

Guidance for OGP Parliamentary Action Plans

Open
Government
Partnership



Guidance for OGP Parliamentary Action Plans

The [Memorandum on Parliamentary Engagement](#) adopted by the OGP Steering Committee in November 2021 outlines three models for parliamentary engagement in OGP:

- 1) direct participation in the national or local OGP process;
- 2) stand-alone open parliament plans (hereby known as OGP parliamentary action plans);
and
- 3) engagement beyond OGP.

[Evidence shows](#) that direct participation in the national or local OGP process and action plan allows parliaments to better explore potential synergies and play a more significant role in advancing broader open government reforms. Parliaments in OGP countries are therefore encouraged to explore ways to directly participate in their national process. Guidance on how to do so is provided in the [Parliamentary Engagement in National OGP Process: Menu of Options](#).

Under the second model, OGP parliamentary action plans can be developed independently from OGP national action plans only in the following scenarios: to provide a stepping stone for parliaments whose direct participation in the national OGP process is not (yet) feasible; or in addition to their participation in the OGP national plans, where this is considered desirable by parliamentary stakeholders.

This guidance document provides guidance for those opting for the second model and specifies procedural arrangements, minimum requirements, guidance, and templates for the co-creation and implementation of OGP parliamentary action plans, where these are not co-created as part of a coordinated national action plan process. It is intended for national OGP members only.¹ Guidance for OGP Local members is forthcoming in 2022.

Beyond this self-service guidance on developing, implementing, and assessing the plans, the OGP Support Unit will publish OGP parliamentary action plans and their assessments on the OGP Member pages. Stakeholders involved in the OGP parliamentary action plans will be invited to join relevant peer exchanges and community events.

Finally, some parliaments may prefer to work outside of the OGP framework (such parliaments should consider the [value propositions for working within the OGP framework](#)). Similarly, a parliament in a country that is not participating in OGP may also wish to advance open parliament commitments or open government at large. In such instances, parliaments can engage in OGP's peer learning and exchange activities.

¹ Parliaments from countries that are not members of OGP may participate and contribute to knowledge sharing and peer learning activities. Parliamentary action plans in such countries may not carry the OGP logo and branding and will not be listed separately on the OGP website. They may choose to follow and adapt the guidance provided in this document, but are not required to do so.

Table of Contents

Eligibility and Process for Parliaments to Submit OGP Parliamentary Action Plans	4
Who Can Submit OGP Parliamentary Action Plans?	4
Process for Initiating OGP Parliamentary Action Plans	4
Minimum Requirements	5
Roles and responsibilities	7
OGP Parliament Liaison	7
Civil Society	8
Multi-stakeholder Forum or Platform	9
The Co-Creation Process	12
Participation and Co-Creation Standards	12
Key Moments in the Co-Creation Process	13
Planning for the Process	13
Outreach	16
Action Plan Development	16
Feedback	18
Action Plan	19
Action Plan Structure	19
Action Plan Timelines and Delivery Windows	21
Submission of Action Plans to the OGP Support Unit	21
Implementation	22
Implementation Planning	22
Implementation Activities	23
Assessment and Reporting	23
Assessment Requirements	23
Assessment Options	25
Self-assessment	25
Assessments Carried Out by Independent Offices of the Parliament	25
Third-party Assessment	25
Guiding Principles	25
Reporting Timelines and Templates	26
Annexes	28
Action Plan Narrative Template	28
Commitment Template	33
Assessment and Reporting Templates	40
Inception Assessment Template	40
End-of-plan Assessment and Learning Template	54
Illustrative Commitments	61

Eligibility and Process for Parliaments to Submit OGP Parliamentary Action Plans

This chapter explains how parliaments can initiate standalone OGP parliamentary action plans and how the process can be initiated.

Who Can Submit OGP Parliamentary Action Plans?

Under the 2021 Memorandum on Parliamentary Engagement, parliaments from active OGP member countries may choose to co-create an independent OGP parliamentary action plan through a stand-alone process. This may be the preferred option in countries where it proves difficult for parliaments to work within the confines of the OGP national action plan, whether because of conflicting executive and legislative calendars, or due to formal and informal protocols governing engagement between the two branches.

OGP parliamentary action plans offer parliaments an opportunity to co-create with civil society, and deliver on commitments that further advance open governance and open up parliamentary processes and systems, and do so in a way that is fully aligned with their own calendars and strategic objectives. It is important to note that parliaments that co-create independent OGP parliamentary action plans are encouraged to find ways in which they can also participate in the national OGP plan and process through the variety of ways described in the [Parliamentary Engagement in National OGP Process: Menu of Options](#).

The rules and guidance that follows in this document applies to those parliaments that: wish to have their parliamentary action plans recognized by the Open Government Partnership; carry the OGP logo; and have their plans uploaded to the OGP website under the member country's page. Similar guidance for OGP Local members will be published by the end of 2022.

Parliaments delivering action plans outside the OGP framework are not obliged to observe these rules and guidance, and may not carry the OGP logo and branding. They can, however, participate in OGP knowledge sharing and peer-learning activities.

Process for Initiating OGP Parliamentary Action Plans

Parliaments that wish to initiate independent OGP parliamentary action plans must notify the OGP Support Unit of their intention to do so in writing. The decision should be endorsed by the Speaker of the Parliament, the Secretary General, or by the leadership of any parliamentary committees or working groups with the mandate to work on open government issues or values. Countries with bicameral parliaments are strongly encouraged to coordinate and convene a single action plan involving both chambers. Where this is not possible, each

chamber may initiate its own process and plan, and must observe the minimum requirements and process described in this guidance document.

This can be done by contacting Rosario Pavese, Senior Parliamentary Advisor (rosario.pavese@opengovpartnership.org), and the Senior Regional Coordinator from the OGP Support Unit covering the country (see the OGP [website](#) for additional staff information). The notification should ideally also be copied to the national OGP Point of Contact (details available on each OGP member page) to enable exploration of coordination and collaboration opportunities between the executive and parliament convened processes. In instances where this is not possible, the OGP Support Unit will inform the OGP Point of Contact and the multi-stakeholder forum/platform upon the receipt of the notification from the parliament.

Once notified, the Support Unit will follow up to ensure that the rules and guidance outlined in this document are understood and that clarifications are provided on any outstanding questions.

Within three months of initial notification, parliaments will need to confirm the following details:

- The appointment of the OGP Parliament Liaison (roles and responsibilities described below)
- The initial mechanism or space for multi-stakeholder dialogue that will be used for co-creation of the OGP parliamentary action plan
- The intended duration of the OGP parliamentary action plan and the targeted submission timeline

Minimum Requirements

For parliamentary action plans to be accepted under the OGP framework and carry the OGP logo and branding, the following minimum requirements must be met:

- **Written notification of the initiation of the OGP parliamentary action plan process** to the OGP Support Unit, as required by the 2021 Memorandum on Parliamentary Engagement in OGP. The notification should include details of the Parliament Liaison (see below) who will serve as the primary contact for the OGP Support Unit. It is strongly recommended that the notification is copied to the OGP Point of Contact in Government. Where this is not done, the Support Unit will notify the OGP Point of Contact in Government to inform them about the parliament's notification to the Support Unit.
- **Appointment of a Parliament Liaison** for coordinating domestic and international engagement in OGP. More details on the roles and responsibilities of the Parliament Liaison are provided in the next section.

- **Evidence of opportunities provided for public input and feedback** during action plan development at the time of submission to the OGP Support Unit, using the assessment templates provided. In the absence of such evidence, the plan will not be accepted and will not be displayed on the OGP member web page. The Support Unit will not carry out a qualitative assessment of the public input and feedback process; it will only verify that clear information on the action plan process and how interested stakeholders can engage have been provided, as part of the process description in the action plan. Parliaments are strongly encouraged to follow the [OGP Co-creation and Participation Standards](#).
- **Timely submission of the assessment reports.** Parliaments are required to provide assessment reports within the timeframes stipulated in this guide ([see section on Assessment and Reporting](#)). Failure to provide evidence of opportunities for public input will result in the report not being accepted by the OGP Support Unit. Similar to the action plans, the Support Unit will not carry out qualitative assessments of the public input and engagement process, but rather only verify that information on the assessment process, including clear instruction on how interested stakeholders can provide input, has been provided (consistent with the description in the assessment template). Future action plans will not be accepted without the submission of the inception and end-of-plan assessments. In situations where assessments have not been submitted due to parliamentary transitions or political changes, parliaments may contact the Support Unit to discuss ways to resume the process and initiate co-creation of a new plan.

As outlined in OGP's [Articles of Governance](#), OGP participating countries are expected to comply with basic rules for continued participation in the partnership, such as timely delivery of action plans, and meeting minimum participation and co-creation requirements during the OGP cycle. Failure to do so over several action plan cycles can lead to a country being placed under procedural review, designated as inactive, and ultimately withdrawn from OGP. However, procedural review does not apply to these independently co-created OGP parliamentary action plans, and OGP members will continue to be assessed at the level of the national/local OGP action plan.

Roles and Responsibilities

OGP's unique model requires a range of actors to coordinate, implement, and assess activities related to the action plan. This section outlines the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders in the process. This is not an exhaustive list of stakeholders and parliaments are free to engage other types of stakeholders in their OGP parliamentary action plan process.

OGP Parliament Liaison

Parliaments developing OGP parliamentary action plans are required to appoint a Parliament Liaison to coordinate the process. The Parliament Liaison will be responsible for communication and coordination with the Support Unit, the national OGP Point of Contact, and other OGP parliamentary action plan stakeholders, ensuring efficient information exchange on action plan development and implementation, events, and peer exchange opportunities.

The selection of the Parliament Liaison is at the discretion of parliament, but the role could be successfully taken up, for example, by a senior administrative or technical officer, an advisor to the presiding officer, or a staffer for a relevant committee. Note that parliaments may wish to have more than one staff member dedicated to servicing OGP (e.g., different staff members may lead or coordinate specific policy issues, including budgets and fiscal policy, anti-corruption, etc.) or coordinating various functional responsibilities (e.g., planning, communications, and public engagement, etc.). However, regardless of the number of staff appointed, the parliament should still designate a single point person as the Parliament Liaison. The name, designation, and contact details of the Parliament Liaison should be provided to the OGP Support Unit within three months of the notification of the intent to commence co-creation of a OGP parliamentary action plan. The Parliament Liaison's details will be shared on the OGP Member page.

The role of the Parliament Liaison is crucial and multidimensional, as they are at the forefront of open parliament efforts in the country—and essential to promoting transparency, participation, and accountability. They regularly engage and convene stakeholders, as well as coordinate with parliament, its staff, and others on OGP initiatives.

Parliament Liaisons are also encouraged to establish mechanisms for communication and coordination with their counterparts in the executive-led process and the multi-stakeholder forum. This allows them to: consider inputs emerging from public consultations relevant to parliament; explore how the open parliament process and actors can support the executive-led plan; and share information with civil society actors that are likely to have interest in both processes.

In addition to a liaison within the parliamentary administration, OGP also welcomes the appointment of a Parliament Lead or Leads. Here, too, the natural choice is likely to be

members of parliament who chair or sit on the relevant working group and/or committee(s), but the decision is for the parliaments to make. The role of the Lead(s) is to take political ownership of the OGP agenda within parliament, and to build cross-party and institutional support for the OGP parliamentary process and plan. The Lead(s), alongside the Parliament Liaison, will also be best placed to share the work being done with other OGP stakeholders at peer exchanges, including regional and global meetings.²

Civil Society

Civil society is indispensable to the OGP process. Civil society may include community groups, non-governmental organizations, think tanks, advocacy groups, academia, labor unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, foundations, and unaffiliated individuals (e.g., academics, former elected officials) to play a role. Any interested stakeholder from civil society or the general public must have opportunities to inform and provide input into the OGP process and plans.

Civil society has also proven to be a key partner in: designing, implementing, and monitoring OGP action plans; participating in multi-stakeholder mechanisms; and awareness-raising among citizens about OGP and its achievements. Ongoing dialogue between government (executive and parliament) and civil society (and other stakeholders as appropriate) is a core element of the OGP model.

While parliaments are already representative institutions, with existing spaces and mechanisms for members to receive inputs and feedback from their constituents, OGP can provide an additional platform and process for ongoing dialogue which helps civil society and parliamentary representatives reach and engage with each other. Civil society can represent the interests of wider communities and serve as intermediaries to reach specific communities in the course of developing and implementing open parliament action plans. To avoid perceptions of bias towards specific civil society groups, the OGP parliamentary action plan process should be open to any actor interested in contributing to it. Additionally, minutes of meetings and summaries of proposals put forward by specific groups should be publicly available to ensure transparency of the process. More information on this can be found in section 4.1 of OGP's participation and co-creation standards.

It's important to note that the co-creation process itself should also be open to public input, allowing any interested stakeholder to share their contributions and feedback. Further suggestions on how to organize and further incentivize a more inclusive process are available in the sections below.

² Parliaments convening their own processes do not have additional decision-making or voting rights in OGP, which continues to rely on a single country view, coordinated via the official OGP Point of Contact in the country. Parliaments and Parliamentary Liaisons are therefore not separately invited to run for or participate in Steering Committee election processes or other matters put to decision-making or a vote among OGP member countries.

Multi-stakeholder Forum or Platform

OGP recommends an established space – a multi-stakeholder forum or platform (MSF/P) -- for ongoing dialogue and collaboration between parliament and civil society on the OGP parliamentary action plan process. This designated space can lead the OGP parliamentary action plan process in the country (see Co-creation Standard 1 for reference).

Depending on the country context, parliamentary system, and rules of procedure, existing spaces for pluralistic lobbying, or sub-committees, working groups or select committees that are open to outside input can be used to serve as the MSF/P.

Alternatively, parliaments can set up a dedicated MSF/P for the OGP parliamentary action plan process. Following are factors to consider in deciding the type of MSF/P that works for each context.

Key responsibilities of the MSF/P may include:

- **Strategic and tactical planning.** Based on available resources, priorities within and outside the parliament, and the political context, the MSF/P strategizes on the best ways to approach the development, implementation, and monitoring of action plans. It ensures that open parliament directions or goals are established, strategic themes to explore are included as part of the process, and key stakeholders needed for developing and implementing open parliament reforms are engaged as part of the process. As an established space, the MSF/P can also be used to respond to emerging priorities or opportunities.
- **Engagement.** The MSF/P proactively identifies ways to engage stakeholders from within and outside parliament in developing and implementing action plans. It also establishes avenues for other stakeholders, such as academia (where they are not already part of the MSF/P), partners, or the general public to engage with the process. The MSF/P also provides opportunities for remote participation in some meetings and events to enable the inclusion of groups unable to attend in person.
- **Communication.** The MSF/P undertakes activities to inform the broader public about open parliament processes in the country and how they can participate. It also proactively communicates and reports back on its activities, decisions, and results to parliament and civil society stakeholders.
- **Oversight.** The MSF/P may also oversee the domestic processes related to open parliament and ensure the development, implementation, and monitoring of action plans. It assesses action plan development and implementation and identifies ways to approach these processes in future iterations. The MSF/P also coordinates cross-sector efforts towards openness beyond the action plan.

While there is no required framework for setting up and establishing an MSF/P, the following should be considered during the process:

- **Parliamentary participants.** It is important to have representatives from relevant departments within the parliamentary administration, such as staff responsible for strategic planning and budgeting, committee work, information management (including access to information, open data, and records), and communication and/or public engagement, in addition to staff from the legal secretariat and/or research services. Beyond this, it is beneficial and recommended to include representatives from across political parties to ensure cross-party ownership of the open parliament process and plans. It is also useful to ensure the specific actors that may have a role in implementation of commitments included in the action plans are part of the MSF/P or regularly engage in MSF/P activities.
- **Civil society participants.** It is crucial to establish clear and transparent rules and criteria for selection, and to ensure the process is open to all civil society actors interested in participating. The rules and criteria should also be in accordance with transparency and accountability requirements as mandated by law and parliamentary process.
- **Other participants.** In a number of OGP countries, representatives from partner organizations that provide institutional support to parliaments (e.g., members of the Open Parliament eNetwork) are invited to participate in the MSF/P. It is important that such representation does not replace the space for civil society participants in the forum.
- **Size of the MSF/P.** The number of representatives from both parliament and civil society should be sufficient to be inclusive and reflect the key open parliament stakeholders in the country. At the same time, it should also be lean enough to allow agility and efficiency in decision-making processes and MSF/P functioning. It is important to note that a core function of the MSF/P is to engage stakeholders beyond the MSF/P in the action plan development and implementation process. The MSF/P does not reflect or represent the entirety of stakeholders important in the open parliament process.
- **Political support.** Sufficient political support, especially from senior parliamentarians, who are committed to promoting open government principles in the parliament and country, is crucial to the success of MSF/Ps. This can be secured through engagement of parliamentarians and relevant parliamentary committees at specific moments or in specific activities of the MSF/P, or through ensuring that they are regularly updated and engaged on matters deliberated upon in the MSF/P.

- **Manner of creation.** There are a number of ways to create an MSF/P. It is important that there is a legal or administrative basis in convening a space or platform that is acknowledged and adhered to by its members. In some cases, this can be based on additions or changes to rules of procedure, a legal decree, or existing legislation. In others, it can just be a formal or informal agreement among MSF/P participants.

Box 1: Examples of OGP Parliamentary Multi-stakeholder Fora in Practice

- Open Parliament Indonesia (OPI) has a steering committee of ten members of parliament, nominated by each political party, and led by the Vice Speaker. A part-time staff member is appointed to support the OPI's work and activities. There is a Secretariat which coordinates OPI activities, with seven non-governmental organizations serving as partners to the Secretariat. Several of these partners are also involved in the national open government action plan process led by Open Government Indonesia (OGI) and the OPI and OGI Secretariats maintain close communication on their respective plans and activities. Overall, OPI aims to build on ongoing strategic planning, allowing the Indonesian Open Parliament Plan to advance established priorities and ambitions. Read more [here](#).
- Georgia has established the Permanent Parliamentary Council on Open Governance, chaired by the Chairperson of the Parliament and with representation of Members of Parliament from across political parties. Additionally the Georgian Parliament has established a Consultative Group consisting of civil society and partner international organizations representatives which works with the Permanent Council in co-creating, implementing and monitoring Georgia's open parliament plans. The Permanent Council was legally created in 2015 through amendments to the Parliament's Rules of Procedure. Additionally, members of the Parliament of Georgia and representatives of other branches of government are also invited to participate in the executive-led OGP Georgia Forum and the newly created OGP Georgia High Level Council to enable better coordination of OGP activities at the national level.

The Co-Creation Process

Research based on OGP data over the last ten years shows that a strong and inclusive co-creation process leads to well-designed and more ambitious commitments. Research also shows that stronger results are achieved when collaboration continues through the implementation of reforms.

Participation and Co-Creation Standards

OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards are intended to support multi-stakeholder collaboration throughout all stages of the OGP action plan cycle, from development through to implementation and monitoring. These standards were developed for the executive branch, but the principles underlying them apply to any effective co-creation process.

Parliaments opting to co-create standalone OGP parliamentary action plans will be responsible for the co-creation process, which includes civil society participation to develop, implement, and monitor their action plans.

Parliaments are encouraged to shape their OGP processes in line with the five Participation and Co-Creation Standards (see Box 2).

Box 2. OGP Participation and Co-creation Standards (2021)

Standard 1	Establishing a space for ongoing dialogue and collaboration between government, civil society, and other non-governmental stakeholders
Standard 2	Providing open, accessible and timely information about activities and progress within a member's participation in OGP
Standard 3	Providing inclusive and informed opportunities for public participation during co-creation of the action plan
Standard 4	Providing a reasoned response and ensuring ongoing dialogue between government and civil society and other non-governmental stakeholders as appropriate during co-creation of the action plan
Standard 5	Providing inclusive and informed opportunities for ongoing dialogue and collaboration during implementation and monitoring of the action plan

More details on the Participation and Co-creation Standards can be found here: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/>

Key Moments in the Co-Creation Process

There are at least four key moments in the co-creation process: planning for the process, outreach, action plan development, and feedback. These are referred to as moments rather than steps or stages because, in most cases, they are iterative rather than linear. Additionally, the moments may even be embedded within each other.



The steps outlined below suggest how the multi-stakeholder forum may choose to organize the co-creation process. Please note that this is not prescriptive, and that parliaments are invited to organize the process in a manner that fits their context, calendar, and resources. Throughout, OGP encourages to adhere to the principles underpinning OGP co-creation standards as closely as possible.

Planning for the Process

Early planning for the different activities to be undertaken during the co-creation process is crucial so that the objectives of the co-creation process are clear, stakeholders and their roles are defined, available resources are identified, and the timeline to complete the process is laid out. Planning involves determining the priorities of the parliament and civil society, understanding the current political climate, mapping key events not directly related to the open parliament process, and assessing the civil society landscape and how all these elements will impact the co-creation process.

The co-creation plan should adhere to a methodology based on:

- **Raising awareness and gathering information.** This includes concrete activities to inform the public and parliamentary bodies about the Open Government Partnership, the co-creation process, and how they will be able to participate. This also includes

activities to gather information from the public and other relevant stakeholders on what issues or themes they want the action plan to address.

- **Defining problems, identifying solutions, and developing commitments.** This includes activities to decide: how problems will be defined, how solutions will be achieved, and how these proposed solutions will be developed into action plan commitments. As commitments are developed, relevant parliamentary and other stakeholders need to be engaged to assess budgetary, legal, technical, and political opportunities and constraints. This may need additional outreach efforts once the process of developing commitments has begun.
- **Providing feedback to participants.** This includes concrete activities that will inform those who participated in the co-creation process about the results of their participation and how their ideas or suggestions will be dealt with in the development and finalization of action plan commitments.

Finally, the co-creation plan should be able to answer the following questions:

WHAT	What key activities will be implemented to realize the goals of co-creation?
WHO	Who will be involved in the co-creation process? What will their roles be? How will they be involved? How will the MSF/P ensure that diverse actors of different backgrounds, expertise, and locations are able to participate?
HOW	How will each key activity be undertaken? What is the methodology or approach? Who will lead the process? Where will the MSF/P get the financial resources to fund the activities?
WHERE	Where will these activities be taking place? Online or offline? In key cities across the country? In the capital?
WHEN	When will the co-creation process occur, including the schedule and timeline of co-creation activities?

Following is an example of a co-creation plan that successfully addresses each of the above questions:



Engagement Opportunities	Outreach and Idea Generation	Analyzing Inputs and Identification of Themes	Thematic Workshops	First Draft, Consultation, and Feedback	Finalization
Purpose	Information dissemination and gathering initial public inputs	Analysis of ideas generated and identification of major themes	Problem definition, solution identification, and prototyping	Public comment on first draft and revision of plans	Plan submitted to ministers for consideration
Participants	National and local CSOs, and the public	MSF with expert panel	Experts with CSOs and agencies working on the themes	Public in general, thematic working groups	MSF
Key Activities	Online open government sessions, online survey	Sense-making workshops	Thematic workshops	Online consultation Thematic workshops	Plan finalization, Plan submission
Resources	Technical team, facilitators and resource persons	Facilitators, resources persons, and workshop costs	Facilitators, resources persons, and workshop costs	Technical team, facilitators, resources persons, and workshop costs	Technical team
Space	Online	Face to face workshops at the capital	Face to face workshops, venue to be selected by working groups	Online, face to face workshops	Finalization meeting, face to face

Information is necessary for participants in the co-creation process to participate meaningfully and effectively. Providing information about the timeline, process, methodology, and how people can participate will enable the public to select avenues of participation and processes they are interested in. Advanced notice should be given to stakeholders of meetings, events, and other related activities so that participants are sufficiently informed and ready to participate in the processes.

Outreach

Part of ensuring meaningful participation in the co-creation process is the conduct of outreach activities to raise awareness of the OGP parliament process, related initiatives, and opportunities to get involved. Outreach activities also ensure the process is inclusive. To ensure inclusive participation, efforts must be made to provide opportunities to as many and as diverse stakeholders as possible.

The MSF/P can use the outreach activities as an opportunity to gather information from participants regarding issues in transparency, accountability, and citizen participation that they would like addressed, as well as problems they want the action plan to tackle or open parliament concerns they would like the action plan to consider. This can be done in several ways: asking participants a focus question (or a few) during outreach events or activities, issuing an open call for ideas online, or circulating an online survey.

The questions to be asked and the process of collecting responses needs to be designed according to the objectives of the co-creation process. It is also important to ensure that the responses and contributions of participants are recorded and documented in a way that will help facilitate the subsequent process of collating or summarizing them and providing feedback to stakeholders in line with good practices on co-creation and participation.

Action Plan Development

With initial inputs from the outreach process, the MSF/P may proceed with action plan development by focusing on identifying commitments that will be included in the action plan. Specific considerations should include:

- **Analyzing Inputs.** Depending on the type, quality, and volume of the inputs gathered from the outreach process, there needs to be a suitable way to make sense of the contributions collected. For example, if during outreach activities, stakeholders are asked what issues the action plan should cover, then there needs to be a way to categorize and cluster similar ideas and find the common theme that binds them. They may be categorized by: sector or policy area (e.g., health, education, environment); department of the parliament's administration or secretariat (e.g., records management and open data, public outreach, committee secretariat); or parliamentary function (e.g., law-making, oversight, representation and budgeting). In this way, numerous ideas may be narrowed to a few that will become the basis for moving forward in the next steps.



- **Defining the problem.** Strong and transformative commitments clearly articulate the problem that the commitment seeks to address. Thus, it is important that the problem is appropriately identified, analyzed, and articulated. To those ends, questions to answer may include:
 - What is the problem?
 - What is affected by it and how?
 - What are the root causes of the problem?
 - What aspects of the problem relate to, or are compounded by, the lack of information, public accountability mechanisms, or opportunities for public participation and monitoring?
 - What has been done so far by parliament and other stakeholders to address the problem?

Thematic working groups may be convened to undertake the task of problem definition. For example, suppose ten issues were identified from the sense-making process, one of which is related to public oversight or participation in committee procedures. In that case, a thematic working group may be convened to explore the issue further and undertake the problem definition exercise with the right stakeholders from the parliament and beyond. Where possible, this should build on existing initiatives or working groups/committees within the parliament.

Also, at this stage, targeted public engagement can be done on specific issues or concerns identified during the sense-making process. For example, if the problem is related to access to the parliament by people with mobility impairment, the MSF/P may involve representatives from those groups in the problem definition and in the subsequent phase of solutions identification. If the problem relates to non-delivery or receipt of social or welfare assistance guaranteed by law, the MSF/P may involve

representatives from those groups and from relevant parliamentary committees exercising oversight of the government's implementation of those programs in refining the problem definition and in identifying solutions.

- **Identifying solutions.** With the problem articulated, the following steps help identify potential solutions:
 - Explore various solutions and select those which most appropriately address the problem.
 - Build on activities that the country has attempted in the past to address the problem, if any.
 - Articulate how the OGP platform can effectively respond to identified issues.
 - Verify whether the proposed solutions are relevant to the OGP values of access to information, civic participation, and public accountability.

It is important to note that even where inputs are solicited in the form of proposed commitments, it is still valuable to go back to the problem definition process to ensure that proposed solutions address the problem and assess whether different commitment proposals could tackle the same or similar problems.

- **Drafting commitments.** The process of drafting the commitment should ideally only start after the co-creation process has clearly defined the problem, explored potential solutions, and selected one (or more) of those solutions as proposed commitments to further develop. While drafting commitments, those leading the draft process should identify the specific activities and milestones, and engage relevant stakeholders to ensure feasibility and secure buy-in for implementation.

In the process of drafting commitments, a new set of necessary ideas may emerge requiring the consultation of another set of stakeholders. This might require additional outreach. The MSF/P should be quick to recognize these opportunities and implement steps for outreach and consultation.

Finally, a parliament may consider prioritizing commitments when several commitment proposals have been identified. Considerations have to be made regarding: the urgency and magnitude of the problem to be addressed; political and operational feasibility given timeframes and resources; and potential impact of the commitments on transparency, accountability, and citizen participation.

Feedback

Ongoing dialogue, whereby ideas received and decisions made are communicated back to stakeholders and then further refined through additional rounds of engagement, can help ensure genuine, high-quality conversation and ultimately greater buy-in of the action plan. The greater the depth of dialogue, the greater the potential impact of commitments, the

better the mutual understanding of ideas and reasonings, and eventually, the more likely it is that genuinely co-created commitments will be effectively implemented.

Parliament and/or the MSF/P are encouraged to keep a public record that documents why specific priorities, ideas, or activities were or were not included in the action plan to help ensure accountability and overcome resistance from those whose proposals were rejected. In doing so, parliament and/or the MSF/P may consider offering the following information:

1. What input that was collected in the consultation/engagement;
2. How decision-makers considered the input;
3. How the input influenced the outcome of the decision;
4. Whether the input was included/not included and why; and
5. In what ways the input will be considered beyond the current action plan, if at all.

After reviewing the commitments and other content within the action plan and providing feedback, the parliament or MSF/P will finalize the action plan, securing required approvals and then submitting it to the Support Unit.

Once the plan is finalized, it is also good practice to provide closure to the co-creation process by sharing next steps and information about how stakeholders will be engaged in the implementation of the action plan or can stay informed of progress. Presenting the action plan in a public event with high-level participation can help kickstart the implementation process and provide support.

Action Plan

The action plan is a key output and outcome of the OGP co-creation process. This section provides the rules and guidance related to action plan structure, aligning principles, and the role of parliament in seeking to advance them. Additionally, it provides templates for the action plan and the commitments contained within it.

Action Plan Structure

Successful action plans focus on ambitious commitments. Moreover, they are relevant to the values of transparency, accountability, and public participation and contain specific, time-bound and measurable goals. Structurally, the action plan contains two main components: the action plan narrative and the commitments themselves. Templates for both are provided in the [Annex](#). Additionally, it is recommended that parliamentary action plans include five commitments (and not exceed ten commitments), focusing on quality over quantity. The commitments should clearly describe reforms, policies, or the activities necessary to promote open parliament.

OGP aims to promote ambitious reforms that stretch the government beyond its current state of practice, significantly improving the status quo by strengthening transparency, accountability, and public participation in governance. Countries may choose to initiate new open parliament initiatives in their action plans or improve on existing, ongoing reforms. Countries are encouraged to show clear improvement from action plan to action plan.

Many of the key aspirations of the open government movement – pursuing rights-based approaches to open government, institutionalizing reforms, promoting and protecting civic space, defending democratic processes, and ensuring an open response, recovery, and renewal from the Covid-19 pandemic – require the support of parliaments. The [OGP Memorandum on Parliamentary Engagement](#) recognizes the following roles for parliaments in the open government context:

- **Taking legislative action.** Parliaments can champion open government values by introducing, reviewing, and ratifying legislation relevant for open government or approving budgets for open government reform. As of 2020, approximately 10-15 percent of all OGP commitments made require legislative action.
- **Ensuring parliamentary oversight.** Parliaments can hold the executive accountable for open government reforms and opening up its own oversight processes to public scrutiny.
- **Opening up parliamentary processes.** Parliaments can adopt open government principles -- transparency, accountability, participation, and inclusion -- in the parliamentary institution and its processes.
- **Creating space for dialogue.** Parliaments can foster the cross-party dialogue and support needed for setting the agenda, advancing, and institutionalizing open government reforms.

Parliaments are encouraged to consider all four of these roles as they explore, identify, and develop commitments for their action plan. See the [Annex](#) for a list of illustrative commitments in these areas.

Regardless of the number and type of commitments, in order to be measurable and be set up to produce strong results, all commitments should be:

- **Verifiable.** Commitments should be specific enough to review and include objectively verifiable activities to assess implementation. It is also important that commitments specify the main implementing body or department and any other stakeholders supporting implementation.
- **Relevant to OGP values.** Commitments should relate to one or more of the open government values of transparency, civic participation, or public accountability.
 - *Transparency.* The parliament discloses more information, improves the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improves the

quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improves the transparency of parliamentary processes or institutions.

- *Civic Participation.* The parliament creates or improves opportunities, processes, or mechanisms for the public to inform or influence decisions. The parliament creates, enables, or improves participatory mechanisms for underrepresented groups. Or the parliament improves the legal framework to guarantee freedoms of assembly, association, and peaceful protest.
- *Public Accountability.* The parliament creates or improves opportunities to hold parliamentarians answerable for their actions and works to improve the legal, policy, or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of public officials.
- **Ambitious.** Commitments should aim for strong results in significantly improving the state of play in the area which it pertains to. Ideally commitments should aim to bring about binding and institutionalized change over time. Data shows that commitments that are ambitious and results-oriented tend to produce stronger early results.

Action Plan Timelines and Delivery Windows

Action plan duration. Parliaments can determine the duration of their OGP parliamentary action plans. In doing so, they should consider the tenure of the parliament, election cycles, and the parliamentary calendar. OGP parliamentary action plans should cover a minimum duration of a year, and ideally no more than four years. Implementation can begin any time following the plan's submission to the OGP Support Unit. End dates should be chosen ensuring sufficient time to conclude monitoring, reporting, and end of plan learning activities within the tenure of the parliament or before scheduled elections that may have implications for the OGP parliamentary action plan process. Parliaments are also encouraged to ensure that overall length and duration of the plan allow for optimal alignment with the parliamentary calendar.

Delivery period. OGP parliamentary action plans can be submitted at any time of the year to the OGP Support Unit, based on optimal alignment with the parliamentary calendar. Once the action plan length and delivery period are selected by the parliament, they should strive for consistency in subsequent plans.

Submission of Action Plans to the OGP Support Unit

Action plans must be submitted to the OGP Support Unit in both the primary administrative language of the country and English. This is a mandatory requirement. Submitting action plans in English ensures that the wider OGP membership can read about the plans and that learning across borders can take place.

The official version of the action plan is the one published on the OGP website. The OGP parliamentary action plan is uploaded alongside the OGP national action plan. The submission date and the length of the plan will be displayed alongside the plan.

The OGP Support Unit will notify the national OGP Point of Contact and MSF/P when the submission is received.

Implementation

Evidence from [OGP at Ten: Toward Democratic Renewal](#) shows that continued stakeholder dialogue and participation during the implementation process is strongly correlated with high levels of completion and stronger results.

Ongoing engagement can help maintain momentum for implementation following the publication of the action plan. This could include:

- **Engagement of relevant parliamentary bodies, civil society and other stakeholders** in implementation, monitoring, communications, and coordination of activities needed for successful completion of commitments;
- **Engaging parliamentarians** at least once a year during implementation to discuss progress, delays, and opportunities to address challenges in order to sustain political support for commitments; and
- **Engagement opportunities during implementation to hold parliament accountable** and encourage course correction measures should priorities or circumstances change.

During implementation, there are at least three important areas where collaboration between lead implementing agencies, supporting partners, and other stakeholders can be beneficial: implementation planning, implementation activities, and assessment and reporting.

Implementation Planning

While the action plan commitment template contains milestones and specific outputs, it does not contain details of specific activities that are required to realize the milestones identified in the commitment statement. Conducting implementation planning among the stakeholders identified in the commitment template can help establish stronger working relationships and build a support constituency for the commitment while also ensuring that specific activities are identified, resourced, and assigned to achieve the commitment milestones.

Implementation planning can be done separately for each commitment. The implementation plans can include the identification of specific activities, resources needed, a timeframe, expected outputs, and responsible persons and ministries. It may also include identified risks and how to manage them.

Implementation Activities

Lead implementers can be supported by other stakeholders, including civil society during the implementation process in some of the following ways:

- **Communications.** Work with parliament to build public awareness of new or changed policies or programs resulting from the commitments (e.g., new rights, new services).
- **Expertise.** Advise parliament on policy implementation. Extend professional experience, skill sets, networks, and influence in supporting policy implementation.
- **Service provision and/or co-production.** Implement the policy in partnership with the parliament.
- **Enabling use and feedback.** Support intended users or beneficiaries of commitments to access new policies, programs, and services and channel user or beneficiary feedback to continue to inform and guide the lead implementers.

Additionally, as good practice, the MSF/P where established, or the parliament where there is no MSF/P, should consider holding open meetings and encouraging a channel of communication allowing implementers to provide updates on commitment completion and listen and respond to civil society and other stakeholder questions and input.

Assessment and Reporting

Regular assessment and reporting is essential for ensuring the credibility of the process and the plan, tracking progress, and identifying course correction measures. It is also important for learning and application of the lessons learned in subsequent action plan cycles.

Assessment Requirements

The 2021 Memorandum on Parliamentary Engagement requires parliaments developing OGP parliamentary action plans to:

1. **Develop a monitoring and reporting mechanism process** to report on the inclusiveness and participation of their processes, as well as the results of the commitment implementation; and
2. **Include parliamentary and non-parliamentary actors in monitoring efforts** to ensure that the views and contributions from stakeholders are considered. The burden of proof to provide evidence for these monitoring reports falls on the parliament.

Standalone OGP parliamentary action plans are not assessed by OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM). As a result, the assessment and reporting mechanism developed by parliaments and/or the MSF/P must fulfill the following criteria:

- **Transparency of the assessment process.** Information on the process, including a timeline of assessments, must be published on the parliament website to allow interested stakeholders and/or members of the public to engage with the process.
- **Clear opportunities for public input and comment.** This requirement ensures there are known and accessible opportunities for non-parliamentary stakeholders, including civil society, to engage. This may include:
 - *Gathering public inputs to inform the assessment.* This is done by creating online and offline opportunities for any interested stakeholder or member of the public to provide input to inform the initial findings for the report.
 - *Pre-publication review.* The parliament and civil actors directly involved in the development or implementation of the action plan must invite public comments for a specified period of time (e.g., 21 days). This provides an important opportunity to receive feedback on the first draft of findings. For more information on how to conduct a pre-publication review process per IRM standards, see the [IRM Guidance on the Scope of Comments](#).
 - *Public comment on draft reports prior to finalization.* Reports should ideally be published online for at least 14 calendar days for public comment. At the end of the 14 days, reports may be updated based on public comments received, including any new evidence received through this process. Once the report is finalized, both the final version of the report and the comments received during the commenting period must be published and available online.
- **Timely submission of assessment reports, using the templates provided, to the OGP Support Unit.** Parliaments that wish to adapt the templates to comply with established assessment and reporting requirements within the parliament may do so, as long as the information required in the OGP templates provided in the annex is captured and published.

Assessment Options

Parliaments can choose from the following options for assessment, based on their needs, resource availability, and degree of independence of the assessors desired in their context:

1. **Self-assessment.** Under this option, a taskforce or working group within the MSF/P or parliamentary research services, rules committees, or other administrative departments within the parliament with a research mandate or capacity may carry out the assessment using the templates provided. As noted above, parliaments that wish to adapt the templates to comply with established assessment and reporting requirements within the parliament may do so, as long as the information required in the OGP templates provided in the annex is captured and published.

2. **Assessments carried out by independent offices of the parliament.** Under this option, independent offices of the parliament such as auditors or inspectorates may carry out the assessment using the templates provided and in line with their established procedures. Note, these assessments will still need to create opportunities for public input to meet OGP requirements.
3. **Third-party assessment.** Under this option, a consultant or a partner organization with relevant expertise may be tasked with conducting the assessment using the templates provided. Similarly, a researcher from OGP's pool of IRM-trained researchers may be contracted to carry out the assessment, also using the templates provided. The OGP Support Unit can facilitate introductions and help with the identification of a short list of researchers for the parliament's consideration. The parliament is responsible for the administrative and financial contracting arrangements and payments for assessment led by third parties or IRM-trained researchers.

Note: The choice of the assessment option must be communicated to the OGP Support Unit in writing at the time of the submission of the OGP parliamentary action plan, along with the name, title/position, and full contact details of the lead point of contact for the monitoring and reporting process. Where a research team or an institution is chosen, a primary contact should be assigned.

Within a wide range of options, this process should be led by people with experience in research, monitoring, or evaluation, particularly in areas related to open parliament, transparency, or governance.

Guiding Principles

Regardless of the assessment option selected, all assessments should follow the principles outlined below:

- **Transparency.** The process and the findings of the assessment should be clear and transparent, with clear opportunities for input by any interested stakeholder.
- **Evidence-based.** Findings should be backed by evidence, such as primary sources or objective information that support the status of completion on the plan development and implementation. The collected evidence should be triangulated with different sources and not be based solely on unfounded statements. The Designated Researcher(s) should be receptive to all feedback, but reporting should not become a compilation of opinions. To guarantee robust reporting, the Designated Researcher should verify any contentious statements or points of view with other sources from the parliament and civil society, and ground the analysis in evidence.
- **Results-oriented.** The researcher(s) should seek to go beyond determining whether activities were completed to evaluate policy or reform-level outcomes. The researcher(s) are encouraged to focus data gathering and analysis on how change

occurs within a specific commitment, policy, or bill. This allows for a better understanding of how these reforms impact the parliament and the intended beneficiaries of the reforms.

- **Constructive with actionable insights.** The assessments should be constructive both in their content and tone. The purpose is to strengthen the role of parliaments in advancing open government reforms, not to discredit the parliament, civil society, or any other stakeholder. Consequently, findings and recommendations should clearly articulate what needs to change, how, and the roles of different actors in driving or facilitating the change.
- **Dialogue enabling.** The assessment process and reports should be used to foster dialogue and learning within and beyond the MSF/P on areas of improvement or further action during and after the assessment. The MSF/P should ensure that such dialogue is not used to introduce subjectivity into the assessments.

Reporting Timelines and Templates

OGP provides parliaments with the templates for each of the required assessments (see annex). Parliaments that wish to adapt the templates to comply with established assessment and reporting requirements within the parliament may do so, as long as the information required in the OGP templates is captured and published. Parliaments are required to undertake assessments at the following three stages:

- **Inception assessment.** This assessment must be submitted to the OGP Support Unit within four months of the submission of the action plan to: a) document lessons and recommendations on the co-creation process and action plan design, including adherence to relevant OGP Participation and Co-creation Standards; and b) generate insights early in the implementation process to achieve good and effective results.
- **End of plan assessment and learning exercise.** This assessment must be submitted to the OGP Support Unit within six months of completion of the plan to enable an evidence-based analysis of the level of completion and early results of action plan commitments, and lessons for reflection and accountability. Parliaments should factor in time for this assessment when deciding on the duration and end dates of their plans to ensure it can be completed during the parliament's tenure or before scheduled elections that may have an impact on the OGP parliamentary action plan process.
- **Mid-point check-in.** For parliaments that adopt action plans with a duration of three years or more, a mid-point check-in assessment is recommended to ensure the continued relevance of the plan and to allow for course corrections as needed. Parliaments are encouraged to submit this assessment to the Support Unit for posting alongside the action plan and other assessments.

All assessment reports will be posted to the OGP website alongside the parliamentary action plans. Where parliaments fail to provide reports within the timeframes stipulated, this will be noted on the website. Future action plans will not be accepted without the submission of the inception and end of plan assessments. Parliaments are also encouraged to post the assessments to their own websites.

In situations where assessments have not been submitted due to parliamentary transitions or political changes, parliaments may contact the Support Unit to discuss ways to resume the process and initiate co-creation of a new plan.

Annexes

These annexes provide the templates for the action plan and assessments. Both action plans and assessments must be e-filed. Instructions for e-filing will be available by mid-2022. Please contact your Support Unit representative or [Rosario Pavese](#) if you plan to submit your plan before June 30, 2022.

Action Plan Narrative Template

Foreword

The foreword can be written jointly or separately by the parliament and civil society representatives or a multi-stakeholder forum. This should summarize the ambition for this plan and how they plan to work together on implementation and monitoring.

The foreword should note the process by which the plan was approved and adopted by the parliament.

Action Plan Duration

Please include the following:

Start Date (month/year)

End Date (month/year)

Date of the next parliamentary election and basic information on the parliamentary calendar

Institutional Arrangements and Coordination

This section describes the institutional arrangements in place to ensure regular coordination, communication, and convening of actors crucial to the development, implementation, and monitoring of the action plan.

Details of the Parliament Liaison (and Lead, where relevant)

Details on the relevant body or department in parliament responsible for coordinating the development and implementation of the action plan

Details of parliamentary bodies/actors involved in the development of the action plan

Details of parliamentary bodies/actor in parliament responsible for coordinating the implementation of the action plan

Open Parliament Vision and Ambition

This section explains the national context and why open parliament efforts are important for the country. This section should also outline the reform priorities for the parliament and how they seek to improve parliamentary institutions and processes.

What is the long-term vision for open parliament? Please refer to relevant strategic development plans and/or related parliamentary agendas.

What are the medium-term goals that the parliament wants to achieve with regard to open government values? What are the challenges and areas of improvement it wants to address?

How does this action plan contribute to achieving the open government goals and addressing the identified challenges?

Role of the Parliament in Open Government and OGP Efforts to Date

This section provides a brief narrative of the role and accomplishments of the parliament in open government and OGP efforts to date. This section should also explain how the action plan builds on previous action plans (if relevant) and related efforts on open parliament reforms. For parliaments that are just beginning to engage in OGP processes, some of the questions may not have specific responses in the initial period of engagement. In such cases, these questions can be used to prompt reflections about potential future courses of action.

- How has the parliament promoted the open government agenda to date? Note: this includes measures taken both within and outside the parliament's open parliament/OGP efforts. Please share highlights of the following:
 - Recent legislative action to support open government across branches and levels of government
 - Parliamentary oversight of the open government agenda, including but not limited to the state's commitments under OGP
 - Measures to strengthen transparency, public participation, and public accountability/oversight in parliamentary processes and systems
 - Measures to promote dialogue and collaboration in the parliament (and beyond) on open government issues

Are there mechanisms in place to explore complementarities and coordination, where possible, between the national and parliamentary OGP action plans? If yes, please specify. If no, please elaborate what mechanisms could be explored in the future.

Are there mechanisms in place to encourage parliamentary oversight of commitments/the action plan co-created by the executive? If yes, please specify. If no, please elaborate what mechanisms could be explored in the future.

To what extent do commitments presented in this OGP parliamentary action plan complement the commitments in the executive-led action plan? These plans can be found on the [OGP website](#) under the members section.

If a previous action plan exists, what reforms proposed in the previous action plans were achieved? Not achieved? Why?

If a previous action plan exists, how does this new action plan build on what has been achieved in previous action plan(s) and other efforts to open parliament?

Action Plan Development Process

Please provide evidence of opportunities provided for public input into the action plan. As specified in the minimum requirements, where such evidence is not provided, action plans will not be accepted and uploaded on the OGP website.

What kind of spaces were used or created for collaboration between parliament and civil society (offline and online spaces)?

What kind of spaces were used or created for cross-party participation in the development of this action plan?

Who participated in these spaces, and what measures did you take to ensure diverse representation? Cite the different types of groups that participated in the co-creation process and the role(s) they played.

How was the co-creation timeline and process developed? With whose input?

How were awareness-raising and outreach activities conducted? Who participated?

How was feedback and reasoned response provided to stakeholders who contributed on what could and could not be included in the plan and why?

Planning for Implementation and Assessment

How will the parliament continue to engage civil society and other non-governmental stakeholders during the implementation of the action plan?

How will you ensure parliamentary participation and oversight during the implementation of the action plan?

Which of the following assessment options will be applied for the inception and end-of-term assessments? Check one:

- Self-assessment
- Assessment by independent offices of the parliament
- Third-party assessment

Please provide contact information, if available, for the designated researchers or primary contact for the organization that will carry out the assessment. If you need assistance with this process, please mention this below.

Commitment Template

This is the template for commitments to be used by parliaments independently co-creating their own OGP parliamentary action plans.

Basic Information

- **Commitment Title**

Provide a brief title for the commitment which clarifies the main action behind the commitment.

Maximum 70 characters

- **Commitment Description**

Describe the specific action that the commitment will achieve (e.g., adopt legislation that ensures public access to information from the parliament, create opportunities for citizens to monitor and review budgetary information).

Maximum 250 characters

- **Timeframe**

Commitment Start Date (month/year)

Commitment End Date (month/year)

Actors Involved in Implementation

Lead Implementing Body and/or Actor(s)

Parliamentary Body/Actor(s)	Name of Contact	Title	Email	Role in Implementation <i>(Select from the following: Lead; support; oversight; coordinate)</i>
<i>Add lines as necessary</i>				

Other Implementing Stakeholders within Parliament (if relevant)

<i>Name of Organization</i>	<i>Name of Contact</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Email</i>	Role in Implementation <i>(Select from the following: Lead; support; oversight; coordinate)</i>
<i>Add lines as necessary</i>				

External Stakeholders Involved in the Implementation of this Commitment

(e.g., Civil society, government departments; partners, community groups, private sectors)

Name of organization/ Institution	Name of Contact	Title	Email	Role in Implementation <i>(Select from the following: Lead; support; oversight; coordinate)</i>
<i>Add lines as necessary</i>				

Commitment Description

- **Problem**

Describe the economic, social, political, or environmental problem identified that this commitment seeks to resolve. Be as specific as possible (e.g., “Lack of publicly available information on parliamentary committee calendars, topics discussed and the outcomes” is more helpful than “lacking a website.” Or, for example, “lack of legal protections and guarantees for freedoms of expression or association” is more helpful than “civic space problems need to be addressed.”) Please also mention the root causes of the problems.

Maximum 1000 characters

- **Status Quo**

Describe the current state of the issue at the beginning of an action plan. (e.g., information on when, where, and on what subjects committee meetings take place is not publicly available, making it hard for citizens to monitor parliamentary activities and action on topics of significance. Or, for example, when citizens are able to participate in the law-making process by providing input on draft legislation available on the parliamentary website, X percent of laws passed by the parliament in the last [specific period] saw revisions based on public input). Describe steps taken to date to address the problem before this commitment was undertaken.

Maximum 1000 characters

- **Action**

What is the commitment? Describe the overall objective, the specific actions that will be taken, and the expected results in the timeframe of the action plan?

Maximum 1000 characters

- **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?**

What are the expected outputs and outcomes once the commitment has been implemented? How will those contribute to addressing the public problem described earlier? Mention if the outputs and outcomes will be expected by the end of the action plan period, or after?

Maximum 1000 characters

- **What long-term goal identified in your Open Parliament Strategic Vision does this commitment help to achieve?**

Refer to the vision statement and goals described in the narrative sections of the action plan.

Maximum 1000 characters

- **What area of parliamentary action on open government is this commitment relevant to?**

<p>Select from the following list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legislative Action - Improving oversight - Opening up parliament - Enabling dialogue 	<p>How is the commitment relevant to the option you have selected?</p>

- **What OGP value is this commitment relevant to?**

<p>Select Values from the following list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transparency - Civic Participation - Public Accountability 	<p>Why is this commitment relevant to this value?</p>

- **What resources are needed to achieve this commitment?**

Please include budget, staff, time, and contributions of civil society and other organizations and any other resources required.

Budget <i>(Estimated budget allocation and specify currency)</i>	Staff <i>(Number of staff required to implement the commitment)</i>	Time <i>(Months needed to implement the commitment)</i>	Other Resources Required <i>(Please describe)</i>	Status of Resourcing <i>(Are resources needed secured, and if not how will they be secured during implementation?)</i>

- **Additional Information [Optional]**

Use this optional space to provide other useful information, for example:

- Where relevant, include links to other parliamentary programs and processes
- Where applicable, include links to the national development plan, the strategic development plan of parliament, and/or other relevant plans
- Link to the executive branch’s OGP commitments
- Gender perspective analysis

Maximum 1000 characters

- **Milestones**

Please add below the individual milestones of your commitment. Add one line per milestone. You can add as many lines as necessary.

Milestone Description	Expected Output/Outcome	Start Date (MM/YYYY)	End Date (MM/YYYY)	Responsible Agency and Contact Person	Other Stakeholders Involved, and How?
<i>Add lines above as necessary</i>					

Assessment and Reporting Templates

These are the assessment and reporting templates for parliaments independently co-creating and reporting their own OGP action plans.

Inception Assessment Template

The inception assessment appraises the co-creation process as well as the design of the commitments at their inception. This assessment should be finalized within four months of the submission of the action plan to the OGP Support Unit.

Section I: Compliance with Minimum Requirements

1. Opportunities for public input:

Did the parliament ensure that any interested member of the public could provide inputs into the action plan contents and observe or have access to decision-making documentation?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including how the public was engaged:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

2. Engagement of civil society:

Did the parliament engage civil society in the development of the action plan?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including the nature of civil society involvement in the development of the plan:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

Section II: Recommended Practices for Co-creation During Action Plan Development

1. **Space for dialogue:** Was there a regular space for ongoing dialogue and co-creation of the plan? Note: this can be the MSF/P where one is established.

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, and type of information available about the space for ongoing dialogue to the public (e.g., composition, mandate, tenure, meeting minutes, decisions):

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

2. Availability of co-creation timeline: Was relevant information about the open parliament plan co-creation process and timeline published by the MSF or parliament?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including what information was available, where it was published, how it was publicized, and to what extent this helped create awareness and engagement from stakeholders:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

3. Awareness-raising activities: Did the MSF or parliament conduct outreach activities with stakeholders to raise awareness of the open parliament process?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including information on types of activities carried out, who was reached, and the effectiveness of these efforts in helping facilitate informed participation during the co-creation process:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

4. Mechanisms for input gathering: Did the MSF or parliament put in place mechanisms to gather inputs from a range of stakeholders?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including the types of mechanisms provided for stakeholders to provide input into the action plan and the effectiveness of these:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

5. Documentation: Were contributions received from various stakeholders documented?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including what kind of documentation was made publicly available:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

6. Feedback to stakeholders: Did the MSF or parliament provide feedback to stakeholders on how their inputs were considered for the final action plan?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including how the MSF or parliament proactively reported back or published written feedback to stakeholders on how their contributions were considered for the plan:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

7. Responsiveness to stakeholder priorities: To what extent does the final action plan respond to stakeholder priorities or feedback from consultations (or previous assessment reports)?

Please check the following:

- Large extent
- Some extent
- Unclear or difficult to say

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

8. Diversity and inclusion in the process: Would you consider the co-creation process to be inclusive and diverse?

Please check the following:

- Very
- Moderately
- Somewhat
- Not sure
- No

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

- 9. Recommendations for improvements:** What could be improved in the overall co-creation process, engagement between parliament and civil society, and public engagement opportunities?

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Section III: Initial Assessment of Commitments

Context and Contribution of the Overall Commitments

1. Context and Objectives:

- *4-5 sentences explaining the origins of the commitments included in the action plan , how they relate to each other, and how they add up in advancing open government.*

2. Potential for Results

- *4-5 summary sentences on commitments that are most promising for results and why, and an analysis of the changes they could produce by the end of the action plan period, if well implemented*

3. Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations During Implementation

- *Include 4-5 sentences highlighting challenges that may derail or risk implementation or curtail the ambition of the commitments during implementation. Also include recommendations on how to overcome or mitigate the challenges. If needed, use concrete examples or reference good practices in the recommendations.*

Keep the narrative fluid for this section, but use bold or bullet points to draw the reader's attention easily to the recommendations.

Commitment-by-Commitment:

1. **Verifiability:** Is the commitment verifiable?

The commitment language provides clearly identifiable activities and measurable deliverables for achievement of the commitment's objective.

- Yes
 No
 Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

2. **Relevance to parliamentary role in open government:** The commitment pertains to one of the following options:

- **Taking legislative action:** Parliaments can champion open government values by introducing, reviewing, and ratifying legislation relevant for open government or approving budgets for open government reform. As of 2020, approximately 10-15 percent of all OGP commitments made require legislative action.
- **Ensuring parliamentary oversight:** Parliaments can hold the executive accountable for open government reforms and opening up its own oversight processes to public scrutiny.
- **Opening up parliamentary processes:** Parliaments can adopt open government principles -- transparency, accountability, participation, and inclusion -- in the parliamentary institution and processes.
- **Creating space for dialogue:** Parliaments can foster the cross-party dialogue and support needed to advance and institutionalize open government reforms.

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including which area of parliamentary action on open government is covered by this commitment:

Maximum 1000 characters

3. **Relevance to OGP values:** Does the commitment language/activities clearly justify relevance to OGP values?

The commitment clearly relates to open government values of transparency, civic participation, or public accountability as defined by the Open Government Declaration, the OGP Articles of Governance, and by responding to the guiding questions below.

- **Transparency:** Will the parliament disclose more information, improve the legal or institutional frameworks to guarantee the right to information, improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public, or improve the transparency of parliament decision-making processes or institutions?
- **Civic Participation:** Will parliament create or improve opportunities, processes, or mechanisms for the public to inform or influence decisions? Will the parliament create, enable, or improve participatory mechanisms for minorities or underrepresented groups? Will the parliament improve the legal environment to guarantee freedoms of assembly, association, and peaceful protest?
- **Public Accountability:** Will the parliament create or improve opportunities to hold parliament answerable for their actions? Will the parliament improve the legal, policy, or institutional frameworks to foster accountability of parliamentarians?

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

4. Potential for results: Please select one option that best describes the commitment:

- a. **Unclear:** The commitment is aimed at continuing ongoing practices in line with existing legislation, requirements, or policies without indication of the added value or enhanced open government approach in contrast with existing practice.
- b. **Modest:** The result is a positive but standalone initiative or change to process, practice or policies. Includes commitments that do not generate binding or institutionalized changes across the state or institutions that govern a policy area.
- c. **Substantial:** The result is significant change to rules (or the creation of new ones), practices, policies, or institutions that govern a policy area, public sector, and/or relationship between citizens and state. The commitment generates binding and institutionalized changes across the state of parliament.

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

- 5. Recommendations for implementation:** Are there any recommended changes to the design of the commitment to help improve its implementation?

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including any foreseeable challenges that may impact the implementation of this commitment:

Maximum 1000 characters

Note: if the action plan is updated to reflect the recommendations, the updated plan may be resubmitted to the OGP Support Unit to have the latest version of the plan reflected on the website.

Mid-Point Check-In Template

For parliaments that adopt action plans with a duration of three years or more, a mid-point check-in assessment is recommended to ensure the continued relevance of the plan and to allow for course corrections as needed. Parliaments are encouraged to submit this assessment to the Support Unit for posting alongside the action plan and other assessments.

Section I: Co-creation during Implementation

- 1. Space for dialogue:** Is there a regular space for ongoing dialogue and co-creation of the plan? Note: this can be the MSF/P where one is established, and has it been active during implementation?

- Yes
 No
 Unclear

How can the spaces for regular dialogue and collaboration to support implementation and course correction be improved?

Maximum 1000 characters

- 2. Information on engagement opportunities:** Has the parliament or MSF provided information to inform any interested stakeholder of the opportunities for ongoing dialogue and collaboration during implementation and monitoring of the action plan?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide evidence (if any) for answer:

Add document or url

How can information on ongoing dialogue and collaboration opportunities be better disseminated for the remainder of the action plan period?

Maximum 1000 characters

- 3. Frequency of updates on results of commitments:** Are results on the implementation of the action plan commitments presented regularly and are opportunities being created for civil society and other stakeholders to comment and provide input?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

How can the process of data collection, monitoring, reporting and providing feedback on the progress of commitments be improved for the remainder of the action plan period?

Maximum 1000 characters

4. Public availability of information on action plan progress: Is information on progress of the action plan and commitments being made publicly available?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including how this was done and how this was publicized:

Maximum 1000 characters

How can the information on action plan progress be better disseminated to the public?

Add document or url

Section II: Commitment-by-Commitment Progress

1. **Progress on implementation:** Is the commitment on track for completion?

Please check the following:

- On track
- Progressing with delays
- Stalled
- No progress

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including factors driving or constraining implementation?

Maximum 1000 characters

What are the course correction measures, if any, required to bring the commitment back on track for completion?

Add document or url

2. **Assistance requirements:** Does the implementing body require any additional assistance for implementing this commitment

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including the type of assistance needed (additional resources, political support, technical assistance, peer exchange with actors implementing similar commitments)

Maximum 1000 characters

How can the assistance be secured?

Maximum 1000 characters

End-of-plan Assessment and Learning Template

This assessment must be submitted to the OGP Support Unit within six months of completion of the plan to enable an evidence-based analysis of the level of completion and early results of action plan commitments, and lessons for reflection and accountability. Parliaments should factor in time for this assessment when deciding on the duration and end dates of their plans to ensure it can be completed during the parliament's tenure or before scheduled elections that may have an impact on the OGP parliamentary action plan process.

Section I: Compliance with Minimum Requirements

- 1. Opportunities for public input:** Did the parliament ensure that any interested member of the public could provide inputs into this assessment? Note: this is a minimum requirement.

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including how the public was engaged:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

2. Civil society engagement: Did the parliament engage civil society in the assessment of this plan?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including the nature of civil society involvement in the assessment of the plan:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

Section II. Recommended Practices for Co-creation During Implementation

- 5. Information on engagement opportunities:** Did the parliament or MSF provide information to inform any interested stakeholder of the opportunities for ongoing dialogue and collaboration during implementation and monitoring of the action plan?

Please check the following:

- Yes
 No
 Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including what opportunities were provided and how:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

- 6. Frequency of updates on results of commitments:** Were results on the implementation of the action plan commitments presented and the opportunity made for civil society and other stakeholders to comment?

Please check the following:

- Yes
 No
 Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including the frequency of updates and the types of opportunities provided for comment and feedback:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

7. Public availability of information on action plan progress: Was information on progress of the action plan and commitments made publicly available?

Please check the following:

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Provide a brief explanation of your answer, including how this was done and how this was publicized:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

Section III: Commitment-by-Commitment Assessment

1. **Completion;** What was the overall level of progress in the commitment implementation at the time of this assessment?

Quick tip: You should assess whether the activities were implemented and to what extent, based on impartial facts that are objectively verifiable.

- No evidence available
- Not started
- Limited
- Substantial
- Complete
- Withdrawn

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence that supports and justifies your answer:

Add document or url

2. **Completion:** [if incomplete,] Describe the main external or internal factors that impacted implementation of this commitment and how they were addressed (or not).

Maximum 2000 characters

3. Early results: Advancing Parliament’s contributions to open government. As a result of this commitment, did the parliament do any of the following, please check all options that apply.

- Approve or amend legislation to advance open government
- Improve parliamentary oversight over open government reforms
- Open up parliamentary oversight processes to public participation or scrutiny.
- Improve the transparency of parliamentary processes or institutions
- Improve opportunities for public participation in parliamentary decision-making
- Create space for dialogue needed to advance and institutionalize open government reforms.

Degree of result:

- Unclear
- Substantial
- Transformative

Explanation (in narrative form) of the impact on people or practice:

Maximum 1500 characters

Evidence:

Add document or url

4. Meeting intended objectives: Did the commitment address the public policy problem that it intended to address as described in the action plan?

- Yes
- No
- Unclear
- Not applicable

Provide a brief explanation of your answer:

Maximum 1000 characters

Provide evidence for your answer:

Add document or url

5. Early results: Other

Please describe any other relevant results that have not been captured above:

Maximum 1500 characters

Section IV: Learning and Reflection

1. *What were the most significant strengths and weaknesses in the commitments and their implementation? What does this imply for follow up and for the next action plan?*

Maximum 1000 characters

2. *How did the institutional arrangements for the plan and process support or hinder its ambition or implementation? What does this imply for follow up and for the next action plan?*

Maximum 1000 characters

3. *What were the strengths and weaknesses in the public engagement approach for this plan? What does this imply for follow up and for the next action plan?*

Maximum 1000 characters

4. *What were the strengths and weaknesses of the MSF during the development and implementation of the plan? What does this imply for follow up and for the next action plan?*

Maximum 1000 characters

5. *Did the choice of the overall timeline and key activities help or hinder the action plan development and implementation? What does this imply for follow up and for the next action plan?*

Maximum 1000 characters

Illustrative Commitments

Below is a list of illustrative commitments across the four key roles identified in the Memorandum on Parliamentary Engagement: legislative action, oversight, open parliaments, and enabling dialogue. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list; these are offered as starting points to provide stakeholders with initial ideas and inspiration.

Legislative Action

- Adopt, or review and amend legislation to strengthen the legal frameworks governing access to information, public accountability, and civic space and participation in specific sectors or policy areas (e.g., climate, gender, justice) or across government (e.g., freedom of information, freedom of association/speech, public participation, open data, privacy, fiscal openness).
- Enact legislation to strengthen reporting and accountability of the executive branch. This may include strengthening whistleblower protection, regular public reporting, complaints processes, or strengthening avenues for public interest litigation.
- Adopt or improve legislation that ensures the public access to information from the parliament, and identify individuals or offices responsible for responding to requests for information.
- Implement a fully functional legislative footprint system, enabling public tracking of legislative initiatives from the drafting stage through to legislative review, adoption, and (where relevant) amendments.
- Improve the ways in which civil society and citizens can provide inputs throughout the legislative drafting and review by mandating public commenting and/or consultation opportunities at fixed points in the process.
- Ensure all primary and secondary legislation is published in an easily accessible format, free of charge.

Oversight

- Strengthen transparency and public participation opportunities in parliamentary oversight by improving transparency of records of fora in parliamentary oversight is exercised (e.g., parliamentary questions, hearings, ad-hoc and standing committees) and providing opportunities for public input into the same.
- Improve transparency of independent oversight bodies created by or reporting to the parliament on government performance (e.g., supreme audit institutions or ombudsman) and transparency of parliamentary response to their findings and recommendations.

- Legally mandate that the Ministry of Finance regularly report to the budget committee in the case of emergency financial spending (e.g., COVID-19, conflict, climate emergencies) to ensure continued parliamentary oversight, and to ensure that the meetings or their records are publicly available to strengthen transparency and accountability of public spending.
- Improve the public review of auditing reports by the plenary and/or parliamentary committees to strengthen accountability and encourage action on relevant recommendations, as well as to invite, consider, and share public submissions.
- Invite regular briefings on the national OGP action plan progress throughout the OGP process at relevant parliamentary working group/subcommittee meetings and invite, consider, and share public input into the same.

Open Parliament

- Proactively publish information related to parliamentary operations, such as information on lawmakers, meeting agendas, bills, debates, and voting records.
- Raise awareness of the potential mechanisms citizens can use to participate in parliamentary work.
- Implement consultations and public hearings that give citizens opportunities to provide feedback and demonstrate their interests, both online and in-person.
- Strengthen communication between legislators and their constituents, and give opportunities for citizens, especially vulnerable groups, to provide input.
- Require each legislator to publish information on their work periodically, such as a comparison between their campaign commitments and their record of legislative activities.
- Review and further improve the asset declaration required by members of parliament and senior parliamentary staff.
- Improve participation of civil society and citizens in the activities of parliamentary committees to ensure their reports and recommendations are sufficiently informed by lived realities.
- Invite the supreme audit institution, or a suitable independent auditor, to conduct a full audit of the parliamentary budget and spending.

Dialogue

- Establish an open government working committee or working group to invite regular inputs from government, create an opportunity for participation by civil society and citizens, and ensure that OGP commitments become logged as part of the parliamentary record.

- Co-create a resolution on open government (and/or a specific area of reform such as political advertising, lobbying, or civic space) to strengthen cross-party support and build a working relationship with relevant civil society and other stakeholders.
- The Speaker, Secretary-General and/or relevant committees initiate a regional conversation around a specific area of open government reform in support of reformers in government and civil society (e.g., tackling misinformation and disinformation, political advertising, digital governance).