

FAQs

on the updated Action Framework 2026

Updated: September 2026

About this document

These FAQs are the public reference on the updated OGP Action Framework. They are written for government Points of Contact and for civil society partners. The questions are numbered and grouped into five sections. Use the table of contents to go directly to the question that matches your situation. If your question is not answered here, contact your OGP Support Unit point of contact.

List of Questions

Understanding the changes to the Action Framework

- 1 What has changed in the Action Framework, and what has not?
Snapshot of changes to the Action Framework
- 2 What does the shift from action plans to action commitments mean in practice?
- 3 What flexibilities do countries now have to co-create and submit commitments under the updated Action Framework?
- 4 When did the rules and revised consequences under the updated Action Framework kick in, and when does the activity clock start?
- 5 What happened to the submission deadlines and delivery windows set under the previous framework?

How the country process works under the updated framework

- 6 Who can submit commitments? Can they come from other branches or government institutions from outside the executive?
- 7 What is the process for developing action commitments under the new framework?
- 8 How are action commitments submitted to OGP, when and in what format?
- 9 What information does the Point of Contact include when submitting or updating commitments?
- 10 Can an institution submit a commitment directly to OGP, rather than through the Point of Contact?
- 11 Is there a limit to how many commitments I can have at any given moment?
- 12 Can a country run multiple co-creation processes at the same time?
- 13 How and when can a country switch approaches (for example from a NAP to batches or individual commitments)? What happens to existing commitments?
- 14 Where should evidence of co-creation be shared for commitments included in the country's OGP portfolio?
- 15 Where should evidence of co-creation be shared for standalone commitments developed outside the centrally coordinated national process?
- 16 Are there any implications for multistakeholder forums (MSFs), in terms of expectations, responsibilities, or structure?
- 17 The updated Action Framework states that members may amend commitments, provided changes are "co-reviewed and agreed" with the OGP multistakeholder forum. Does the framework specify how this agreement should be reached (consensus, majority, no objection, etc.)?

What the changes mean for my country's current situation

- 18** How does the updated Action Framework affect my country if I'm in the middle of co-creating now?
- 19** How does this affect me if I'm planning co-creation in 2026?
- 20** How does this affect my country if I'm implementing an existing action plan?
- 21** If my country is implementing a four-year plan, do I still need to conduct a mid-term refresh?
- 22** If my country is implementing, can I extend an action plan or add, edit, or modify commitments? How and when?
- 23** What happens if our mid-term refresh, or the next set of commitments, is delayed?
- 24** What happens when a new administration takes office while commitments are under implementation?
- 25** Do the self-assessment templates still apply?

Assessment, accountability, and consequences

- 26** What has changed in regards to the OGP Procedural Review Policy?
- 27** What has changed around expectations for members to maintain active status and consequences for not meeting them?
- 28** What has changed in expectations from members in participation and co-creation, including consequences for not meeting the Standards minimum requirements?
- 29** Have the Participation and Co-creation Standards and Minimum requirements themselves changed?
- 30** How will the IRM assess members moving forward?
- 31** How will there be accountability if my country is not getting an Action Plan Review from the IRM?
- 32** What happens to countries previously in acting contrary or similar procedural statuses?

Special cases and broader alignment

- 33** What happens if a country withdraws from OGP? Can other branches or local members continue participating?
- 34** What does this mean for OGP Local members?
- 35** What happens to Open Gov Challenge commitments?
- 36** What does this mean for Open State plans, strategies, long-term reforms, or localization programs?
- 37** Does the Action Framework introduce democratic safeguards?

Understanding the changes to the Action Framework

1 What has changed in the Action Framework, and what has not?

The updated Action Framework improves how countries can organize and manage their open government commitments, while maintaining the core principles that define participation in OGP.

At its core, the update introduces greater flexibility. Countries are no longer required to organize their work around fixed two- or four-year action plan cycles. Instead, they maintain a portfolio of action commitments that can be developed and grouped in ways that better align with domestic priorities, timelines, and political cycles.

At the same time, the fundamentals of participation remain unchanged. Co-creation between government and civil society remains central. Countries are still expected to remain an active member of OGP. Accountability mechanisms remain in place, with clearer and more proportionate consequences where standards are not met.

The Updated Action Framework document includes a summary table outlining the key changes introduced, alongside elements that remain the same (see table below). The questions that follow in this FAQ unpack those elements in more detail.

In short, the updated framework changes the structure and timing of how commitments are organized, but it does not change the core expectations of transparency, participation, accountability, and expectations for remaining an active member.

Snapshot of changes to the Action Framework

Area	From	To	What It Means
Core unit of action	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.
Timelines & delivery	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.

Area	From	To	What It Means
Procedural review	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.
Activity status and review	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 → withdrawal. Greater visibility and staged 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.
Consequences for not meeting minimum requirements for co-creation	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.
Co-creation & participation review	Less clear progression of review: notification → under review → inactive → withdrawal. Limited visibility and differentiation of disincentives: Members under review cannot stand for governance roles.	Clearer & better aligned progress of performance review: review → probation → withdrawal. Greater visibility and staged 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.
IRM role & products	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.

2 What does the shift from action plans to action commitments mean in practice?

In short: the individual action commitment replaces the action plan as the unit of action. Countries maintain a portfolio of co-created, time-bound commitments, and a traditional action plan remains one way to organize that portfolio.

Under the previous framework, countries were expected to submit National Action Plans (NAPs) made up of a set of commitments implemented over fixed two or four year cycles. The new framework shifts the focus from the action plan as the unit of action to the individual action commitments themselves.

Members are now expected to maintain a portfolio of action commitments. These commitments can still be grouped and presented as a traditional action plan, but they can also be developed and submitted at different moments, independently of one another, or through a combination of approaches. The key requirement is that all commitments are co created, time bound, and regularly reviewed, regardless of how they are packaged or timed.

The organizing idea that ties these changes together is the country's OGP portfolio: the full set of commitments a country is co-creating, implementing, or reviewing, brought together in one place and coordinated through the Point of Contact. An action plan is one way to organize that portfolio, and the most common one, but it is no longer the only way.

In practice, this means a country may co-create a set of commitments together as part of a plan aligned with a political or budget cycle, and later add additional commitments when new reform opportunities arise.

→ More information on how commitments are developed, who can submit them, how they are coordinated across institutions, and how they are communicated to OGP can be found in the next section, [“How the country process works under the updated framework.”](#)

3 What flexibilities do countries now have to co-create and submit commitments under the updated Action Framework?

The updated Action Framework introduces greater flexibility in how countries organize, time, and manage their open government commitments, while maintaining clear standards for co-creation and accountability.

Area of Flexibility	What This Means in Practice
How commitments are packaged	Countries are no longer required to submit all commitments together in a single two- or four-year National Action Plan. They may choose to: • Develop and submit commitments together within a traditional action plan with defined start and end dates. • Develop and submit commitments individually or in batches as opportunities arise. • Combine both approaches.

Area of Flexibility	What This Means in Practice
Timing and duration	Countries can determine the start and end dates of their commitments and action plans, provided that all commitments have clearly defined start and end dates and that their duration is of at least one year and no longer than six years.
Flexibility during implementation	Countries may review and update commitments during implementation. Any changes should be discussed and agreed with stakeholders through the multistakeholder forum or the country's space for dialogue and then communicated to OGP by the Point of Contact. Countries are expected to review progress at least every two years.
How co-creation processes are organized	Commitments may be developed through a centrally coordinated process (typically led by the MSF or government agency that hosts OGP, but may convene different branches or levels of government), or through decentralized or standalone co-creation processes led by other ministries, agencies, or branches of government. To be included as part of the country's OGP portfolio, resulting commitments and the evidence of the co-creation process through which the commitments were developed, must be formally communicated to OGP through the Point of Contact. Note: this is purely a coordination requirement and is not a formal approval by the POC or their ministry (see questions 6, 8, 9 and 14)

4 When did the rules and revised consequences under the updated Action Framework kick in, and when does the activity clock start?

The update is implemented as a clean transition, with no grace period. This means that all members are subject to the new framework, rules, and consequences at the same time, starting from adoption on 4 February 2026, when the updated Action Framework was adopted by the OGP Steering Committee.

This immediate application is possible because the core minimum expectations for members have not changed. The requirement to remain active (with no more than one year without activity) and adherence to the Participation and Co-Creation Standards continue to apply.

Every member started the updated framework with a clean slate on 4 February 2026. This also means that the activity clock starts on 4 February 2026. If the country's last active commitment led or coordinated by the national executive ends after that date, the clock starts on that later date instead. The earliest any member can reach Stage 1 of the Activity Review is therefore 4 February 2027 (see [question 27](#) for the stages). Procedural statuses linked to the previous Action Framework do not carry over under this clean slate approach (see [question 32](#)).

A single commitment led or coordinated by the national executive, co-created and under implementation, counts as activity by a member. Activity is therefore not limited to the launch of new commitments; continued implementation of existing commitments with remaining milestones can also satisfy activity requirements.

To ensure a fair and harmonized transition to the updated OGP Action Framework, the Steering Committee's decision to begin implementation with a clean slate is applied uniformly across all member countries. While the measure was initially relevant for countries holding procedural statuses under the previous framework, extending it to all members avoids the coexistence of different sets of rules during the transition period and ensures equal treatment across the Partnership. As a result, all countries have until February 2027 to submit at least one co-created action commitment and fulfill the minimum activity requirement necessary to remain active in OGP.

5 What happened to the submission deadlines and delivery windows set under the previous framework?

The previous fixed delivery windows (30 June and 31 December) no longer apply. There are no submission deadlines under the updated Action Framework, and members do not need to wait for a fixed cycle to submit commitments or update OGP on changes to their approach. The expectation that remains in place is the activity requirement: no more than 12 months should pass without at least one active commitment led or coordinated by the national executive (see [question 27](#)).

For countries implementing a four-year action plan, the expectation to conduct a mid-term refresh remains (see [question 21](#)). If your country has a refresh or delivery date that was set under the previous framework and you expect a delay, coordinate with your Support Unit point of contact and the IRM in advance (see [question 23](#)).

Procedural statuses linked to the previous framework, such as “acting contrary to process,” were reset when the updated framework was adopted (see [question 32](#)).

How the country process works under the updated framework

6 Who can submit commitments? Can they come from other branches or government institutions from outside the executive?

In short: any commitment coordinated through the Point of Contact becomes part of the country's OGP portfolio, whichever branch or institution developed it. Standalone commitments can still be shared with OGP and published, but they are not part of the portfolio and are not assessed by the IRM.

Under the updated Action Framework, the Point of Contact is responsible for ensuring that OGP has a clear and consolidated picture of which commitments are included as part of the country's OGP portfolio, and where to find evidence of how each commitment was developed.

Coordination with the Point of Contact is what determines whether a commitment is part of the country's OGP portfolio. This does not create a new approval or verification role for the Point of Contact, the multistakeholder forum, or the national executive over the substance of commitments developed by other branches. It does mean that OGP needs visibility of the full portfolio in one place.

Responsibility for coordinating OGP action sits with the national executive which signed up to the Partnership. For this reason, commitments that form part of a country's OGP portfolio are expected to be communicated through, or in coordination with*, the Point of Contact (POC) or country Multistakeholder Forum (MSF). Additionally, countries may share other open government commitments or plans with OGP, even where these are not integrated into the country's OGP portfolio. OGP may publish these initiatives on the country's page for visibility and learning.

Commitments included as part of the country's OGP portfolio

Any commitment that is coordinated through the POC* becomes part of the country's OGP portfolio.

These commitments:

- Are developed in line with the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and minimum requirements.
- Have a clear start and end date, lasting between one and six years.
- Are subject to assessment by the IRM, in line with its prevailing methodology.
- Such commitments may be developed through:
 - A centrally coordinated national co-creation process (like those typically led by countries' MSFs), or
 - A separate or asynchronous co-creation process led by a different ministry, agency, parliament, judiciary, or other branch of government, provided they are coordinated through or with the POC.

The origin of the co-creation process does not change the expectations. Once included as part of the country's OGP portfolio, the same standards and accountability mechanisms apply.

***Coordination with the POC** determines whether a commitment is part of the country's OGP portfolio. This is not intended to create a new formal approval or verification role for the POC, MSF, or the national executive over the substance of commitments developed by other branches. However, the POC is responsible for ensuring that OGP has a clear and consolidated picture of which commitments are included as part of the country's OGP portfolio and of where to find the evidence to account for how they were developed.

Other commitments shared with OGP that are not included within the country's OGP portfolio

Countries may also choose to share additional open government commitments or reform plans that are not coordinated through the POC and therefore not integrated into the country's OGP portfolio. Parliaments, judiciaries or independent oversight institutions may develop and submit standalone commitments or plans independently of the centrally coordinated national process and without opting for inclusion in the country's portfolio.

These initiatives:

- Are published on the country's OGP page for visibility and learning.
- Do not count toward maintaining minimum activity.
- Are not subject to IRM assessment.

While standalone commitments are not formally assessed, institutions are strongly encouraged to follow the Participation and Co-Creation Standards.

7 What is the process for developing action commitments under the new framework?

The expectations for co-creating commitments remain the same under the updated Action Framework. All commitments must be developed in line with the Participation and Co-Creation Standards, regardless of how or when they are submitted.

Countries have flexibility to plan and organize their co-creation processes in ways that fit their domestic context, timelines, and policy opportunities, while following the Standards. OGP guidance is available to support this, drawing on the extensive experience documented from members over the years and established best practices on what effective co-creation looks like in practice.

8 How are action commitments submitted to OGP, when and in what format?

In short: commitments are submitted by email to your OGP Support Unit point of contact at any time. The OGP commitment template is mandatory, and submission is expected in the country's administrative language and in English.

Under the updated Action Framework, members have flexibility in how they develop and submit action commitments. However, how commitments are documented and communicated to OGP remains consistent.

The OGP commitment template is the mandatory format used for submitting all commitments under the updated Action Framework. This applies to individual commitments, commitments sent in batches, and Action Plans. Two new fields apply to all submissions vis-a-vis the 2024 version: a brief description of how the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and the minimum requirements were met, as well as a public link to evidence of co-creation per commitment, if available; and start and end dates in month and year format per commitment.

The updated commitment template is available for download here:

[Commitment template 2026 in English](#)

[Commitment template 2026 in Spanish \(Plantilla de compromiso de OGP\)](#)

[Commitment template 2026 in French \(Modèle d'engagement du PGO\)](#)

Commitments should be submitted in both the country's administrative language and in English. Submitting in English allows the IRM to begin its assessment. It is recommended to submit both language versions at the same time.

What to communicate	When	How
Chosen approach to co-creating commitments (for example: national action plan, batches of commitments, individual commitments, or a mixed approach), with a brief explanation of how it will work in practice at that time	When the member begins co-creating commitments under the new Action Framework, and whenever the approach changes	Point of Contact emails their OGP Support Unit point of contact.
Action commitments being submitted or updated, following the current available guidance, such as the standard OGP commitment template. Changes to this guidance will be notified later.	Each time new commitments are ready to be submitted or updated, whether as part of a plan, a batch, or individually	Commitment template(s) shared by email with the OGP Support Unit point of contact.
Information on where evidence of co-creation (following the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards) can be found.	At the time commitments are submitted or updated	Included in the email to the OGP regional staff contact, with links to public sources (for example, a national platform, ministry website, or other public repository with evidence of co-creation)

Important note

- The approach to co-creating commitments is not fixed. Members can adapt their approach over time and notify OGP when this changes.
- All countries may use available guidance for the submission of commitments, including the existing commitment template, regardless of the approach or how commitments are packaged or timed.
- There are no fixed submission windows. Submissions are sent by email to the OGP Support Unit point of contact at any time (see [question 5](#)).
- Members do not need to wait for a fixed cycle to submit commitments or update OGP on changes to their approach.

9 What information does the Point of Contact include when submitting or updating commitments?

When submitting new or updated commitments, the Point of Contact's covering email includes:

- The chosen overall country approach (plan, batches, individual commitments, or a combination).
- Where applicable, whether each commitment is new, a modification, or a continuation.
- For modifications: what changed, and whether the change was co-reviewed with the MSF or the country's space for dialogue.

Each commitment includes:

- A named lead institution, with a contact.
- Start and end dates within the one-to-six-year range.
- Supporting stakeholders specified by organization rather than by generic category.
- A public link to evidence of co-creation.

Starting in September 2026, all commitments submitted by the Point of Contact will be automatically reviewed for Open Gov Challenge eligibility. Submitters will be notified if a commitment is accepted to the Challenge. See further information in [question 35](#).

10 Can an institution submit a commitment directly to OGP, rather than through the Point of Contact?

The default route is coordination through the Point of Contact: this is what determines whether a commitment forms part of the country's OGP portfolio (see [question 6](#)). In exceptional cases, where an autonomous or independent institution prefers to submit its own commitment directly to OGP rather than through the Point of Contact, the commitment can still form part of the portfolio, provided the Point of Contact confirms its inclusion and OGP has a consolidated picture of the country's portfolio.

Coordination and confirmation do not give the Point of Contact, the multistakeholder forum, or the national executive an approval or verification role over the substance of commitments developed by other institutions. The commitment itself must be co-created in line with the Participation and Co-Creation Standards, and evidence of co-creation must be publicly available (see [question 14](#)). Please contact Member Services at memberservices@opengovpartnership.org if you wish to make use of this exceptional approach.

11 Is there a limit to how many commitments I can have at any given moment?

There is no explicit limit on the number of commitments a country can have at any given time. However, experience shows that maintaining a focused portfolio of commitments works best. In practice, having roughly five to fifteen commitments at any given moment tends to support meaningful ambition, effective implementation, and sustained multi stakeholder engagement, while avoiding fragmentation or overload.

12 Can a country run multiple co-creation processes at the same time?

Yes. Countries may run multiple co-creation processes at the same time, based on what best fits their context, priorities, and timelines.

The key requirement is that any commitments that are part of the country's OGP portfolio must be co-created, point to evidence of co-creation, and submitted in coordination with the Point of Contact who is responsible for communicating which commitments form part of a member's OGP portfolio.

EXAMPLE

Example: A country's multistakeholder forum is conducting a centrally coordinated co-creation process to develop several action commitments, led by the Point of Contact and overseen by the MSF. At the same time, another ministry or different branch of government that is not currently represented in the MSF is running its own co-creation process outside this centralized effort, building on an existing dialogue with civil society organizations that may or may not be part of the OGP multistakeholder forum.

The ministry or the branch of government chooses to continue that process independently, but intends for the resulting commitments to be included in the country's OGP portfolio. As long as the ministry coordinates submission with the Point of Contact, and provides evidence of co-creation, both co-creation processes can run in parallel without issue.

13 How and when can a country switch approaches (for example from a NAP to batches or individual commitments)? What happens to existing commitments?

Countries may switch approaches at any time, based on domestic needs, learning, or changes in political, budgetary, or implementation contexts. There is no requirement to wait for the end of an action plan cycle or a formal review moment.

How

A change in approach should be discussed and agreed through the OGP multistakeholder forum or space for dialogue, following the Participation and Co-Creation Standards. Once agreed, the Point of Contact should inform the OGP Support Unit of the new approach and submit the updated list of commitments, clearly explaining what has changed.

Role of the MSF

The revised framework does not prescribe a specific decision-making rule (such as consensus or majority vote). Instead, it requires that the change be discussed and agreed through a Standards-compliant participatory process, ensuring transparency and meaningful engagement.

Existing commitments

Changing approach does not negate existing commitments. Commitments that are under implementation remain part of the country's OGP portfolio of commitments and are expected to continue being implemented, unless they are formally revised through a co-review process.

14 Where should evidence of co-creation be shared for commitments included as part of the country's OGP portfolio?

In line with Participation and Co-Creation Standard 2, information on co-creation should be publicly available, easy to find, and shared in a timely manner.

OGP is agnostic about the specific platforms or formats used, as long as information about the process and activities is open and accessible. This may include publication on a national OGP website, a government portal, an agency website, or another publicly accessible platform.

For commitments developed by other agencies or branches that are included as part of the country's OGP portfolio in coordination with the Point of Contact, the same expectations apply. Evidence of how the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and minimum requirements were met must be available in the public domain. The Point of Contact is responsible for indicating to OGP where this information can be found when submitting or updating commitments. When submitting a commitment developed through a parallel or asynchronous process by another branch or institution, the Point of Contact also identifies the lead institution and confirms where the evidence of co-creation is publicly accessible.

Regardless of which institution led the co-creation process, once a commitment forms part of the country's OGP port, it is subject to the same transparency, documentation, and assessment expectations.

15 Where should evidence of co-creation be shared for standalone commitments developed outside the centrally coordinated national process?

There are no formal requirements for how evidence of co-creation must be shared for standalone commitments developed outside the centrally coordinated national process. However, all institutions developing standalone commitments are strongly encouraged to follow the Participation and Co-Creation Standards.

When submitting standalone commitments or plans to OGP, institutions are encouraged to share any available documentation or evidence of co-creation at the time of submission. This information can be published on the country's member page to support transparency, learning, and visibility of the process. While submission of such evidence is not linked to formal assessment or compliance, it reflects good practice and supports the credibility of the commitment.

16 Are there any implications for multistakeholder forums (MSFs), in terms of expectations, responsibilities, or structure?

The updated Action Framework does not prescribe changes to the structure or composition of multistakeholder forums. Countries retain flexibility to organize their MSFs in ways that best fit their context. The substance of the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and their minimum requirements remains the same. The Participation and Co-Creation Standards continue to apply in the same way as before.

At the same time, the increased flexibility introduced by the updated framework creates an opportunity for MSFs to play a more strategic role in supporting ongoing co-creation, rather than engagement that is primarily tied to fixed action plan cycles. As commitments can now be developed, amended, and reviewed at different moments, MSFs may choose to engage in ways that support coordination, transparency, and learning across the country's overall OGP process.

MSFs remain an important space for dialogue on key decisions: it is where the country's chosen approach (a plan, batches, individual commitments, or a combination) is discussed and agreed, where co-review takes place when commitments are amended, extended, shortened, or dropped, and where periodic stocktaking of commitments is carried out at least every two years. The MSF can continue to serve as a central reference point for oversight and collective discussion.

17 The updated Action Framework states that members may amend commitments, provided changes are “co-reviewed and agreed” with the OGP multistakeholder forum.

Does the framework specify how this agreement should be reached (consensus, majority, no objection, etc.)?

The revised Action Framework does not prescribe a specific decision-making rule, such as consensus, majority vote, or no-objection.

Instead, how agreement is reached is guided by the Participation and Co-Creation Standards, which all OGP participating countries are expected to follow. In practice, this means that changes to commitments should be discussed and agreed through a Standards-compliant process that ensures meaningful participation, transparency, and responsiveness to stakeholder input, rather than through a predefined voting rule.

What the changes mean for my country's current situation

18 How does the updated Action Framework affect my country if I'm in the middle of co-creating now?

You can continue with your current approach. The updated Action Framework allows members to continue operating under a traditional action plan model in 2026 and beyond, so there is no need to change course or disrupt an ongoing co-creation process.

At the same time, the new framework provides flexibility that you may choose to use if helpful. For example, you may submit the commitments that are ready as part of a plan and add additional commitments later, once they have been co-created and finalized. There is no longer a requirement to wait for all commitments to be completed before submitting them together.

In addition, if other ministries, agencies, or branches of government are running their own co-creation processes, the resulting commitments may be included as part of the country's OGP portfolio, provided they are coordinated with the Point of Contact and share evidence of co-creation. This allows parallel efforts to move forward without delaying one another, while maintaining a coherent national portfolio.

In short, if you are already co-creating, you can continue as planned. The updated framework simply gives you more flexibility in how and when commitments are submitted.

19 How does this affect me if I'm planning co-creation in 2026?

You will have more flexibility on how to package commitments (a plan, batches, individual commitments, or a mix) and more flexibility on timing and duration. The key expectation is that your choices are made in consultation with the multistakeholder forum or the country's regular dialogue space, and then clearly communicated to OGP. Please contact your Support Unit point of contact to discuss how best you can use the options provided by the new Action Framework based on the needs and realities of your country's context.

Important note on IRM in 2026

During 2026, the IRM is reviewing its approach, products and methodology to align with the updated Action Framework. As part of this transition, the IRM will not be producing Co-creation Briefs or Action Plan Reviews. It will continue to produce Results Reports and Midterm Reviews. If you would like to receive recommendations from the IRM in lieu of the Co-creation Briefs and/or the Action Plan Reviews, please contact your Support Unit point of contact.

20 How does this affect my country if I'm implementing an existing action plan?

Your current action plan is not affected. You can continue implementing your plan as originally agreed.

The revised Action Framework does, however, introduce additional flexibility during implementation. You may add, extend, shorten, modify, or drop commitments, or amend their scope or ownership, if needed. Any such changes must be co reviewed and agreed with the multistakeholder forum, relevant working groups, or the agreed space for dialogue, and must be clearly communicated to OGP when updated commitments are submitted. The process for reviewing changes is expected to meet the same standards of co-creation as the original commitments.

For example, a country implementing an action plan may find that one commitment becomes unfeasible due to a change in legislation, while a new reform opportunity emerges in a different ministry or branch of government. Under the revised framework, the country could, through dialogue with its multi-stakeholder forum or spaces for dialogue, adjust the scope or timeline of the original commitment and add a new commitment during implementation. Both changes would be documented and communicated to OGP, following OGP suggested guidance like the commitment template, while the rest of the action plan continues unchanged.

Important note on IRM in 2026

During 2026, the IRM is reviewing its approach, products and methodology to align with the updated Action Framework. As part of this transition, the IRM will not be producing Co-creation Briefs or Action Plan Reviews. It will continue to produce Results Reports and Midterm Reviews. If you would like to receive recommendations from the IRM in lieu of the Co-creation Briefs and/or the Action Plan Reviews, please contact your Support Unit point of contact.

21 If my country is implementing a four-year plan, do I still need to conduct a mid-term refresh?

Yes. If you are implementing an existing four year plan, the expectation to conduct a midterm refresh at the two year mark remains. More broadly, the new framework maintains the requirement for members to, at least every two years, take stock of their open government commitments, review progress with stakeholders, and identify next steps, using processes similar to the current midterm refresh. The guidance for these mid-term reviews remains the same, until new guidance is issued later in 2026. Mid-term reviews conducted in 2026 will follow the same processes as before.

22 If my country is implementing, can I extend an action plan or add, edit, or modify commitments? How and when?

The proposal introduces flexibility to extend, shorten, modify, amend scope or drop commitments, provided changes are co-reviewed and agreed with the multistakeholder forum and clearly communicated to OGP when submitting updates.

How

Any changes must be discussed and agreed through the OGP multistakeholder forum, relevant working groups, or spaces for dialogue, following the same standards of co-creation. Once agreed, updated commitments must be clearly communicated to OGP through the Point of Contact, including the nature of the change and the revised timelines or milestones.

When

Changes can be made at any point during implementation, for example in response to learning, shifting priorities, capacity constraints, or political and budgetary changes. There is no requirement to wait for a new action plan cycle or a formal refresh moment, although countries are expected to take stock of commitments at least every two years and communicate any updates to OGP.

An extension or amendment does not need to be agreed or announced before the current end date of an action plan, and nothing procedurally happens if a plan's end date passes while a domestic approval process, for example a cabinet decision, is still pending, provided the change is agreed with the multistakeholder forum, documented, and communicated to OGP once confirmed, with the revised end date. The threshold that matters for active status is that no more than 12 months pass without at least one active commitment led or coordinated by the national executive (see question 27).

23 What happens if our mid-term refresh, or the next set of commitments, is delayed?

A delayed action plan refresh, or a delay in delivering the next action plan or set of commitments, does not trigger an automatic consequence or letter under the updated framework. Two review tracks exist, and neither is triggered by a delay in itself:

- The Activity Review applies only when more than 12 months pass without an active commitment led or coordinated by the national executive (see [question 27](#)). If your country has active commitments under implementation, this track is not triggered.
- The Participation and Co-Creation Review is driven by IRM findings against the minimum requirements of the Standards (see [question 28](#)). A delayed refresh, in itself, is not a breach of a minimum requirement.

The country remains in regular standing as long as it has active commitments and continues to meet the Standards. The previous “acting contrary to process” designation tied to missed procedural steps has been retired under the clean transition (see [question 32](#)).

Where a delay is foreseen, communicate the expected submission date to your Support Unit point of contact and to the IRM in advance. The IRM can accommodate delays where there is a clear timeline for submission. Without prior agreement, the IRM proceeds with its reporting as planned.

24 What happens when a new administration takes office while commitments are under implementation?

Commitments under implementation remain part of the country's OGP portfolio of commitments and are expected to continue on their original terms, unless formally revised through the co-review process (see [question 13](#)). Countries can adjust timelines, modify commitments through a co-review process with stakeholders, or add new commitments that reflect emerging priorities (see [question 22](#)). Where a transition makes it difficult to develop new commitments immediately, existing commitments can continue under implementation while the incoming government determines its way forward. The key consideration is maintaining at least one active commitment within the 12-month threshold, and keeping OGP informed of any changes through the Point of Contact.

An incoming administration inheriting an action plan can therefore work within the existing plan, dropping, modifying, and adding commitments inside the current cycle through co-review with the multistakeholder forum, or agree through the same co-review process to close out the plan and move to a new plan, a batch, or individual commitments. In both cases the Participation and Co-Creation Standards apply, and the IRM assesses whatever sits in the portfolio, whether that is the action plan, the plan plus changes, or only individual commitments.

25 Do the self-assessment templates still apply?

Countries are still encouraged to self-report on their commitments. The self-assessment is a country-led product, distinct from the IRM assessment. Self-assessment reports are not required, but they provide structured evidence for the IRM and a useful record for domestic stakeholders. The 2024 Self-reporting Commitment template has been updated so it works regardless of how a country organizes its OGP work, whether as an action plan, batches, or individual commitments. The substance is unchanged from the 2024 version.

You can download the updated 2026 self-assessment template here:

[Self-assessment template 2026](#)

[Self-assessment template 2026 in Spanish \(Plantilla de autoevaluación de OGP\)](#)

[Self-assessment template 2026 in French \(Modèle d'auto-évaluation du PGO\)](#)

Assessment, accountability, and consequences

26 What has changed in regards to the OGP Procedural Review Policy?

The updated Action Framework replaces the previous single procedural review model with two separate and clearer tracks of assessment:

- The Activity Review: a process for assessing whether members maintain active status in OGP and applying progressive consequences when they do not (see [question 27](#)).
- The Participation and Co-Creation Review: a process for assessing whether members meet the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards and applying proportional consequences when they do not (see [question 28](#)).

The two tracks are independent and apply simultaneously. They are set out in the OGP Participation and Co-creation Review Policy. The Standards as well as the Participation and Co-creation Review Policy are being updated and will be published in due course.

27 What has changed around expectations for members to maintain active status and consequences for not meeting them?

Under the previous Procedural Review Policy, activity was primarily assessed in relation to action plan cycles. A country was considered to have acted contrary to process if it failed to publish a new action plan within 12 months after the end of the previous one or if it made no progress on implementing its commitments, as assessed by the IRM, and repeated instances across consecutive cycles could lead to Procedural Review.

The updated framework separates activity into its own track, with clearer thresholds, automatic progression, and proportionate consequences.

Maintaining active status under the updated Action Framework

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 a minimum level of activity no more than 12 months should pass without at least one active commitment led or coordinated by the national executive and included in the country's OGP portfolio through the Point of Contact.

An active commitment is one that:

- Has been officially submitted to OGP (see [questions 8 and 9](#) for more information),
- Is under implementation, and
- Has not yet been completed or closed.

What happens if the minimum activity requirement is not met?

Stages	Time without an active commitment	What happens	Consequences
Stage 1	12 months	Notification is sent to the OGP POC.	Support-focused. OGP Support Unit offers support and outreach to encourage activity.
Stage 2	2 years	Country placed on an inactivity watch list. Notification is sent to the Ministerial POC and the country's status is published on the OGP website	Governance roles are restricted unless timeline for restoring activity is communicated.
Stage 3	3 years	Country designated as inactive). Notification is sent to the Ministerial POC and the country's status is published on the OGP website	The country cannot hold governance roles, loses voting rights, and is not eligible for awards.
Stage 4	4 years	Automatic withdrawal from OGP membership. Notification is sent to the Ministerial POC.	The country must reapply as a new member and meet eligibility criteria.

All countries started with a clean slate on 4 February 2026. This means that the earliest Stage 1 can be invoked for any OGP member country is 4 February 2027 (see [question 4](#)).

Reactivation

- Countries in Stages 1–3 may return to active status at any time by launching implementation of at least one new active commitment.
- After withdrawal (Stage 4), a country must reapply and meet eligibility requirements to rejoin.

How does this apply to other branches and levels of government beyond the national executive?

- Commitments from other branches may continue to be submitted while a country is under activity review.
- However, they do not affect the activity review process, since the national executive is responsible for maintaining active status.
- If a country is withdrawn, commitments from other branches are no longer accepted (this does not apply to OGP Local members).

What has changed in expectations from members in participation and co-creation, including consequences for not meeting the Standards minimum requirements?

Like under the previous policy, all OGP member countries continue to be expected to develop and implement commitments in line with the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and its minimum requirements. What changes under the updated Action Framework is how consequences are structured: technical issues are treated differently from fundamental concerns, and repeated fundamental concerns trigger a staged and progressive review process.

How concerns are considered under the updated framework

Under the updated Action Framework, concerns related to participation and co-creation are categorized as either technical or fundamental.

The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) will assess whether countries meet the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and identify if there are concerns and whether they are technical or fundamental. Its findings are published and inform the decisions of the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee, which determines whether a country enters a formal review process.

TECHNICAL CONCERNS

A technical concern relates to whether and how the minimum requirements of each standard are met. These may include issues such as timing, format, documentation, or frequency of engagement, where the core Standard is substantively in place but certain elements are not fully aligned with requirements.

What happens:

- The concern is noted and published.
- The member is notified.
- The Support Unit and peers may offer advice and support.
- No formal review status is triggered.

FUNDAMENTAL CONCERNS

A fundamental concern arises when a country fails to meet at least one minimum requirement under the Participation and Co-Creation Standards. Examples may include not establishing a space for ongoing dialogue, not providing a reasoned response to stakeholder input, or making no progress on implementation of any commitments.

When the IRM identifies a fundamental concern, the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee considers the assessment, including any relevant contextual information, before confirming whether the country enters the staged review process.

Progressive consequences for fundamental concerns

Stage	Trigger	Consequences
Stage 1	First confirmed fundamental concern	Country placed under co-creation and participation review. Governance roles are restricted unless a remediation plan is submitted. The country's status is published on the OGP website.
Stage 2	Second consecutive instance	Country placed under probation. Loss of governance roles, voting rights, and award eligibility. The country's status is published on the OGP website
Stage 3	Third consecutive instance	Automatic withdrawal from OGP membership. The country must reapply and meet eligibility criteria to rejoin. C&S may choose to extend probation if a member is able to present sufficient evidence and plans for timely remediation.

In sum, the updated framework provides clearer definitions, separates minor procedural issues from serious failures to meet minimum standards, and applies proportionate consequences depending on the seriousness and persistence of the concern.

For more details on how the IRM is adapting its assessment approach under the updated framework, see [question 30](#) below.

29 Have the Participation and Co-Creation Standards and Minimum requirements themselves changed?

The core expectation that all OGP members adhere to the Participation and Co-Creation Standards has not changed. Co-creation between government, civil society, and other stakeholders remains a foundational requirement of participation in OGP.

What has changed is how the Standards and their minimum requirements are framed and applied under the updated Action Framework.

What is changing

Updates to the language of the Participation and Co-Creation Standards	The language of the Participation and Co-Creation Standards reflects the shift in the core unit of action under the revised Action Framework. Because countries now work with action commitments that can be grouped and presented in different ways, references throughout the Standards have been updated to refer to action commitments, while still encompassing action plans as one possible way of organizing them. This ensures the Standards apply consistently across all formats and approaches, rather than being tied only to traditional two or four year action plans.
Updates to when and how the Standards and their minimum requirements apply	The Standards and their minimum requirements are no longer tied to specific moments in a fixed two or four year action plan cycle. Under the previous framework, co-creation requirements applied at defined stages of the cycle, such as during action plan development, implementation, and, for four year plans, the mid-term refresh. Under the updated framework, there is no fixed co-creation calendar. Countries can choose when to co-create commitments and may do so at different moments, including while other commitments are already under implementation. As a result, the Standards apply as ongoing requirements whenever a country is developing or implementing one or more action commitments, regardless of timing or format.
Clear distinction between technical and fundamental concerns.	The updated framework clarifies the nature of the minimum requirements and the consequences for not meeting them. The Standards now distinguish more clearly between fundamental requirements for co-creation (for example, having a space for ongoing dialogue or providing reasoned responses to input) and technical considerations (such as timing, format, documentation, or frequency of engagement). This distinction is used to determine proportionate consequences when minimum requirements are not met, with technical issues triggering notification and support, and fundamental concerns triggering a formal participation and co-creation review process with progressively stronger consequences if they persist.

In practice, this means countries must be able to demonstrate that they comply with the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards whenever they develop, implement or review commitments, regardless of how or when those commitments are packaged, and can expect clearer, more predictable and proportionate consequences if minimum requirements are not met (see [question 28](#) on the consequences for not meeting requirements).

The OGP Co-Creation and Participation Standards will be updated and published in due course to reflect the changes approved through the annual review and to align fully with the revised Action Framework.

30 How will the IRM assess members moving forward?

The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) is adapting its assessment approach to align with the updated Action Framework.

During 2026, the IRM is in a transition period. As part of this transition:

- Action Plan Reviews and Co-Creation Briefs are paused for action plans submitted after 4 February 2026.
- Results Reports and Midterm Reviews for existing four-year action plans continue to be produced throughout 2026.
- Upon request, the IRM may still provide recommendations to support co-creation during this period.

Looking ahead, the IRM is examining potential changes to its products, including their scope, timing, and format. This work draws on input from the Action Framework consultation process, as well as feedback gathered through previous IRM consultations, meetings and sessions over the years. In the first phase over the coming months, the IRM will solicit feedback with the wider OGP community on a draft proposal for potential changes. During the implementation phase in the second half of 2026, following approval of the final proposal, there will also be further opportunities for consultation with the OGP community - such as on new reporting templates or methodologies.

Any updates to IRM products or methodology will be developed through the IRM's own governance processes, including stakeholder consultation and oversight by the International Experts Panel and the Steering Committee. Until this work is finalized, the IRM continues to serve as an independent source of accountability, learning, and public reporting within the parameters outlined above.

31 How will there be accountability if my country is not getting an Action Plan Review from the IRM?

During the transition to the updated Action Framework in 2026, a limited number of countries will not receive an Action Plan Review (those that submit an action plan after 4 February 2026). This is a temporary and intentional pause, designed to allow the IRM the time and resources needed to adapt its products and methodology to the new, more flexible framework.

This does not mean that accountability expectations are suspended. Countries are still expected to:

- Adhere to the Participation and Co-Creation Standards when developing and implementing commitments.
- Maintain a minimum level of activity in OGP.

More broadly, this transition period reflects a shift in how accountability is delivered, not a retreat from it. The pause in IRM Action Plan Reviews is part of a broader effort to ensure that future IRM assessments remain credible, timely, and aligned with how countries actually work under the updated Action Framework.

32 What happens to countries previously in acting contrary or similar procedural statuses?

As part of the transition, all procedural statuses linked to the previous Action Framework and its Procedural Review Policy are reset. This means that designations such as “acting contrary” do not carry over into the new framework. All members start under the revised rules, standards, and consequences with a clean slate.

Because the transition starts from a clean slate, there is no need for a separate grace period. The reset also applies to activity: the activity clock starts on 4 February 2026. If the country's last active commitment led or coordinated by the national executive ends after that date, the clock starts on that later date instead (see [question 4](#)).

Special cases and broader alignment

33 What happens if a country withdraws from OGP? Can other branches or local members continue participating?

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, then commitments from other branches and levels of government will no longer be accepted by OGP.

Local governments that are members of OGP Local are not affected by a national executive's withdrawal. Because they participate in OGP in their own right, local members may continue to participate under the OGP Local framework, subject to its rules and requirements.

34 What does this mean for OGP Local members?

The updated Action Framework does not change the rules or requirements for OGP Local members. OGP Local continues to operate under its own framework, processes, and assessment rules.

That said, the updated Action Framework may create opportunities for closer alignment and collaboration between national and local open government efforts. The increased flexibility at the national level can make it easier for countries to connect national commitments with local reforms, or to recognize and build on open government initiatives led by local governments.

Importantly, OGP Local members participate in OGP in their own right. Their participation is not affected by changes to the national Action Framework, nor by a national executive's withdrawal from OGP. Local members remain subject to OGP Local rules and continue to engage through OGP Local processes.

35 What happens to Open Gov Challenge commitments?

The Open Gov Challenge continues to be an important way for countries to advance their open government objectives within the thematic areas and priorities of the Challenge. Starting in September 2026, the Open Gov Challenge was updated to reflect a changing policy landscape and to create room for raising ambition in several areas. In addition, all commitments received by OGP are now being automatically reviewed for Challenge eligibility. Submitters will be notified if a commitment has been accepted to the Challenge.

Countries interested in submitting Challenge commitments should continue to follow the existing guidance available on the [OGP website](#).

As OGP continues to develop clearer and more streamlined guidance on how commitments are submitted under the updated Action Framework, any implications for the Challenge will be communicated in due course.

36 What does this mean for Open State plans, strategies, long-term reforms, or localization programs?

The updated Action Framework creates greater opportunity to align OGP participation with broader Open State plans, open government strategies, long-term reform agendas, and localization programs.

Because countries now have flexibility in how and when commitments are developed and submitted, OGP can more easily complement and reinforce long-term reform efforts. A national Open State strategy, for example, can serve as the overarching vision, while specific priorities within that strategy are translated into time-bound OGP action commitments that fall within the one- to six-year timeframe.

This flexibility also allows countries to sequence reforms over time. Commitments can build on one another across political or budget cycles, supporting continuity while maintaining clear accountability through defined milestones and review processes.

Similarly, localization programs or national initiatives designed to scale open government at the local or subnational level can be reflected in OGP through concrete, time-bound commitments that align with the broader strategy and meet the Participation and Co-Creation Standards.

In short, the updated framework strengthens the ability of countries to connect long-term open government strategies with concrete, co-created, and time-bound commitments that are visible and accountable within OGP.

37 Does the Action Framework introduce democratic safeguards?

The scope of the Action Framework is limited to the OGP process itself, specifically the rules and expectations for co-creating, implementing, and reviewing open government commitments. The Participation and Co-Creation Standards are designed to assess the quality of these processes, not to function as comprehensive benchmarks for a country's overall democratic performance.

Broader democratic safeguards within OGP are addressed through other mechanisms, including the eligibility criteria, the Values Check, and the Response Policy. Concerns related to democratic backsliding, political commitment, or systemic risks sit outside the scope of the Action Framework and are more appropriately addressed through these mechanisms.

Do you have any additional questions?

If your question is not answered in this document, contact your OGP Support Unit point of contact. The updated policies, standards, and templates referenced in this document will be published on the OGP website once adopted.