Researcher Questionnaire
Consolidated IRM Report 2021 for OGP Local

Name of OGP local member: _____

Name of researcher: _____

1. Commitment completion

Please complete the following table for each commitment in the action plan

Commitment number:	
Commitment name & wording (as it appears in the action plan):	
Activities/milestones (as they appear in the action plan):	**Activity/milestone completion level** (Please complete with: fully/partially/not started/unknown)
1.1	
1.2	
1.3	
1.4	
1.5	
Etc.	
Overall completion level of the commitment (Please complete with: not started/limited/substantial/complete/no evidence)	
In this section, please state and explain the overall completion level. *For a coding of "complete" all milestones/activities must be fully completed* *A coding of "no evidence" can only be made once you have:* 1. *Verified the local OGP repository first.* 2. *Conducted desk research.* 3. *Made at least three attempts to request information from the POC/implementing agency or MSF members as needed.* 4. *Asked during an interview.* *If all steps fail, then the "no evidence" coding may be used and attempts to gather evidence must be recorded as justification in the table.*	

Comments (3-4 sentences on the overall completion level of the commitment, including evidence).	*In this section, please state:* ● *how many activities/milestones were in the action plan under this commitment* ● *How many were fully completed* ● *How many were started but not fully completed* ● *How many were not started* *Justify your coding for completion and always use a citation for your sources and evidence.* *Please consider:* *(i) If the commitment was only partially completed or delayed, what were the reasons for this?* *(ii) Was the commitment abandoned? What were the reasons for this?* *(iii) Was there a change in priorities during commitment implementation which meant that insufficient time and resources were dedicated to this commitment?* *(iv) What was the impact of the COVID-19 crisis (if any) on the completion of the commitment?*

2. Early results

Please describe below **the most important early results achieved as a result of the implementation of commitments**. It does not need to cover all the commitments, only those that produced significant results.

When deciding which commitments to include here, consider those which:

a) were either substantially or fully completed;
b) led to a specific change in policy and/or practice *beyond* simply the completion of the planned activities/milestones;
c) were considered to have transformative or moderate potential impact according to the Design report. (However, it may be that the successful implementation of other commitments also had important results and therefore these can also be included here, where appropriate).

For these commitments, consider what have been some of the positive early results which have been achieved as a result of implementation. This section will not follow the "Did it Open Government (DIOG)" coding, but instead will include a narrative description of the important policy changes achieved from the most successful commitments.

When describing early results, consider the following:

-   What was the problem the commitment aimed to address?
-   What was the situation before the commitment was implemented?
-   What has changed/improved as a result of commitment implementation? For example, has there been a change in, or introduction of, a specific law, policy or practice as a result of commitment implementation? (Note that, unlike the DIOG criteria, early

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

results do not necessarily have to relate directly to OGP values. However, they must relate to a specific policy area e.g. health, service delivery, ICT etc)
- What factors contributed to successful implementation and positive early results?

Please complete the following table for each relevant commitment

Commitment name	
Description of early results:	

Limitations and challenges: For those commitments that were substantially/fully completed but *did not* achieve strong early results, please briefly describe the reasons for this. Consider the following:

- Were the limited results due to ill-conceived or unrealistic commitment design?
- Were the limited results due to a disconnect between the commitment activities and the problem they aimed to address (i.e., were the activities appropriate to achieve the commitment objectives?)
- Were the results limited because the problem itself was not a pertinent or priority issue in the first place?
- (For the above questions, you may wish to refer back to the coding for potential impact in the Design Report. If the commitment was rated as having low potential impact, this may help explain limited results)
- Were there other reasons for limited results, despite substantial or full completion? For example, did stakeholder engagement/enthusiasm decline during implementation, hence limiting the extent of the result achieved?

Please complete the following table for each relevant commitment

Commitment name:	
Description of limitations/ challenges:	

Open Government Partnership

Independent Reporting Mechanism

3. Stakeholder participation and engagement

Please describe the **level of government-civil society engagement** and the **quality of dialogue** between government and civil society during implementation of the second action plan. Provide an analysis on **how engagement changed (improved or worsened)** compared to the co-creation process to develop the second action plan.

Consider:

- Did stakeholder participation increase or decrease over time?
- Did the range of actors involved become more or less diverse over time?
- Did the local government/MSF adopt any tools or mechanisms for tracking implementation of commitments?
- Did the local government/MSF adopt any tools or mechanisms for keeping stakeholders engaged during implementation of the action plan?

Level of stakeholder engagement:

Please use the above analysis to complete the table below, comparing the level of public influence during development and implementation of the action plan. Ensure that the level of public influence during development of the action plan in the table below is the same as presented in the Design Report.

For further guidance on how to code the level of public influence during implementation of the action plan, please refer to the IRM Guidance on Level of Public Influence.

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Level of public influence		During development of action plan	During implementation of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.		
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue and the public helped set the agenda.		
Involve	The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered.		
Consult	The public could give inputs.		
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.		
No consultation	No consultation		

4. Lessons learned and recommendations to fellow OGP local members

Please briefly describe below any **overall lessons** that have been learned through the **implementation of the last 2 actions plans** in your jurisdiction.

Lessons might be related to:

- **Design of commitments**: e.g., interesting themes, themes which captured the imagination of stakeholders, commitments which were particularly relevant, ambitious or challenging (or perhaps over-ambitious), commitments which were not sufficiently ambitious or not so relevant
- **Implementation of commitments**: E.g., Were sufficient resources (human, financial, other) allocated to commitment implementation? Were there any challenges that arose during commitment implementation? How did relevant actors adapt? Was there flexibility in commitment implementation to account for unforeseen circumstances?
- **Process:** Which kinds of participation mechanisms (e.g., formal vs informal) proved most successful for sustaining engagement? How did the local actors leading the process (MSF or other) monitor and evaluate their own participation in the OGP process? Did they adopt any innovative tools or processes for M&E and for learning?

In addition, consider the following open questions to ask local stakeholders (POC/MSF/civil society reps, others)

- **What have been the 2-3 main lessons you have learned** during your involvement with the OGP Local Program (including what you have learned since the first action plan cycle starting in 2016)?
- **What, if anything, did you change from the first action plan cycle** that helped you improve in the second cycle?
- **Is there anything you would do differently** if you could start the process again from the beginning?
- **Is there anything you would recommend** for new local members joining the OGP to keep in mind?

These questions could be addressed through a focus group/meeting with MSF or through a short stakeholder survey.

Open
Government
Partnership

Independent
Reporting
Mechanism

Lessons learned: