

OGP Coalition on Justice

Advancing Justice through Open Government

*Implementation of Open Gov
Challenge Commitments on Justice*

October 2026

Open
Government
Partnership



Table of Contents

Message from the Coalition Co-Leads	3
Progress of Open Gov Challenge Commitments on Justice	4
Buenos Aires, Argentina: Open Data on Court Rulings and Processes	4
Canada: National Justice Survey and Legal Problems Data	5
Canada: State of the Criminal Justice System Dashboard	7
Catalona, Spain: Raise Awareness about Whistleblower Standards and Protections	8
Chile: Open Justice for an Open State	10
Colombia: Transparency and Accountability in the Council of State	12
Colombia: Open and Accessible Court Rulings	15
Côte d'Ivoire: Draft a Law on the Protection of Whistleblowers	17
Costa Rica: Addressing the Judicial Backlog	19
Costa Rica: Open Courts Pilot Program	21
Costa Rica: Participatory Framework for Restorative Justice	23
Dominican Republic: Implement the Open Justice Policy	25
Honduras: Implement an Open Justice Policy	26
Kaduna State, Nigeria: Increase Coordination to Support Justice Reform	29
Kenya: Create a Digital Justice Framework	31
Sierra Leone: Amend the Ombudsman Law to Increase Access to Justice	33
State of Minas Gerais, Brazil: Increase the Accessibility of Court of Justice Data	35
Quintana Roo, Mexico: Co-Create a New Strategy to Strengthen the Rule of Law	36
Lessons Learned from Coalition Members	39
Conclusion	42

Message from the Coalition Co-Leads

Justice is one of the ways people experience government most directly. Whether someone can understand their rights, access services, have their voice heard or seek redress shapes their trust in public institutions. Making justice more accessible, responsive and accountable is essential to building governments that work for everyone—and open government plays an important role.

Through the Open Government Partnership (OGP), we have seen how transparency, public participation, and accountability can advance people-centred justice. Access to information helps people understand justice institutions and their decisions. Involving people in shaping justice policies and services helps ensure these reflect their needs, while effective accountability and redress mechanisms allow people to raise concerns and seek solutions.

The [OGP Coalition on Justice](#) reflects one of OGP's defining strengths: its multi-stakeholder approach. Over the past decade, OGP members have increasingly involved different branches and levels of government in their action plans, building momentum toward an *Open State* where progress depends on collaboration across institutions and between government and civil society. The Coalition brings this approach to justice, uniting the executive, judiciaries, subnational courts, ombuds offices, civil society organizations and other partners. This diversity recognizes that no single institution or stakeholder can deliver more open, accessible and accountable justice alone. The Coalition offers a space to exchange experiences, learn from one another and turn shared commitments into action.

This publication supports the Coalition's efforts to track progress, share implementation experiences and strengthen peer accountability. Based entirely on information and data provided by Open Gov Challenge commitment implementers, it helps members reflect on their commitments and sustain momentum toward meaningful justice reform.

The ambition of the Open Gov Challenge must also evolve with the policy landscape, however. Its updated scope opens new directions for action and encourages governments to pursue meaningful, ambitious change in advancing people-centered justice.

The experiences shared here offer valuable lessons and remind us that justice reform requires ongoing commitment, collaboration and a willingness to learn from successes and challenges. We hope this publication inspires others to adapt useful approaches and identify new opportunities to work together.

As Co-Leads, we remain committed to this collective effort. We invite governments, judiciaries, civil society and all those working toward more open and accessible justice systems to learn from these experiences and help carry this work forward.

The Co-Leads of the OGP Coalition on Justice

Government of Canada and Supreme Court of Chile

Progress of Open Gov Challenge Commitments on Justice

Buenos Aires, Argentina

Open Data on Court Rulings and Processes

The Buenos Aires City Supreme Court submitted an [Open Gov Challenge commitment](#) to make judicial activity data more transparent, standardized, and reusable to strengthen accountability and public trust. The commitment centers on publishing open data on court rulings and processes, including judicial performance metrics, case classifications, and resolution time data.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Buenos Aires City Supreme Court has successfully established regular publication schedules and expanded data granularity across multiple datasets. [Weekly publications](#) release approximately 100-150 court rulings in PDF format, with filing date, judgment date, topic, subtopic, and presiding judge information included. The Court also publishes court rulings as [open data every month](#). This represents a significant increase in data richness compared to earlier publications that only included ruling and ruling date. Bi-annual statistical reports and annual comprehensive reports with graphics and detailed monthly breakdowns have been institutionalized, ensuring sustained transparency.

Three major milestones have been completed: publication of the resolution timeframe matrix (documenting average processing times), jurisdictional disputes report, and comprehensive court rulings report. These datasets are published according to open data standards, allowing the public to freely access, reuse, and analyze judicial information. The Court has made deliberate decisions to maximize usability. For instance, rather than publishing pre-calculated case duration figures, it publishes both filing dates and judgment dates separately, empowering users to derive their own calculations.

Civil society has been engaged throughout the implementation process in a collaborative manner. CSOs have contributed to validating the transparency approach, advocating for expanded datasets, and potentially helping to communicate the initiative's value to the broader public. This collaborative relationship has supported the Court's progress and helped maintain civil society patience as operational challenges -particularly caseload surges- have emerged.

KEY CHALLENGES

The primary implementation challenge has been the manual, case-by-case classification of the subject matter of court judgments. Given the Court's current caseload, this process will need to be reconciled with a timely future expansion of the datasets.

The expansion of jurisdiction has given rise to a more structural challenge: the Court's caseload has surged by between 400% and 500% (rising from approximately 1,800 to 8,000 cases per year), creating a need to optimize processes and ensure effective, efficient, and transparent management.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADRESSED

To address the manual classification process, the Court has launched an artificial intelligence (AI) procurement tender to automate case subject-matter classification. This investment will replace the current manual process with an automated system, substantially reducing the time and effort required to publish enriched datasets.

The Court is also planning progressive data expansion by incorporating incoming case data into published datasets. This will enable public comparison of case inflow versus ruling output, providing transparency into case stock and allowing external observers to track progress.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Buenos Aires City Supreme Court is on track to complete its Open Gov Challenge commitment by December 2026. The deployment of AI for automated case classification will be a critical milestone, enabling faster dataset expansion and higher-quality data publishing.

The Court's experience offers valuable lessons for other judiciaries considering similar transparency initiatives: invest in automation early, design data for user flexibility rather than pre-calculated metrics, and pair transparency commitments with genuine efforts to address underlying operational challenges. With these elements in place, open judicial data can serve as a powerful tool for accountability and public trust in the justice system.

Canada

National Justice Survey and Legal Problems Data

As part of the Open Gov Challenge and Canada's 2025–2029 National Action Plan, the Department of Justice [committed](#) to tracking how Canadians experience serious legal problems and using that information to help guide decisions. This includes sharing results from the [National Justice Survey \(NJS\)](#) and [Canadian Legal Problems Survey \(CLPS\)](#) in easy-to-understand formats, such as infographics or a simple online dashboard.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Department of Justice has made [CLPS methodology reports](#) and data tables publicly available. This gives researchers and the public access to the survey's underlying data. The Department has also published two infographics on Canadians' confidence in the [adult](#) and [youth](#) criminal justice systems. These infographics were viewed about 1,900 times in English and French between January and June 2026.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Department is also finalizing a comprehensive report on the 2025 CLPS findings. The report is being designed to follow the same format as the 2021 CLPS report, making it easier to compare Canadians' experiences before and after the pandemic. It is expected to be published before the end of 2026.

The survey data is already being used to inform work outside the Department of Justice. For example, it contributed to an OECD study examining the cost of justice problems in Canada.

KEY CHALLENGES

Making survey findings easy to understand for everyone is a persistent challenge. Researchers are usually comfortable working directly with datasets and statistical tables, but many stakeholders across the legal and justice sector lack training in social science methodology.

Sharing and promoting these findings is also difficult. Publishing reports and reaching out to stakeholders often requires input and approval from several teams within the Department, but staffing shortages and competing priorities have slowed the work down.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To make survey results easier to understand for people without a research background, the Department of Justice is creating user-friendly materials such as plain-language infographics.

To share the research more widely, the Department is using events and networks. For example, it presented early findings from the OECD study to practitioners and researchers at the Action Committee on Access to Justice's National Research Conference in May 2026. Publishing the OECD case study as a standalone report could also encourage more organizations and individuals working on access to justice, within and outside Canada, to engage with the research.

LOOKING AHEAD

In the near term, the Department will finish and publish the full 2025 CLPS report. The next phase of this work will ensure that the data is accessible, understandable, and widely used. We hope to continue developing visual tools and dashboards, and expand outreach efforts through webinars, newsletters, and other knowledge mobilization activities. Ultimately, the goal is to ensure that justice-related data becomes a routine part of policy discussions, academic research, and access-to-justice initiatives.

Canada

State of the Criminal Justice System Dashboard

As part of the Open Gov Challenge and Canada's 2025–2029 National Action Plan, the Department of Justice [committed](#) to updating its [State of the Criminal Justice System Dashboard](#) and automating those updates so Canadians can more easily access current justice data.

Automating the dashboard increases efficiency and reduces resource demands within the department while ensuring that accurate, up-to-date information is consistently available to the public. In an era of scarce resources, automated data updates help maintain a public dashboard that provides timely, reliable, and accessible information on experiences with the justice system. By making current data readily available, the dashboard enhances transparency, supports informed decision-making, and enables Canadians to better understand how the justice system is performing, including how outcomes and experiences may differ across diverse populations.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Department has automated 20 of the 78 dashboard indicators (about 25%). This means that when new data becomes available, those indicators can be updated automatically instead of requiring someone to update them manually each time.

The Dashboard has since then received significant public attention. Between January and June 2026, it received about 72,957 page views, showing that there is strong public interest in accessible information about the justice system.

KEY CHALLENGES

Keeping the Dashboard up to date is one of the biggest challenges due to two factors. On one hand, the Dashboard draws on data with different collection cycles: the Department updates some data annually, while other data only becomes available every five years. On the other hand, because that data comes from many different sources, updating the Dashboard also requires coordinating with several teams across the Government. Together, these factors add time to the automation process.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

The Department of Justice is currently working closely with specialized teams to coordinate the process of automating Dashboard indicators. As automation expands, it should reduce the manual work needed to gather and update information from different sources.

To reach more users, the Department plans to expand outreach through webinars, newsletters, and other activities aimed at justice-sector professionals and organizations. It also plans to build stronger relationships with civil society organizations to raise awareness of the data already available. Starting in March 2027, the Department will also begin collecting regular feedback from key users on the Dashboard's accessibility and usefulness, helping it understand what's working and what needs improvement.

LOOKING AHEAD

In the near term, the Department of Justice will continue automating indicators, and promoting Dashboard's use.

The ultimate goal is to make the Dashboard's data not only available but actually used, so that justice-related data become a routine part of policy discussions, research, and access-to-justice work.

Catalonia, Spain

Raise Awareness about Whistleblower Standards and Protections

As part of the Open Gov Challenge, the Catalan Anti-Fraud Office (Oficina Antifrau de Catalunya, OAC) committed to raising awareness of whistleblower standards and protections across public administrations, the private sector, and civil society in Catalonia. The goal is to build a culture where public servants are trained to help prevent corruption and citizens, businesses, and organizations understand that reporting misconduct is a shared responsibility.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

Within OAC, all technical staff received training on building a culture of reporting, as well as a workshop on interviewing whistleblowers.

For external audiences, OAC launched a self-paced online course, *Reporting in Defense of the Public Interest (Alertar en defensa del interés público)*, in September 2025. The course takes about seven hours over three weeks. Participants receive a certificate after passing an evaluation and completing a satisfaction survey. It is aimed at public-sector staff and private-sector employees responsible for internal reporting channels. In 2025, 255 public-sector and 72 private-sector participants enrolled, with 224 and 57 respectively earning certificates. So far in 2026, 202 public-sector and 36 private-sector participants have enrolled, with 183 and 31 receiving certificates. Average satisfaction has been close to 9 out of 10 in both years.

OAC also partnered with Catalonia's Official College of Psychology to develop a new course, *Psychological Assistance for Whistleblowers (Asistencia psicológica a las personas alertadoras)*, running from October 1 to November 19, 2026. The 40-hour blended course helps professionals and institutions understand whistleblowers' emotional and psychological needs, recognizing that legal protection does not address all of the emotional impact of reporting misconduct.

OAC also participates in national and European forums, where it shares good practices and common challenges with peer institutions through the Network of Anti-Fraud Offices and Agencies of Spain (*Red de Oficinas y Agencias Antifraude de España*) and the *Network of European Integrity and Whistleblowing Authorities*.

OAC also developed a Service Charter (Carta de Servicios) through a participatory process open to civil society, even though it is not legally required to have one. Through this process, OAC reviewed its current protection services, defined users' rights and responsibilities, and opened a dialogue about its role as an independent protection authority. The Charter sets out OAC's services, minimum quality standards, and users' rights and responsibilities. It also directly supports Catalonia's 2026–2028 OGP Action Plan by putting citizen participation at the center of designing one of OAC's most important services. OAC describes it as the first whistleblower protection service charter in Spain and the first developed through a participatory process.

KEY CHALLENGES

The biggest challenge for the training program has been generating interest among organizational leaders. The course is new to the private sector, which had not previously participated in OAC training because it was focused on public servants. Private companies have generally started by requesting training for small groups before deciding whether to offer it more widely to their staff.

OAC also found it difficult to make the training accessible to a wide range of audiences while covering the necessary legal content. Legal material can make non-experts hesitant or resistant, so OAC had to balance accessibility with keeping the training complete and technically accurate.

For the Service Charter, the main challenge was getting strong participation, particularly from potential users such as whistleblowers and institutions affected by reports. OAC had to carefully structure the sessions to include different perspectives while protecting whistleblowers' privacy and trust. It also had to keep discussions focused on assessing current services, identifying improvements, and defining users' rights and responsibilities, rather than discussing individual cases.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To increase private-sector participation, OAC is adapting its training to the specific needs of private organizations instead of using the same approach developed for the public sector. This reflects the sector's different starting point and its preference for testing the course with small groups first.

To make the training more accessible, OAC uses participant feedback to improve the course. Staff review the questions, concerns, and suggestions shared in end-of-course surveys and use them to update future training.

For the Service Charter, OAC hired an external facilitation firm to develop the participatory materials and lead all sessions. It also provided two ways to participate: online through Decidim Antifrau, a platform created for the Charter project that can also support future participation processes, and in person at civic centres in Barcelona. OAC also held a dedicated session with experts in psychology, criminal law, labor law, journalism, and compliance. A steering group of internal and external members oversaw the process and the quality of the Charter.

LOOKING AHEAD

For the training program, OAC's immediate goal is to strengthen the course and reach as many participants as possible. A second phase will expand and deepen the content based on the specific issues raised in participant feedback.

For the Service Charter, OAC will publish a report on the participatory process, including individual responses to every contribution received, and then publish the final Charter.

Over the medium and long term, OAC will regularly assess its protection services using the Charter's methodology and indicators. This will help identify new needs and make further improvements. OAC sees the Charter as a living document that can be updated as its services and users' needs change.

Chile

Open Justice for an Open State

As part of Chile's 2023-2027 National Action Plan for an Open State and the Open Gov Challenge, Chile's Supreme Court of Justice and Public Criminal Defender's Office (Defensoría Penal Pública, DPP) co-lead a [commitment](#) to make the justice system more transparent, accessible, and open to collaboration with citizens. The commitment responds to a recommendation from OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) to develop a comprehensive open justice policy and strengthen citizen participation.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Judiciary has completed an internal review of its [User Care Policy](#) and is now developing a strategy for including Open Justice in the final policy.

In 2024, DPP approved and published its own [Open Justice Institutional Policy](#). The policy was developed through an internal co-creation process led by its Open Justice Committee. To implement the policy across the country, DPP created 17 regional subcommittees, one in each Regional Public Defender's Office. Starting in August 2026, members will receive training to help the subcommittees move from being formal structures to permanent teams responsible for territorial coordination, activity tracking, and results reporting.

The Judiciary has also appointed local judges in all 17 judicial jurisdictions to lead Open Justice efforts. In May 2026, the Chair of the Supreme Court's User Care Subcommittee held the first meeting of this network. The group is now developing a territorial work plan for the Supreme Court's User Care Subcommittee to review and approve.

The Judiciary's [Interactive Legal Glossary](#), which explains technical legal terms in plain language, is now in its final testing phase. A working prototype has been developed, and the Judiciary plans to launch it publicly in October 2026. The goal is for the glossary to continue expanding over time.

Between 2024 and 2025, DPP held 103 outreach activities: 24 Open Justice in the Community sessions with municipal officials, 32 Youth Court mock trials, and 47 Innocents Project talks at higher education institutions. DPP [planned](#) 51 more activities for 2026. The [Innocents Project](#) alone reached students at ten Chilean universities. Community sessions also involved municipal governments, police and prison services, the civil registry, and justice professionals, covering topics from adolescent criminal responsibility to gender-specialized defense and human rights standards.

The [Judicial Facilitators pilot](#) has also reached an important milestone. The Supreme Court approved the pilot, and the Judiciary is now preparing an agreement with the Organization of American States' Inter-American Judicial Facilitators Program to implement it. The pilot will test three ways of connecting courts with communities: judicial staff serving as facilitators, formal links between first-instance courts and community leaders, and coordination with the local police courts that handle everyday municipal disputes.

KEY CHALLENGES

Bringing Open Justice to the local level is difficult because different institutions have responsibility for different parts of the justice system. Local police courts handle many common disputes, but they are managed by municipalities rather than the Judiciary. This makes it harder for the Judiciary to introduce reforms directly.

Budget and legislative support are also challenges. Implementing some reforms requires support from the Executive and Legislative branches, whose priorities do not always align with those of the Judiciary. Some groups may also see Open Justice reforms as a disruption to existing practices.

For DPP, the central challenge has been consolidating one consistent management model across its 17 regional subcommittees without losing the territorial relevance that makes their work useful locally. Another challenge is moving beyond simply counting activities to measuring whether those activities actually improve people's knowledge of or trust in the justice system.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

The Judicial Facilitators pilot is helping address the gap between courts and local communities. By testing different ways to connect the two, the pilot can help the Judiciary work with communities in areas where it does not have direct authority.

The Judiciary has also worked with civil society to address concerns that Open Justice reforms could disrupt existing practices. The Chilean Civil Society Open Government Network and Chile's Academic Open Government Network, both part of the National Open State Roundtable, have helped shape some of the commitment's milestones. The Academic Network includes around 40 higher education institutions and helps introduce law students to Open Justice principles before they enter the justice system. Its upcoming 4th Congress on Open Government will continue this work.

To strengthen coordination across DPP's 17 regional subcommittees, DPP has developed a training program focused on improving how the subcommittees work together, coordinate activities, and track results.

LOOKING AHEAD

The commitment will run until the second half of 2027. DPP will focus on completing the remaining activities and strengthening its territorial Open Justice structure. A key priority will be training the 17 regional subcommittees so they can better coordinate their work, monitor progress, and document results. Closing the commitment will also mean shifting from indicators that count activities toward indicators that measure outcomes.

The Judiciary will complete its evaluation of the Judicial Facilitators pilot and finalize the remaining parts of the commitment, including the updated User Care Policy, territorial coordination mechanisms, and an operational Legal Glossary by the end of 2026.

Continued cooperation between the Supreme Court and DPP will be important for turning these activities into lasting practices that can be used across Chile.

Colombia

Transparency and Accountability in the Council of State

The Council of State, Colombia's highest administrative court and supreme advisory body, [committed](#) to improving transparency and accountability within the institution and across the wider Colombian Administrative Court system. As part of the Open Gov Challenge and Colombia's [2023–2025 national action plan](#), this commitment addressed three main challenges identified by the Council: active transparency deficit for different stakeholder groups, insufficient public understanding of the Council's role and judicial functions, and limited opportunities for the public to participate in accountability processes, even when these involve the dissemination of statistical information and judicial decisions. The commitment includes a series of connected milestones, from consulting stakeholders to gathering citizen feedback and involving the public in accountability activities.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Council of State has made substantial progress on all of the commitment's milestones, demonstrating results and concrete actions to promote transparency and open justice. Stakeholder consultations have been conducted to prioritize information needs for accountability exercises, with civil society playing a crucial role in identifying priority topics and providing feedback throughout the process. The Council has also published structured datasets on [Colombia's national open data portal](#), including detailed information on one of its constitutional functions, namely, the loss of congressional mandates between 1991 and 2023, as well as case law relating to Indigenous communities. These are important topics for civil society advocates and affected communities.

The Council has significantly expanded how it communicates with the public through different channels. It publishes explanatory videos on [YouTube](#), [Instagram](#), and [TikTok](#) and runs a podcast on [Spotify](#), which provide plain-language explanations of important decisions. It has also created a dedicated [microsite](#) with interactive dashboards that present accountability and institutional management information in an accessible way. In consultation with civil society partners, the Council has developed [plain-language summaries of complex judicial decisions](#), shortening lengthy rulings to 3-4 pages. It has also translated content into [Indigenous languages](#) and created formats tailored to [children and adolescents](#).

In addition, the Council of State has introduced opportunities for citizens to provide feedback and participate through regional events. In 2025, it held 10 in-person regional events called “Encuentros de Justicia Abierta y de Legalidad” (Open Justice and Legality Encounters). Each event brought together 5 to 6 judges from the different sections of the tribunal, along with the Council’s President, showing strong support from senior leadership. The events combined accountability activities with the presentation of relevant judicial decisions with a significant social impact. They were livestreamed to reach a wider audience. The Council also uses satisfaction surveys, both at events and through its microsite, to gather feedback and improve its communication channels.

Since 2021, the Council of State has also operated a [virtual complaint window](#) (PQRSDF), allowing people to anonymously submit petitions, complaints, and feedback. The Tribunal has also started introducing this tool in administrative tribunals as well.

Finally, the Council of State has participated in various international forums on the subject to share the progress on this commitment. For example, it participated in the International Conference on Open Justice held in the Dominican Republic in August 2025, where the Santo Domingo Declaration was signed. It also participated in the OGP Global Summit, held in Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain in October 2025. These spaces have enabled the Council to exchange experiences and learn from other jurisdictions, with a view to strengthening and complementing the open justice practices to which it is committed.

KEY CHALLENGES

The most significant challenge has been translating complex legal decisions into plain language while maintaining accuracy and legal precision. Judicial rulings often involve intricate constitutional and administrative law concepts that resist simplification without losing critical nuance.

Budget constraints have also made it harder for the Council of State to expand its accountability work across the country. This has affected training staff outside the capital (Bogota) and the introduction of new technology in regional administrative tribunals. For example, gaps in technology infrastructure have limited access to the virtual complaint window in some areas outside Bogota. Civil society partners have also identified this as an important area for improvement.

Another challenge has been balancing public participation with judicial independence. Courts must remain impartial when making decisions, which can create challenges when feedback from civil society or the public relates to or evaluates the substance of judicial rulings. The Council of State has recognized the need for clear guidance to distinguish between feedback on communication and assessment on the decisions themselves.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To address the challenge of using plain language, the Council of State established an internal Plain Language Commission and strengthened its Technology of the Information and Communications Committee. In addition, the Council continues to work with civil society organizations, universities, and communication experts to improve its plain-language materials. It complements this strategy with the implementation of technology tools for the administrative contentious jurisdiction and the strengthening of existing mechanisms to ensure access to justice for all people across the country. Despite budgetary constraints, the Council has continued to dedicate resources to this work, showing that transparency and accountability remain institutional priorities.

The Council is also exploring collaboration with civil society organizations, such as Corporación Excelencia en la Justicia (Excellence in Justice Corporation), and seeking support from international mechanisms and organizations to fund training programs and the expansion of communication channels to enable the wider dissemination of the Council's decisions. These partnerships recognize that improving judicial transparency requires support from a wider range of actors, not just the Council's own resources.

To address the challenge of balancing participation with judicial independence and autonomy, the Council of State continues to explore ways to use citizen feedback to improve its work while protecting the independent decision-making required for its judicial role.

LOOKING AHEAD

Looking ahead, the Council of State's focus is likely to be on strengthening and standardizing these existing initiatives as part of a broader strategy for judicial transparency. The main challenge is now to move beyond creating new communication channels and ensure that existing ones are used consistently, provide high-quality information, and include systematic follow-up on citizen feedback. By showing how public input leads to concrete improvements in communication and accountability, the Council could move toward a more inclusive model of open justice, particularly at the regional level.

Colombia

Open and Accessible Court Rulings

As part of the Open Gov Challenge and Colombia's [2023-2025 national action plan](#), the Constitutional Court made a [commitment](#) to make judicial information easier for people to understand and access. The goal is to make constitutional court decisions more accessible, especially for groups that have traditionally had less access to the justice system. The commitment focuses particularly on children and teenagers with visual impairment, Indigenous communities, and Afro-descendant communities.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Court used social media to find out what legal issues people were most interested in. It then selected 10 court decisions and rewrote them in plain language. These decisions cover topics such as LGBTIQIA+ workers' rights, protections for social leaders, access to information, enforced disappearance, public lands, carbon credits, and the Escazú Agreement. Through its Clear Justice (Justicia Clara) initiative, the Court now shares some of these simplified rulings through Instagram and YouTube, with magistrates often participating directly in the outreach efforts.

The Guardians of the Constitution (Guardianes de la Constitución) project made its existing [children's book](#) available in Braille for children and teenagers with visual impairment, and in Creole for the Raizal community in San Andrés and Providencia.

Through the [Rights in the Territory initiative](#) (Derechos en el Territorio), the Court worked with Indigenous communities to adapt at least five important court decisions into language and formats that better reflect their cultures and rights. The adapted decisions were published in an illustrated book. The Court worked directly with communities through meetings in several regions, and it held more meetings than originally planned.

Local organizations and community leaders have been important in reaching these audiences. The Court has particularly relied on the Amazon Conservation Team to connect it with Indigenous and other ethnic communities. Without this local partner, it would have been much harder for the Court to reach people directly in their communities.

The Court has also improved transparency and monitoring by creating two statistical [dashboards](#). One tracks requests the Court sends to Congress, while the other tracks tutelary orders directed at government ministries since 2021. The Court also meets twice a year with the Bogotá Mayor's Office to review whether these orders are being followed. This makes the dashboards part of an ongoing accountability process rather than simply publishing the information once.

KEY CHALLENGES

The end of USAID funding meant that it was no longer possible to develop in-person workshops, which were originally intended to simplify court decisions.

There are also two important gaps that have not yet been addressed. The Court has not returned to the schools and communities it originally worked with to evaluate the real impact these materials and workshops have had on children. In addition, the current programs do not yet reach enough young people. Youth remains largely outside the initiative's main target audiences.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

For the simplification of court decisions, the Court has focused more on lower-cost ways of reaching people. It continues to use social media and has judges participate directly in its outreach efforts.

To reach more young people, the incoming Court leadership plans to create a school of young guardians, building on the existing Guardians of the Constitution program. This would expand the initiative to an age group it has not yet reached.

The Court also plans to continue supporting the workshops being independently run by municipal ombudspersons. This allows the program to grow without requiring the Court to provide additional funding or staff for every workshop.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Court's next priorities are to evaluate the impact of its programs and reach more people. It plans to return to the schools and communities it has already worked with to find out whether the Guardians of the Constitution and Rights in the Territory programs are actually having the intended impact. This evaluation has not yet taken place.

The Court also wants to extend its outreach to older children and young people. One way it hopes to achieve this is by running a pilot moot court for young people. The Court also plans to use more informal and widely accessible methods of communication. For instance, it plans to involve other stakeholders who could disseminate content to diverse audiences.

A new partnership with Colombia's Ombudsman's Office will create additional opportunities for collaboration. Planned activities include short documentaries, tracking whether court decisions are being followed, a pilot program in six Bogotá schools, and additional efforts to share the illustrated Rights in the Territory book.

The commitment was also highlighted in an OGP publication celebrating its 15th anniversary as an example of improving inclusion and access to justice. This suggests that the Court's approach could serve as a model for other institutions working on similar issues.

Côte d'Ivoire

Draft a Law on the Protection of Whistleblowers

As part of the Open Gov Challenge and its [2024-2026 national action plan](#), Côte d'Ivoire's High Authority for Good Governance (HABG) [committed](#) to developing a new law to protect whistleblowers.

This commitment responds to a critical gap in existing legal frameworks: while the 2018 law protects witnesses and informants within formal judicial proceedings, it leaves workplace whistleblowers and those reporting corruption outside the judicial system without legal protection. The new law aims to establish standalone whistleblower protection mechanisms, ensuring that individuals who report acts of corruption can do so without putting themselves at risk.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The HABG has achieved substantial technical progress on the draft whistleblower law through a rigorous, multi-stakeholder validation process. The draft text has been validated by key relevant technical stakeholders, including the Ministry of Justice, the General Secretariat of Government, the Prime Minister's Office, the Parliament, the Platform of African Whistleblowers (PLAAF), financial intelligence units, asset recovery agencies, and civil society organizations.

Two workshops were held to achieve this. During the first workshop, participants suggested modifications to the initial draft. HABG then updated the draft and brought it back for a second review. This process helped improve the draft law and build consensus among the different groups involved.

An initial draft of a practical guide for using the new law was also developed. The final version of this guide will be aligned with the provisions of the final version of the new law to make sure it reflects how it will work in practice.

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provided critical support. International experts helped stakeholders understand the distinction between witness protection (covered under the 2018 law) and whistleblower protection, and provided comparative examples from other countries, including Senegal.

Civil society's deep engagement was also instrumental. Their informed participation in the workshops helped achieve shared understanding within government, clearly identifying the protection gap. This sustained partnership ensured that the draft reflects both technical legal sophistication and the practical protection needs of potential whistleblowers.

KEY CHALLENGES

The most significant challenge was bringing various stakeholders, including government institutions, to agree on the necessity of new legislation. Many actors considered the 2018 law on witness and informant protection sufficient, without realizing it covers only a limited subset of whistleblower situations.

Political-level adoption represents the next major challenge. This requires advocacy work with political actors to build government ownership before the Ministry of Justice formally transmits it to the Government Secretariat.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

International technical expertise proved essential in addressing skepticism about the necessity of new legislation. UNODC experts were brought in at key moments to explain the difference between witness and whistleblower protection and to share examples from other countries. This helped government and civil society stakeholders agree on the gap in the 2018 law.

Moreover, civil society organizations reinforced the case for new protections. Their input showed how the lack of protection can affect people who report corruption and failures in the public interest.

The HABG is already working with policymakers to secure their support for the technically validated bill. This political engagement, based on technical consensus already achieved, aims to ensure decision-makers understand both the legal substance and the national interest involved in adopting whistleblower protection legislation.

LOOKING AHEAD

The commitment stands at a critical juncture: technical validation is complete, but political adoption is ongoing. The next phase of the process involves submitting the draft law to the Government before its adoption by Parliament. Once political adoption is obtained, the team will align the practical guide with the law to help people understand and use the new protection measures.

Continued engagement of international experts and civil society organizations will be essential as the legislation moves through political bodies, ensuring that the voices of those who would benefit from these protections are heard at the highest levels of decision-making.

Costa Rica

Addressing the Judicial Backlog

As part of Costa Rica's 2023–2027 [action plan](#), the Judiciary's Planning Directorate made an Open Gov Challenge [commitment](#) to reduce the judicial backlog. Consultations showed that improving public trust would require the Judiciary to reduce delays in court processes and communicate more clearly about its work and services. The commitment's interconnected milestones aim to make judicial performance data public and actionable, while building a culture of continuous improvement within the Judiciary.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Judiciary has launched the [Comprehensive Platform for Judicial Information and Statistical Indicators](#), an interactive analytical tool designed to monitor trends, generate insights, and facilitate evidence-based decision-making. This platform enables the public to track the progress of case files across various judicial units, including new case filings, case closures, the duration of proceedings, and active workloads. Additionally, users can analyze the judicial backlog by filtering cases according to date, type of proceeding, legal area, judicial circuit, and specific unit. In this way, the platform offers litigants, journalists, and the public direct, transparent access to institutional information.

To make the platform easier to use, the Judiciary held two workshops in 2025 with participants from ten internal government offices, as well as civil society organizations, academics, journalists, and lawyers. Participants identified 40 specific ways to improve the dashboard. The Judiciary is now putting these recommendations into practice.

The "Improvement Model" ([Modelo de Mejora Continua](#)) places a Judiciary professional in each participating judicial circuit to help offices develop work plans and improvement actions. In July 2025, the Judiciary expanded the Model from eight to twelve circuits, closing coverage gaps in areas that previously had no dedicated support.

Each circuit's administrative council now reviews management indicators monthly. Based on these indicators, every office receives a color-coded rating from blue (excellent management) to red (management with room for improvement). The Judiciary publishes these ratings monthly on its [website](#). This makes judicial performance more transparent to the public and encourages offices to improve. Over the past year, the Model has reduced the average age of backlogged cases by about 24 years, while also increasing productivity and reducing the number of active cases.

The Judiciary has also created opportunities for direct dialogue with citizens. It held two sessions in 2025, with two more planned for August 2026. These sessions explain the Improvement Model and give citizens an opportunity to suggest further improvements.

KEY CHALLENGES

Using citizen feedback to improve the Comprehensive Platform for Judicial Information and Statistical Indicators requires more analytical capacity than the Judiciary's statistics team can easily provide. The core challenge is serving very different users, from litigating lawyers to first-time visitors, without splintering the platform into multiple separate interfaces.

Budget constraints initially put the planned expansion of the Improvement Model at risk. The newly added circuits also had to build the same habits as the eight original circuits: reporting management indicators regularly and working together on improvements. This required a dedicated alignment process before the Model could take hold.

Communication and public awareness activities have fallen behind the original December 2025 target. In particular, structural restrictions on adding new public sections to the Judiciary's website have delayed plans for a public repository of all initiatives addressing the backlog.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

The Judiciary is building user-profile-specific views, so a litigating lawyer, a journalist, and a citizen each see information suited to their needs. It is also creating a plain-language glossary explaining terms such as “first instance,” “case entry,” and “backlog.”

The Judiciary is also partnering with the Costa Rican Bar Association to train its members on navigating and using the public dashboard through the Open Justice Congress. This helps extend the Judiciary's capacity to support users.

Despite budget constraints, the Judiciary continued with the Improvement Model's expansion as planned. It reached the four additional circuits, as well as administrative areas within those circuits that had previously lacked dedicated professional support. The Judiciary is continuing to work with these circuits during their monthly indicator reviews to build stronger reporting and improvement practices.

To address the delayed repository, the Judiciary is identifying where it can be placed on the website while making sure it is easy for citizens to find.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Judiciary considers this work larger than the commitment's formal timeline. The Improvement Model is a permanent institutional management practice that will keep evolving well past 2027. The Judiciary also wants to standardize citizen dialogue mechanisms and user testing of new digital tools as regular institutional practice.

Looking further ahead, the Judiciary sees potential for using artificial intelligence to help its Planning Directorate analyze performance indicators and identify which offices need additional support. It also plans to share these practices with other judiciaries in the region working to reduce backlogs.

Costa Rica

Open Courts Pilot Program

The National Commission for the Improvement of the Administration of Justice (CONAMAJ) submitted an Open Gov Challenge [commitment](#) to pilot an Open Courts model that brings transparency, public participation, and collaboration into the day-to-day work of individual courts.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

CONAMAJ and the Center for Support, Coordination, and Improvement of the Jurisdictional Function (CACMFJ) first piloted the model in four courts—two rural and two urban—from 2023 to 2024. The pilot showed that court users have very different needs depending on the court's subject matter and location. The original design pushed courts to complete many actions on a rigid timeline, and it did not fit that diversity well.

Based on these lessons, CONAMAJ and CACMFJ redesigned the model to be more flexible and let courts choose from a broad range of open-justice actions that fit their needs. The focus shifted from completing a set of activities to creating genuine, lasting changes in how courts work. Participation has grown from four to seven courts.

Every participating court has included public participation in its action plan, keeping community and civil society engagement at the center of the model. For example, the San Carlos Domestic Violence Court worked with Costa Rica's National Institute for Women (INAMU) to hold an accountability session with local women users. Through discussion with users, they identified their needs and used the feedback to improve how the court operates.

The Heredia Alimony Court surveyed users and rewrote its forms in plain language based on their feedback. It is now measuring whether this change improves users' experience of the service. The Alajuela Domestic Violence Court, San Carlos Agrarian Court, and Cartago Traffic Court have also carried out training and outreach activities. The Cartago court partnered with the Municipality of Cartago's road safety education program to reach residents through an existing community space.

Institutional partners have also played an important role in the implementation. CONAMAJ and CACMFJ's partners, such as the Contralorías de Servicios and the Regional Administrations, have actively contributed to the Open Courts Model. In the next phases, these partnerships will be key to expanding the Model's reach and keeping it going in participating courts.

The implementation of the Open Courts Model has also involved continuous capacity-building for the judicial personnel participating. This has strengthened their ownership of the Open Justice approach and helped them make it part of their daily work. Even so, more support is needed to consolidate the Model and improve the scope, quality, and depth of its actions. Personnel need stronger technical skills in areas such as problem analysis, results-based planning, outcome indicators for measuring results, and strategic communication.

KEY CHALLENGES

The biggest challenge is convincing parts of the institution that the model is valuable. Courts already face heavy workloads and large backlogs, so participation in a new initiative can feel like additional work rather than something that helps them.

Measuring results was difficult during the early stages of implementation. The original pilot focused more on completing activities than on measuring their impact, leaving CONAMAJ with limited evidence of the model's benefits.

Sustaining the model as it grows strains CONAMAJ's limited staff. Each team member now follows two courts, up from one in the pilot phase, and further growth would require rethinking how much direct support the team can realistically provide.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To build support within the Judiciary, CONAMAJ encourages courts to choose open-justice actions that also help improve their everyday work and case management. This gives courts practical benefits and helps show that open justice does not have to mean additional work.

CONAMAJ is also strengthening its approach to measuring results, focusing on one or two strategic actions at each court. Demonstrating concrete results from these early efforts is a keyway to show other courts the value of the model and encourage them to participate.

To make the model more sustainable with limited staff, CONAMAJ has reduced the amount of hands-on support it provides. Courts and their staff now take greater responsibility for designing and implementing their own actions. Partnerships with organizations such as INAMU and the Municipality of Cartago also help courts reach more people without increasing CONAMAJ's workload.

These approaches have led to clear progress in institutional ownership, engagement, and a sense of belonging among judicial personnel. This is an important foundation for the Model's sustainability as it strengthens the commitment to keep developing the Model and gives CONAMAJ and CACMFJ good conditions to continue investing in it and expand it.

LOOKING AHEAD

CONAMAJ and CACMFJ plan to expand the model gradually, using evidence of results to guide future growth. As it improves its ability to measure impact, it will use those findings to show other courts the practical benefits of open-justice approaches and encourage them to participate. This measurement work is still in its early stages, and CONAMAJ continues to look for tools that are appropriate for a small program with limited resources.

CONAMAJ also plans to keep the model flexible, allowing each new court to choose open-justice actions that respond to the needs of its users rather than requiring every court to follow the same approach.

Costa Rica

Participatory Framework for Restorative Justice

As part of the Open Gov Challenge, the Judiciary [committed](#) to building a standardized participatory accountability methodology for its 12 restorative justice offices nationwide. Restorative justice depends on citizen participation to reach a restorative agreement. Yet each office had historically run its own informal accountability practice, which mostly informed communities of results rather than gathering their input. This commitment sets out to bring restorative justice and open justice principles together into a single co-designed methodology.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Judiciary developed the new methodology using direct input from communities. In 2025, restorative justice teams conducted a SWOT analysis —looking at strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats— through community meetings. In 2026, they also sent a survey to all institutions in the restorative justice support network. Most of the institutions responded, and their answers provided input for developing the methodology. Together, the meetings and survey responses provided valuable input and helped identify the main issues the new methodology should address.

To develop the methodology, the Judiciary brought together the main institutions involved in restorative justice cases, including the Public Prosecutor's Office, Public Defender's Office, the Restorative Justice Governing Office, and the Social Work and Psychology Department. It also developed a facilitation guide that incorporates the perspectives of all these four institutional bodies.

The Judiciary tested the methodology for the first time in June 2026 in San José, with more than 80 participants from public institutions, civil society organizations, and community movements. Judicial facilitators also supported the exercise. Senior officials took part directly: the Attorney General, the Director of the Public Defender's Office, and the head of the Social Work and Psychology Department. Justice Gerardo Rubén Alfaro Vargas, who oversees Restorative Justice in the Costa Rican Judiciary, also gave a speech during the accountability exercise. Their involvement helped build broader institutional support for the approach.

The Judiciary is now reviewing feedback from the pilot and preparing a public report on the results. The report will describe what the exercise achieved and what the Judiciary plans to improve in the next national accountability cycle in 2027.

The Judiciary has drafted the results report of the participatory accountability exercise and sent it to its leadership. The report is now awaiting institutional validation and has not yet been approved or published. Once approved, it will describe what the exercise achieved and what the Judiciary plans to improve in the next national accountability cycle in 2027.

KEY CHALLENGES

The main challenge was developing one methodology that can work across Costa Rica's very different regions. Resources are concentrated in the metropolitan area, while regional and coastal offices often have fewer resources. Standardizing an approach that stays adaptable and accessible across all these contexts, while still guaranteeing real participation, took deliberate design work.

Technology and connectivity gaps in remote areas made it harder to reach all the communities the methodology is intended to serve.

Budget constraints limit how often the Judiciary can carry out the accountability exercise. For now, it can take place only once a year. Limited resources may also make it difficult to respond to every request raised by civil society.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To address differences between regions, the Judiciary plans to gradually expand the methodology over the next two years. Each of the 12 restorative justice offices will eventually use the same approach to hold its own local accountability process, helping reduce the gap between the metropolitan area and other regions.

To address connectivity challenges, the Judiciary combined in-person community meetings with an online survey. This allowed it to reach communities with limited internet access while also gathering input from a wider network of institutions.

To address budget constraints, the Judiciary has made transparency part of the methodology itself. Its upcoming results report will clearly explain which requests from civil society cannot be addressed because of budget limitations and which can be addressed through better coordination or internal organization. By explaining these limits publicly instead of reporting only successes, the Judiciary treats honesty as part of genuine accountability.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Judiciary's central priority for the next two years is regionalization: extending the standardized methodology to all 12 restorative justice offices, so each can run its own accountability exercise locally rather than relying on a single centralized event.

As the methodology expands, the Judiciary aims to make this participatory accountability exercise a standing annual practice at every site. This would ensure that restorative justice offices across the country, not only in the capital, apply the same open-justice principles consistently.

Dominican Republic

Implement the Open Justice Policy

As part of the Open Gov Challenge, the Judiciary of the Dominican Republic [committed](#) to developing and implementing an Open Justice Policy, the institution's first comprehensive framework for open judicial governance. The policy responds to problems the Judiciary itself identified: limited citizen participation in designing and evaluating judicial policy, barriers to accessing judicial information and services, low public understanding of judicial decisions, and persistent gaps in citizen trust.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Judiciary developed the Open Justice Policy through co-creation roundtables, validation sessions, and public consultation, with civil society organizations, legal professional associations, media, international organizations, and everyday justice system users. The International Network for Open Justice (RIJA) supported the consultation process throughout.

The design of the policy prioritized building on existing institutional infrastructure to ensure implementation. For instance, the Open Justice Policy is now part of the Judiciary's Planning Directorate annual and biannual work plans.

In July 2026, the Judiciary Council formally approved the Open Justice Policy at an official launch event. It also introduced the Open Justice Commission to lead and oversee the implementation of the policy.

To create a credible path to execution, the Judiciary prepared a preliminary multi-year implementation plan, so it can enter the Judiciary's regular budget planning rather than depend on any single administration's discretion. OGP supported this process by applying methodologies and lessons from its own work helping the Dominican Republic implement earlier reforms, such as the Civic Space Strategy.

The Judiciary's communications team has put in place a campaign to showcase the work completed so far and the steps still ahead.

KEY CHALLENGES

Momentum is at stake. Years of consultation and drafting built strong public and institutional engagement. But detailing every action line and its budget takes time, and delays risk turning that goodwill into impatience, inside the Judiciary and among the external stakeholders who helped shape the policy.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

The Judiciary's multi-year implementation plan, tied to the budget cycle, protects the policy from leadership turnover. Also, the Judiciary is not detailing every action line immediately. Instead, it is prioritizing a subset for full specification now: each gets a name, scope, timeframe, and responsible team. The Judiciary treats these priority lines as trackable commitments, with assigned budgets and monitoring built on the OGP framework.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Judiciary is planning a virtual, international launch event of the Policy in November 2026. They are currently finalizing the establishment of the multi-stakeholder Open Justice Commission that the Policy calls for, which needs to be in place before they move forward with the implementation plan. The Judiciary has also confirmed that they will use the domestic OGP action plan to implement the Open Justice Policy.

Honduras

Implement an Open Justice Policy

As part of Honduras' [2023-2025 national action plan](#) and the Open Gov Challenge, the Judiciary of Honduras [committed](#) to promoting judicial openness and mainstreaming the principles of participation, collaboration, and transparency throughout the administration of justice to strengthen public confidence in justice and protect people's rights. The commitment encompasses interconnected milestones spanning from the approval and dissemination of an institutional open justice policy through to the redesign of communication mechanisms.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Judiciary of Honduras has achieved substantial progress across multiple milestones, demonstrating institutional commitment to the Open Justice agenda. The foundational achievement was the development and unanimous approval of the [Open Justice and Integrity Policy](#) by the Supreme Court in October 2024, through a co-creation process involving academia, civil society, and judicial personnel. The Policy establishes three strategic pillars and biennial action plans with impact indicators.

By 2025, approximately 540 judicial and civil society actors have been trained through dissemination and operational planning workshops, with an estimated 1,100 total participants across both cycles.

Training programs have expanded significantly through multiple partnerships. This includes working with the Costa Rican Judiciary, reaching around 200 participants; offering four rounds of self-paced courses through the International Development Law Organization (IDLO); holding a forum with judges from Brazil, Mexico, and Peru; and developing training materials with USAID. This multi-partnership approach reflects the Judiciary's recognition that open justice capacity requires ecosystem-level collaboration including academia, civil society organizations, and international partners.

The Judiciary has also redesigned [its website](#) and moved it to a new SharePoint platform with 16 sections. The new [Citizen Portal](#) provides access to three key sections: Know Your Rights, Learn About the Judiciary, and Citizen Services. It also includes interactive maps showing court locations and a legal glossary using plain language. A new [open data section](#) also makes justice-related information more accessible to the public.

The [Open Judicial Office Model](#) (*Modelo de Despachos Judiciales Abiertos*) was approved by the President of the Supreme Court and published in the Official Gazette in November 2024. The model focuses on making courts more responsive to people's needs and applying Open Justice principles in how they operate.

The Judiciary tested the Model in two courts in Francisco Morazán: the Sentencing Court and the Special Court for Domestic Violence. Both courts developed plain-language materials and translated them into Garifuna. Each court has also held two dialogues with civil society organizations. In the second dialogue, each court reported on the actions in its first action plan and on how it is responding to demands for justice, including case management and response times. The Sentencing Court also shared data on the most frequent crimes, and the Domestic Violence Court shared the most common forms of violence. Based on these dialogues, both courts co-created a new action plan with the participating organizations to continue the Model.

KEY CHALLENGES

The most significant ongoing challenge has been the pause in the implementation of the Open Justice Cooperation Roundtables and integrity/transparency mechanisms. This pause stems from two interconnected factors: the institutional need to respond to demands and recommendations from previous civil society consultation exercises, and critical personnel rotation in key leadership positions. While the foundational work was strong—the Citizen Roundtable for Judicial Transparency and Integrity was established in La Ceiba in March 2025—the momentum has been interrupted by these structural changes.

Another challenge was uncertainty about which institution would lead Honduras' open government work after the national government changed. This made it harder for the Judiciary to coordinate with other parts of government and maintain continuity. Since July 2026, the Institute of Access to Public Information has taken on the lead role, giving the Judiciary a clear partner for planning the next phase of the commitment.

Budget constraints make it difficult to expand in-person training. Online courses cost less, but the Judicial School has found that fewer people complete them and that participants see them as less effective than in-person training. The Judiciary therefore faces a challenge in expanding training while maintaining its quality.

Another challenge is the limited use of electronic case files. While the institutional commitment to judicial transparency is strong, the technological infrastructure necessary to publish structured judicial data at scale remains underdeveloped. This barrier affects the Judiciary's ability to advance certain aspects of the open data agenda outlined in the commitment.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To restart the transparency roundtables, the new magistrate responsible for Open Justice is being supported to learn about the process and reinvigorate this mechanism. The Judiciary still plans to bring these groups back together once leadership and capacity are more stable and it can respond to the issues raised by civil society.

The Judiciary is also planning to expand the Open Judicial Office Model to more courts following the positive results from the two pilot courts.

The Domestic Violence Court pilot in particular, has generated concrete outputs that strengthen the case for replication. These include a plain-language manual and simplified legal glossary developed with USAID, translations into Garifuna for vulnerable communities, and access to psychosocial support through partnerships with the Red Cross. These examples show how open justice reforms can directly improve people's experience with the justice system.

To improve access to judicial data, the Judiciary is prioritizing the development of an electronic case filing system. Progress has been slower than expected because of the complexity of introducing digital systems across many courts with different levels of technical capacity.

Civil society, academia and international partners continue to be important partners in addressing these challenges. They have helped develop the Open Justice Policy, design the pilot court model, create plain-language materials, and support reforms to domestic violence law. This sustained partnership demonstrates that open justice is not a government initiative but a collaborative agenda requiring ongoing engagement between all relevant parties.

LOOKING AHEAD

The change in Honduras' national government has created some uncertainty, but the Judiciary has continued to move forward on open justice. Approving the policy, expanding training, redesigning the website, and testing the Open Judicial Office Model have created a strong foundation for future work.

The main priorities now are to:

- Restart the transparency roundtables and respond more systematically to civil society recommendations.
- Expand the Open Judicial Office Model to more courts.
- Develop the electronic case filing system so the Judiciary can make more data available to the public.
- Create more formal ways to work with civil society.

Continued support from international partners will also be important to make open justice a standard part of how the justice system operates across Honduras.

Kaduna State, Nigeria

Increase Coordination to Support Justice Reform

Kaduna State's Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee (ACJMC) submitted an Open Gov Challenge [commitment](#) to improve coordination across the criminal justice system. The commitment aims to reduce the number of people held in pre-trial detention for long periods by making sure that those responsible face consequences when justice standards are not followed.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Police Duty Solicitor Scheme is the clearest success so far. The Public and Private Development Centre (PPDC), a civil society organization and member of the ACJMC, has trained and placed lawyers in police stations across Kaduna State for the past two years. These lawyers give legal advice to people as soon as they are arrested. They also help police officers understand the elements of the offences the suspects are alleged to have committed and advise on the next steps.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has joined the effort by training more solicitors and helping expand the scheme to police stations that PPDC does not yet cover. UNDP has also committed funding for the next two years. The scheme has already contributed to a decline in complaints about violations of fundamental rights reaching Kaduna courts, and both police officers and defendants have responded positively to the presence of the solicitors.

The ACJMC is working to introduce community service as an alternative to imprisonment for minor offences. To learn how the program works, it made a study visit to Ogun State. It then set up a subcommittee to review the study report and the documents gathered there, and to adapt them to Kaduna State's context. The subcommittee will also propose an amendment to the Kaduna State Penal Code, so courts can impose community service as a punishment for minor offences.

The Bail Bond Guidelines have also made significant progress. The committee developing the guidelines has completed a draft and visited other Nigerian states to do benchmark practice. The remaining steps—including creating a screening committee, publishing application documents, and informing courts and the public—require relatively few additional resources.

KEY CHALLENGES

Two other parts of the commitment have made much less progress: quarterly ACJMC meetings and monthly visits by magistrates to detention facilities.

Both activities depend on funding to cover sitting allowances for committee members, monitoring of how the ACJL is applied in urban and rural areas, travel stipends so magistrates can reach detention facilities across the state, as well as support the Bondsman scheme and community service. Although the government has a budget line for these activities, the funds have not yet been released.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

The Committee plans to propose virtual meetings as a way to meet the legal requirement for quarterly meetings, instead of relying only on physical ones. Members have generally preferred to meet in person, so this option has not yet been used. However, formally proposing virtual meetings could provide a practical way for the ACJMC to continue meeting regularly.

Civil society and international partners have also helped keep other parts of the commitment moving. PPDC and UNDP have provided funding and support for the Police Duty Solicitor Scheme, allowing it to continue despite delays in government funding. This partnership has helped ensure that at least one key part of the commitment continues to make progress.

LOOKING AHEAD

The next steps focus on areas where the Committee and its partners can make progress.

Virtual meetings could allow the ACJMC to continue meeting every quarter without waiting for funding. The Bail Bond Guidelines and Community Service can also be finalized with relatively limited additional resources. Meanwhile, PPDC and UNDP will continue expanding the Police Duty Solicitor Scheme to more police stations.

Continued support from civil society and international partners has helped keep the commitment moving despite funding challenges. In the longer term, however, the government will need to take responsibility for the Police Duty Solicitor Scheme once external funding ends. Progress on the ACJMC meetings and magistrate visits will also depend on whether government funding becomes readily available.

Partners' collaboration and support will really assist in breaching most of the justice challenges facing the State.

Kenya

Create a Digital Justice Framework

As part of the Open Gov Challenge, the Judiciary of Kenya [committed](#) to creating a Digital Justice Framework. The goal is to leverage emerging technology—particularly artificial intelligence (AI)—to modernize court processes and enhance access to justice.

One key part of the plan is to use AI to turn court recordings into written transcripts. This could help reduce delays for people involved in court cases, since transcripts are currently slow to produce when proceedings have to be transcribed by hand.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Judiciary has now introduced e-filing in all courts across Kenya, and about 80% of courts use a virtual platform that allows people to attend hearings remotely. Links to these hearings are published on a [public cause-list portal](#).

Building on this digital foundation, the Judiciary has started testing AI to create transcripts of court proceedings, using the Whisper tool. After training and improving the system, it is now about 70% accurate and is being used to transcribe proceedings for around 280 judicial officers in Nairobi courts.

This progress was achieved through extensive stakeholder engagement, bringing together judicial officers, the Law Society of Kenya, development partners, academia, and technology experts to shape the transcription workflow. In parallel, the Judiciary has developed two governance instruments: a Judiciary AI Usage Policy and a Data Governance Policy, both currently in draft and undergoing public participation. Civil society organizations, including Kituo Cha Sheria, FIDA Kenya, Katiba Institute, and the International Commission of Jurists, have received the draft policies and have been invited to provide feedback. Judicial officers, police, probation officers, and people working with children have also taken part in discussions about AI and the draft policies.

The Judiciary has established six pilot e-filing support centers at court stations and Huduma Centers. It is also working to set up e-filing centers at court-station level to make digital court services easier to access. Huduma Centers play a complementary role by helping court users, especially self-represented litigants who may need support using the e-Filing system and other digital court services.

KEY CHALLENGES

Civil society organizations have helped shape how the e-filing system has been rolled out.

When e-filing was first introduced across Kenya, Kituo Cha Sheria challenged the Judiciary in court. It argued that requiring everyone to use e-filing assumed that people had access to computers, phones, and the internet. This could leave some people unable to use the courts. The court agreed and ordered the Judiciary to create support for people at risk of digital exclusion. This led to the creation of the six e-filing support centers.

However, the support centers have since faced another legal challenge. The Law Society of Kenya filed a separate petition challenging plans to expand the centers beyond the six pilots. It has raised concerns about public participation and argued that simplifying court processes at these centers could discourage litigants from seeking the services of an advocate. The court has paused any further expansion until the case is decided. It is not yet clear when that will happen.

The Judiciary also faces technological and resource challenges in scaling AI-enabled transcription. Although dedicated servers have been acquired significantly improving the processing speed of the Whisper AI transcription system, the key remaining challenge is the accuracy and learning capability of the AI model. A three-hour court recording can currently be transcribed in approximately 30 minutes. However, the current configuration does not support continuous learning or model adaptation based on validated and corrected transcripts. Consequently, while the AI can generate an initial draft transcript within a short period, significant time is still required for manual review and correction of errors. If the AI model is configured to learn from validated and corrected transcripts, it would progressively improve its recognition of court-specific terminology, names, legal language and commonly occurring speech patterns. This would improve transcription accuracy and reduce the time and effort required for post-transcription editing and quality assurance.

Public input on the two draft policies has also been delayed. A workshop planned for around 100 participants had to be cancelled because a national strike disrupted transportation in Nairobi. The workshop has since been rescheduled, several months later.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

While the Law Society's case is being considered by the court, the Judiciary is continuing to operate the six existing e-filing pilot centers. It is waiting for the court's decision before expanding them.

In the meantime, the Judiciary is continuing to work on the two draft policies. It is holding focused group discussions with judicial officers and other justice-sector actors ahead of the rescheduled public participation workshop. Civil society organizations are also reviewing the drafts and are expected to provide formal comments at the rescheduled workshop.

On the AI-enabled transcription, the Judiciary acquired a dedicated server infrastructure that has substantially improved processing speeds, enabling a three-hour court recording to be transcribed in approximately 30 minutes.

Given the technological and resource considerations involved in scaling AI transcription, the Judiciary is also adopting a focused approach to implementation. Rather than introducing the technology across all courts simultaneously, efforts are being concentrated on the Small Claims Court, where a significant proportion of litigants are self-represented. The Judiciary aims to progressively automate the process from filing a case through to the issuance of a court order and to facilitate the availability of transcripts within 24 to 72 hours after proceedings, without requiring a separate request from the litigant.

The focused implementation will provide an opportunity to demonstrate the practical benefits of AI-enabled transcription and end-to-end digital court processes, while generating lessons to inform future scaling and investment.

LOOKING AHEAD

The next steps depend on two important developments:

- The court's decision on the Law Society of Kenya's case, which will determine whether the e-filing support centers can expand beyond the current six.
- Enhancement of the AI transcription system, particularly its ability to learn from validated and corrected transcripts. While dedicated servers have already improved processing speed, enhanced learning capability will be important in improving accuracy and reducing the time required for manual corrections.

In the meantime, the Judiciary will continue refining end-to-end automation at the Small Claims Court and work toward finalizing the Judiciary AI Usage and Data Governance Policies through the rescheduled public participation workshop.

Sierra Leone

Amend the Ombudsman Law to Increase Access to Justice

Sierra Leone's Office of the Ombudsman [committed](#) to amending the Ombudsman Act of 1997 to increase access to justice as part of the Open Gov Challenge. The commitment aims to replace the 30-year-old Ombudsman Act of 1997 with a modernised law before the next election cycle. As this reform was Cabinet-approved as a formal OGP commitment, it gives it institutional footing independent of any single administration.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The legislative reform itself is advancing steadily. The Ombudsman's office expects to have the revised Act ready by the end of 2026, with the document ready for parliamentary debate well before Sierra Leone's next election cycle.

The draft of the new Act directly addresses the constraints of the nearly 30-year-old original law. Key changes are: (1) removal of routing through the Ministry of Finance, giving the Ombudsman direct control over budget and hiring independence; (2) creation of a Deputy Ombudsman position to ensure continuity of operations when the Ombudsman is unavailable; (3) making Ombudsman decisions binding and enforceable, with financial penalties for institutions that ignore them; and (4) expanding the Ombudsman reach through new regional offices and a real-time digital complaints system, closing the access gap for citizens in remote districts.

During the development of the new Act, the support of the International Network for Open Justice (RIJA) was fundamental. RIJA reviewed the draft materials and provided a comparative research paper mapping citizen participation mechanisms across Ombudsman institutions in Africa and beyond to ground these recommendations in international practice. The Campaign for Human Rights and Development International (CHARDI) complemented

these efforts with its own grassroots work. Through sensitization activities with communities, CHRDI has kept the reform people-centered, advocated against any government interference in the Ombudsman's work, and lobbied Parliament directly to justify and increase the office's budget.

Ahead of the legislative change, the Ombudsman's office has built a multi-channel public awareness strategy. The "Did You Know" social media campaign, explaining what the office does and does not do, proved successful enough that at least 14 other Sierra Leonean institutions replicated it. This effort runs alongside "Know Your Rights" and "Know Your Responsibilities" campaigns, radio jingles in multiple languages, and "mobile clinics" that travel to districts without a physical office to meet communities with permission from local chiefs and collect complaints on the spot.

KEY CHALLENGES

Sustaining the reform's momentum across political transitions is a real risk. Political will is inherently temporary, and Sierra Leone's current momentum can convert into support durable enough to survive a change in administration.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

On the sustainability risk, the Ombudsman's office points to the reform's institutional footing rather than any individual's political commitment. Cabinet approved it as an official OGP commitment in a single sitting, anchoring it beyond any one administration. With two and a half years remaining before the next election, the office is targeting completion of the new Act by the end of 2026 and parliamentary passage by early 2027, well ahead of any transition risk.

LOOKING AHEAD

Sierra Leone's near-term path centers on finishing the Act by the end of 2026 and reaching parliamentary passage by early 2027.

State of Minas Gerais, Brazil

Increase the Accessibility of Court of Justice Data

As part of the Open Gov Challenge, the Court of Justice of the State of Minas Gerais (TJMG) [committed](#) to making the court's data easier for ordinary citizens to understand. The Court had long published information that met the requirements of oversight bodies such as the National Council of Justice and the Court of Accounts, but it was often presented in a technical and rigid format that was difficult for citizens to understand. The commitment addressed this in two phases: first, improving the content of the Court's transparency portal to make it clearer and more citizen-friendly; and second, creating a communication plan to inform different audiences about the changes.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

The Court has completed both phases. In the first phase, it reviewed and updated all of the content on its [transparency portal](#). This included simplifying language, revising texts, and adding plain-language explanations of concepts that citizens may not know, such as how public procurement works. The Court also moved some information to other parts of its website so that the transparency portal would focus on information of general public interest. The goal was to move from simply providing information to communicating with citizens in a way they could understand.

The Court also involved citizens directly through user-experience research with several types of users. The research tested how easily people could find information, understand it, and navigate the portal. The findings directly shaped the improvements and led to changes the Court had not originally planned, such as adding a distinct icon to each section to help citizens quickly identify where to find information.

From January to June 2026, the Court implemented a communication plan to raise awareness about the importance of transparency, explain the changes to the portal, and promote a [public survey](#) asking citizens about their experience with the redesigned portal. The Court shared the materials through its institutional channels, including its [website](#), digital displays in court buildings, and social media, particularly Instagram and LinkedIn (see [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)).

KEY CHALLENGES

The first phase was the most challenging, mainly because so many Court units had to review and update the portal. Each section contains information managed by a specific unit. For example, human-resources information comes from the Human Resources unit, so the Court had to coordinate with all of the relevant areas.

Another challenge was balancing accessibility with accuracy. The Court wanted to explain information in plain language while keeping it technically correct. Each responsible unit therefore had to review and approve the simplified texts, which required ongoing coordination across the institution.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To address these challenges, the Court first held meetings with all relevant units to build a shared understanding of transparency. It explained that while the Court was already informing citizens, it was not yet effectively communicating with them because much of the information was difficult to understand. Once the units understood that the redesign was focused on communicating with citizens, they were better able to work toward a common goal.

The Court then moved to shared online documents, allowing each unit to review and approve changes together without needing constant meetings. User-experience research also helped identify specific ways to improve how information was organized and presented. The Court's internal plain-language team handled the rewriting, while feedback from citizens helped guide its decisions.

LOOKING AHEAD

The Court sees this commitment as part of a longer-term effort to improve active transparency. Its participation in the Open Gov Challenge has also helped support a broader effort to build an institutional culture of open data.

In June 2026, the Court launched a [new jurisprudence research platform](#) that provides access to case-law data in an open format through an API, making the data easier to access and reuse.

The Court is now developing its Open Data Plan (Plano de Datos Abertos, PDA). The plan will set guidelines, priorities, and processes for opening public databases, including which data to prioritize and which would be most useful to society. The Court aims to publish the plan by the end of 2026 and begin implementing it in 2027. It plans to update the plan about every two years as its needs change.

The public survey on the transparency portal is still open and will continue to inform improvements. This keeps citizen input at the center as the Court moves from improving one portal toward developing an institution-wide open data policy.

Quintana Roo, Mexico

Co-Create a New Strategy to Strengthen the Rule of Law

Quintana Roo, Mexico [committed](#) to co-creating a strategy to strengthen the rule of law as part of the Open Gov Challenge. The commitment responds to several pressures that come together in the state, including migration, tourism, and population growth. Together, they call for a comprehensive approach to improving people's quality of life, a responsibility that governments had not historically taken on. To address this, the state's three branches of government, autonomous bodies, municipalities, and civil society began working together on a shared strategy. This commitment is an example of a cross-institutional alignment uncommon elsewhere in Mexico.

PROGRESS SUMMARY

Quintana Roo built its strategy based on evidence and input from institutions and citizens. The team broke down the World Justice Project (WJP) [Rule of Law Index](#) to identify the state's specific challenges. It combined this with a review of laws and regulations to determine which institutions had the authority to act. Working groups then brought institutional leaders together to review the findings and agree on priorities.

This process identified seven institutions with a key role in strengthening the rule of law: the Judiciary, the State Attorney General's Office, the Specialized Prosecutor's Office in the Fight against Corruption, the Secretariat of Citizen Security, the Regulatory Improvement Secretariat, the Ministry of Government, and the Secretariat of Anti-Corruption and Good Government. Each institution developed its own work program, and together these programs make up the overall strategy. The seven institutions also help ensure that progress is coordinated and tracked.

The strategy has produced 166 registered actions to date. Key examples include: (1) developing and implementing a structured [Criminal Prosecution Plan](#); (2) modernizing the State's Public Property Registry through a new "Cycle System" platform, including an alert system to prevent unauthorized property transactions; and (3) digitizing 51 government procedures, with 78% of the work toward a single-window system completed, making services more accessible and reducing opportunities for corruption.

The state also exceeded its annual target for resolving pending labor cases, reducing the active backlog from about 26,000 cases in 2022 to approximately 19,174. It has also strengthened its police force through certifications, training, agreements between agencies, body cameras, and a standard protocol for interacting with citizens.

To improve access to public services for people who do not speak Spanish, the state created a Mayan-Spanish translator network and is now expanding it to include other languages spoken in the state.

WJP has played an important role in putting the commitment into practice across all three levels of government. First, WJP held workshops for government officials, civil society, and technical experts on how the Rule of Law Index works and what its findings mean for Quintana Roo. Second, WJP supported sessions where the Governor, senior officials, and civil society organizations responded directly to citizens' questions. Third, WJP helped create a Citizen Council to oversee parts of the Criminal Prosecution Plan focused on investigating torture and extrajudicial executions. The Council monitors progress, maintains direct dialogue with the Prosecutor's Office, and publishes its findings on a dedicated [website](#).

KEY CHALLENGES

Making the Rule of Law Index useful for action, rather than simply treating it as a score, required significant work. The team had to examine the individual questions and indicators behind the Index to understand Quintana Roo's specific problems and which institutions were responsible for addressing them. A headline ranking alone does not provide a clear plan for action.

Coordinating seven formally autonomous institutions around one shared agenda has also been difficult. Once the diagnostic showed that all of them needed to be involved, the state had to build trust and align institutions that do not report to the same chain of command.

Developing the strategy was easier than maintaining it. The ongoing challenge is to implement all 190 actions, adjust those that are not working, and make sure they address real problems faced by citizens rather than simply improving a metric. Changes in government also create a risk that new administrations may deprioritize or stop work started by their predecessors.

HOW CHALLENGES ARE BEING ADDRESSED

To make the Index actionable, the state disaggregated it down to the individual variable level and paired that analysis with working groups that put institutional heads directly in the room with the diagnostic findings.

To improve coordination among institutions, the state started with smaller initiatives and used early successes to build momentum. For example, body cameras were first introduced in a few municipalities before other municipalities followed. Similarly, when some agencies published their work programs, this encouraged others to strengthen their own. This snowball approach worked better than trying to impose one approach across the state.

Furthermore, civil society organizations and international partners like WJP brought reach and legitimacy when the government couldn't generate it alone. For instance, WJP's Citizen Council gave the Criminal Prosecution Plan independent oversight and a direct channel of dialogue with the Prosecutor's Office.

To help maintain progress through changes in government, the state created an electronic dashboard where each participating institution tracks its work through a unique login. As administrations change, outgoing officials must formally transfer these credentials to incoming officials, allowing them to see what their predecessors were tracking. The state is now extending this approach through a public-facing platform, still under construction, that will allow citizens see progress, provide input, and monitor implementation directly.

LOOKING AHEAD

In the near term, Quintana Roo plans to complete and expand the work already underway while making progress more visible to the public. Completing the public-facing dashboard will help make citizen involvement a lasting part of the strategy, including beyond the current administration.

The World Justice Project (WJP) is working with the entities that developed the strategy to prepare a document on Quintana Roo's experience and the processes behind these results. The goal is to share it with local and national governments so they can replicate the approach.

Lessons Learned from Coalition Members

The lessons below synthesize patterns that recurred across the Coalition's commitments on justice. They reflect what members have learned collectively.

CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION IS A NECESSARY CONDITION

Commitments that treated civil society as a partner in design and oversight moved further and adapted better.

- Civil society often sees problems that institutions miss, like confusing services or unclear information.
- When civil society has its own funding, a commitment can keep moving even if government funding stops.
- Civil society complaints or legal challenges can make a reform better, if institutions listen instead of resisting.
- Genuine engagement required dedicated staff time and resources. Civil society interest alone is not enough without institutional support.
- The best way to involve civil society depends on each country's laws and institutions. There is no single formula.

INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP SETS THE PACE

Strong leadership support determines how fast a reform moves. But that support alone is not enough. A reform also needs to be built into budgets and institutions to survive after leaders change.

- When senior leaders participate directly and publicly, it shows that a reform is a core institutional value, not a compliance exercise.
- One blocked approval at the top can stop progress, even when staff elsewhere are ready to act.
- Linking a reform to the multi-year budget cycle protects its funding better than a written policy alone.
- Including a reform in several action plans, one after another, keeps it alive even when leaders change.
- Creating visible structures, like oversight commissions, early on makes a reform harder for a future administration to quietly abandon.
- Institutions with financial and operational independence often keep a reform going, even during political change.

AVAILABILITY IS NOT THE SAME AS ACCESSIBILITY

Publishing data or information is only the first step. Making it genuinely usable requires deliberate, additional investment.

- Raw data works for researchers, but most people need plain language and visuals to understand it.
- Simplifying legal language is not just about communication; it is a substantive part of accountability and public trust.
- Reaching different audiences requires multiple channels: in person, online, written, and audio or video. No single format works for all.

PARTNERSHIPS MULTIPLY WHAT ONE INSTITUTION CAN DO ALONE

No single institution can build sustainable open justice capacity by itself. The strongest commitments rely on a wide network of partners.

- International organizations and peer institutions bring technical expertise and comparative experience that help institutions avoid starting at zero.
- Trusted local organizations are often essential to reach marginalized or remote communities that institutions cannot reach on their own.
- Diversifying partnerships protects a commitment. If one funder leaves, others can keep it going.
- Partnering with professional associations can extend an institution's reach to audiences, such as practitioners, it could not train directly on its own.

MEASURE WHAT CHANGES, NOT JUST WHAT HAPPENS

Counting activities is easier than measuring outcomes, but only outcome data demonstrates real impact and builds the case for further investment.

- Testing products and services with real users, including civil society, reveals gaps that internal review alone will not catch.
- Formal feedback systems give institutions real evidence, instead of making them guess what works.
- Visible usage data, such as page views or participation counts, offers tangible evidence of public demand that can justify continued investment.

MOMENTUM BEATS PERFECTION

After years of consultation and drafting, the greatest risk to a reform is not doing too little, but taking so long to plan implementation that momentum and public patience run out.

- Prioritizing a smaller set of high-impact actions and expanding gradually sustains progress better than attempting a fully detailed plan upfront.
- Flexible approaches work better than rigid, one-size-fits-all models, because needs differ across offices and regions.
- Early, visible wins build trust and credibility, and make it easier to justify more investment later.
- Changing institutional culture takes longer than one pilot project. Expecting quick results can backfire; patience improves long-term success.

Conclusion

The commitments in this publication show meaningful steps toward more open and accessible justice systems. Across regions and legal systems, courts and justice institutions are publishing open data, such as weekly rulings in Buenos Aires and a public backlog dashboard in Costa Rica. Judiciaries are explaining decisions in plain language, in Braille, and in Indigenous languages, and using digital tools, like nationwide e-filing in Kenya, to make services easier to reach. Honduras and the Dominican Republic have advanced open justice policies in their judiciaries, while Catalonia, Côte d'Ivoire, and Sierra Leone are strengthening protections for whistleblowers and citizens' access to redress.

Progress across implementing institutions remains ongoing and uneven, with real challenges along the way. Yet the efforts reported demonstrate a continued commitment to making justice more transparent, accessible, and responsive to people's needs.

In addition, the lessons learned from these experiences explain why work is advancing in particular contexts. Progress has been strongest where civil society organizations acted as partners from the start: helping design policies, testing tools, reaching communities that institutions could not reach alone, and in some cases keeping initiatives going when other support ran out. The experiences also show that civil society must have a role in implementation, not only in design. Involving civil society in delivery, monitoring, and feedback keeps reforms aligned with people's needs and strengthens implementation.

Leadership also mattered, especially when it was backed by budgets and institutions that outlast any single administration. Other keys to success were making data usable and not just available, building strong partnerships, measuring real results, and keeping up momentum.

These lessons can and should travel, and the OGP Coalition on Justice is a place to share them. The path ahead is clear: keep opening justice, keep listening to the people it serves, and keep learning together.



Open
Government
Partnership

