mitigation strategies

A number of risks were identified in relation to proportional consequences, along with suggested strategies to mitigate them.

Risks/unintended consequences	Mitigation strategies
Strict consequences may be viewed as punitive, especially in countries with limited co creation experience, which could discourage participation and reduce motivation	Introduce consequences gradually through warnings, improvement plans, and periodic reviews to allow learning before sanctions apply
Assessments could be applied unevenly across countries or become politicized, undermining legitimacy and creating tension among members	Publish clear, uniform guidance to ensure consistent interpretation and application
Governance related sanctions may have limited effect because they only apply to Steering Committee members, leaving few visible accountability tools for others	Develop alternative accountability measures for non SC members to ensure consequences remain meaningful and visible
Perceived disproportionality could weaken political buy in, causing disengagement or discouraging those making genuine efforts under challenging conditions	Pair consequences with technical support, mentoring, and peer learning to help members meet standards without fear of punishment
Consequences may overlook temporary or unavoidable contextual limitations, unfairly penalizing countries facing crises or resource constraints	Build flexibility into the system to recognize extenuating circumstances and maintain political buy in and fairness
A system focused solely on penalties may weaken morale and reduce cooperation	Use positive incentives, such as public recognition of sustained engagement, to reinforce constructive participation

Key takeaways for the Action Framework on expectations

Stakeholders want a system that is balanced, fair, and firm where necessary. The reviewed Action Framework should:

- Clarify the difference between activity and co creation performance so assessments are easier to understand
- Add early support and guidance when standards are not met, especially for technical or good faith issues
- Strengthen consequences for fundamental breaches in a way that protects credibility while remaining proportionate
- Ensure fairness and consistency in how standards are applied across different contexts

PERSPECTIVES ON MEMBER ACTIVITY, PERFORMANCE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Stakeholders welcomed the proposal to separate the assessment of whether a member is “active” from the assessment of how well they perform on co-creation standards. They felt this distinction makes the system more transparent and avoids conflating delays or procedural challenges with failures in co creation. Participants valued the proposal’s intention to introduce a clearer activity standard with a progression of consequences, helping ensure that accountability is fair, targeted, and proportionate.

Support for clearer assessments

Contributors highlighted that this separation

- increases fairness
- creates clearer expectations
- offers more predictable pathways for engagement

They viewed this as a necessary step to improve confidence in the system.

Concerns around fairness and consistency

Stakeholders cautioned that a new activity standard must be

- applied transparently and consistently across regions and political contexts
- sensitive to temporary or unavoidable disruptions
- accompanied by clear communication about why a country is considered active or inactive

They emphasized that accountability should encourage re engagement and improvement rather than unintended exclusion.

Risks and mitigation strategies

A number of risks were identified in relation to clearer activity assessments, along with suggested strategies to mitigate them.

They also emphasised the need for consequences that encourage course correction, not disengagement.

Risks and mitigation strategies

A number of risks were identified in relation to proportional consequences, along with suggested strategies to mitigate them.

Risks/unintended consequences	Mitigation strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countries may be misclassified as inactive due to political transitions, crises, or temporary disruptions • Governments may focus on meeting minimal administrative steps to appear active while neglecting substantive co creation • Rigid rules could penalize countries facing unavoidable challenges • Excessive leniency could allow disengaged governments to avoid accountability • Civil society engagement may weaken if inactivity is declared or prolonged • Overemphasis on national executive activity may overlook strong open government work at other levels of government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce warning systems or recovery mechanisms before sanctions apply • Use complementary assessments that consider both activity and performance, ensuring form does not replace substance • Establish a clear progression of consequences with transparent criteria • Provide early support, guidance, and peer learning opportunities to encourage re engagement • Include complementary forms of evidence and participation where relevant

Key takeaways for the Action Framework on activity, performance and accountability

Stakeholders want a system that is balanced, fair, and firm where necessary. The reviewed Action Framework should:

- Clarify the difference between activity and co creation performance so assessments are easier to understand
- Add early support and guidance when standards are not met, especially for technical or good faith issues
- Strengthen consequences for fundamental breaches in a way that protects credibility while remaining proportionate
- Ensure fairness and consistency in how standards are applied across different contexts

REFLECTIONS ON THE IRM AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ACTION FRAMEWORK

Although revising the Independent Reporting Mechanism is not within the mandate of the Action Framework Task Force, stakeholders raised relevant points about how the IRM would need to adapt to ensure accountability, learning, and credibility under a more flexible Action Framework.

Stakeholders reaffirmed the importance of the IRM as an independent source of oversight and credibility. They emphasized that accountability and public reporting remain central to OGP's value, and that the IRM's independence is essential for maintaining trust among civil society and government reformers.

Stakeholders noted that a more flexible Action Framework will require the IRM to consider how to maintain timely and predictable assessment cycles. Many highlighted the need for clearer and more regular feedback moments, shorter turnaround times, and reporting that is aligned with the pacing of different action options. Participants also raised the importance of predictable accountability points, ensuring that flexibility in action plan formats does not lead to uncertainty about when progress will be reviewed or how governments will be held to account.

Another theme was the need for the IRM to balance depth and breadth. Stakeholders encouraged the IRM to go deeper on selected elements that matter most for understanding open government results and reform trajectories, including the quality of co-creation and results or impact on reforms. At the same time, they acknowledged that greater depth requires more resources, which underscores the need for a sustainable approach that does not overextend the system.

Participants also encouraged an IRM approach that is context aware and constructive, providing practical guidance and forward looking insights in addition to formal assessment. Many expressed appreciation for evaluations that help stakeholders understand why progress unfolded as it did and what could support improvement.

These reflections are important for anticipating how assessment will need to adapt under a revised framework. The report will therefore include suggestions for the IRM and the IEP to consider as they reflect on assessment approaches aligned with a more flexible Action Framework.

CROSS CUTTING REFLECTIONS ON POLITICAL WILL, STRATEGIC DIRECTION, AND SUPPORT FOR REFORMERS

Stakeholders highlighted a set of broader enabling conditions that shape whether any action plan model can succeed. Across consultations, participants noted that meaningful open government practice depends on:

- Political will and senior-level commitment, which unlock coordination across institutions, give co creation real influence, and help secure resources for implementation.
- Adequate resourcing and institutional capacity, both within government and civil society, to sustain participation and follow-through.

- Strategic clarity, including a shared national vision or priorities that guide reform choices and prevent open government work from becoming fragmented or reactive.
- Support for reformers, including peer learning, regional exchange, and practical guidance that help actors navigate complex political environments and address capacity gaps over time.

While these reflections underscore issues that sit at the heart of successful open government practice, they also point to factors that the Action Framework alone cannot address. High-level political will, adequate resourcing, and a supportive institutional environment depend on national contexts that extend beyond the design of the Framework. However, participants identified several ways in which OGP can help countries move closer to these conditions. They stressed the value of clearer guidance on how to use the Framework, more opportunities for peer exchange, and practical tools that help reformers interpret options and understand what good practice looks like. Many noted that structured spaces for sharing experience, troubleshooting challenges, and learning from peers can help countries navigate obstacles related to political will or capacity, even if those challenges cannot be solved through rules alone.

Taken together, the feedback suggests that while the Action Framework cannot generate political commitment or resources, it can be designed and supported in ways that give reformers the clarity, tools, and networks they need to make the most of their context and continue driving reforms forward.

Key takeaways for the Action Framework on political will, strategic direction and support for reformers

Stakeholders noted that while the Action Framework alone cannot generate political will or resourcing, its effectiveness would be strengthened by accompanying support that helps countries make the most of the options available. Ideas to consider include:

- Provide clear and practical guidance to help members understand how to use the different action options effectively in their context.
- Encourage and facilitate peer exchange, mentoring, and regional learning spaces where reformers can learn from each other’s approaches and challenges.
- Support greater strategic clarity by offering tools or examples that help members connect action plan choices to broader national open government priorities.
- Strengthen support for inclusive collaboration between government and civil society, recognizing that meaningful engagement requires sustained capacity and predictable processes.