

NATIONAL ACTION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

INTRODUCTION TO THE REVIEW TOOL

The Open Government Partnership was launched in 2011 to provide an international platform for domestic reformers committed to making their governments more open, accountable, and responsive to citizens. Since then, the OGP has grown from 8 countries to more than 60 participating countries.

The primary mechanism of the OGP for supporting domestic reformers to secure open government reforms is the development and implementation of National Action Plans by member countries. The OGP Articles of Governance state that 'OGP participants commit to developing their country action plans through a multi stakeholder process, with the active engagement of citizens and civil society'. Participation is a core component of open government, and an essential element of developing a OGP National Action Plan.

In the first round of National Action Plans, there were concerns with the quality of consultation, quality of commitments and ambition of commitments. The OGP did, however (according to 60% of the respondents to the 2013 CSO survey), help to increase trust and cooperation between government and CSOs.

This review tool is designed to support the objective and comparable analysis of National Action Plans from the perspective of civil society. It reviews the openness of the process of developing a country's National Action Plan (i.e. the degree of transparency, participation and accountability), the quality and ambition of commitments. It is intended to be used within countries before and during the formulation of an action plan as an advocacy tool to support the development of a dialogue and partnership process between government and civil society. In addition, results from across country cohorts will be used to inform the improvement of the overall OGP mechanism.

The review tool is currently in its pilot phase, and will be further developed based on the feedback of the pilot countries.

The process for completing the review is as follows:

- A lead civil society organisation - selected and approved by engaged CSOs - conducts a preliminary review.
- The preliminary review is shared with other engaged CSOs for comment, and is subsequently revised by the lead CSO based on these. The lead CSO has discretion over if and how comments from other CSOs are taken on board.
- The revised review is shared with the relevant OGP lead for headline comments from the government, and is subsequently revised by the lead CSO based on these. The lead CSO has discretion over if and how comments from government are taken on board.
- A final version of the review is published, with comments from other CSOs and government included.

TIMELINE

Part A of the review is intended to be completed at the end of the consultation / engagement process.

Part B of the review is intended to be completed immediately following the publication of the National Action Plan.

NOTES

When completing this survey, please be aware of the following:

Answers are required for all multiple choice questions. Text boxes are included at the end of each section for any points of clarification. A further comments box is included at the bottom of the page for any reflections you wish to record.

We define open government according to the Open Government Partnership's four core open government principles:

- **Transparency:** information on government activities and decisions is open, comprehensive, timely, freely available to the public and meets basic open data standards (e.g. raw data, machine readability).
- **Citizen Participation:** governments seek to mobilize citizens to engage in public debate, provide input, and make contributions that lead to more responsive, innovative and effective governance.
- **Accountability:** there are rules, regulations and mechanisms in place that call upon government actors to justify their actions, act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and accept responsibility for failure to perform with respect to laws or commitments.
- **Technology and Innovation:** governments embrace the importance of providing citizens with open access to technology, the role of new technologies in driving innovation, and the importance of increasing the capacity of citizens to use technology.

PART A: HOW THE NATIONAL ACTION PLAN WAS DEVELOPED

INTRODUCTION TO PART A OF THE REVIEW TOOL

The Open Government Partnership states that: "Each participating country must develop an OGP action plan through a multi-stakeholder, open, and participatory process." The questions in Part A of the review are intended to assess the process of developing your country's National Action Plan, including the extent to which it was open and participatory.

WHO YOU ARE

As the lead CSO, please provide your:

Name

Organisation

Country

Contact email address

Contact phone number

1. TRANSPARENCY OF THE PROCESS

1. To what extent was the information that the government made available prior to the start of the public consultation process sufficient to understand how it would work?

- To a large extent (the information provided was of good detail and quality)
- To a moderate extent (the information provided was of average detail and quality)
- To some extent (the information provided was of poor detail and quality)
- Not at all (the government provided no information to explain the public consultation process)

2. To what extent did the government proactively and transparently communicate a timeline outlining the National Action Plan development process?

- To a large extent (a timeline was proactively shared with key actors and published via a range of channels)
- To a moderate extent (a timeline was published but not proactively shared with key actors)
- To some extent (a timeline was made available on request)
- Not at all (no timeline was published or made available upon request)

3. To what extent did the government proactively and transparently communicate opportunities to be involved in the development of the National Action Plan?

- To a large extent (opportunities to be involved in the action plan development were proactively communicated to key actors and published via a range of channels)
- To a moderate extent (opportunities to be involved were published but not proactively shared with key actors)
- To some extent (opportunities to be involved were communicated on request)
- Not at all (opportunities to be involved were not published or communicated)

4. To what extent did the government proactively and transparently communicate who the OGP point of contact for developing the action plan was, including their name, position, department/ministry, and contact details?

- To a large extent (the information was proactively communicated to key actors and published via a range of channels)
- To a moderate extent (the information was published but not proactively shared with key actors)
- To some extent (the information was communicated on request)
- Not at all (the information was not published or communicated)

5. To what extent did the government proactively and transparently communicate who the minister or senior official with accountability and final decision making responsibility for the action plan is?

- To a large extent (the information was proactively communicated to key actors and published via a range of channels)
- To a moderate extent (the information was published but not proactively shared with key actors)
- To some extent (the information was communicated on request)
- Not at all (the information was not published or communicated)

6. To what extent were all documents relating to the National Action Plan (e.g. draft National Action Plans, consultation documents, final National Action Plan) published?

- To a large extent (all documents were proactively published)
- To a moderate extent (the majority of documents were proactively published)
- To some extent (documents were provided on request)
- Not at all (documents were not proactively published or made available on request)

7. To what extent were all documents relating to the National Action Plan (e.g. draft National Action Plans, consultation documents, final National Action Plan) made available in the official national language(s)?

- To a large extent (all documents were proactively published in the official national language(s))
- To a moderate extent (the majority of documents were proactively published in the official national language(s))
- To some extent (documents were provided on request in the official national language(s))
- Not at all (documents were not proactively published or provided on request in the official national language(s))

8. To what extent were progress updates proactively and transparently published in a regular and timely fashion?

- To a large extent (progress updates were proactively published at regular intervals - for example, at least every two weeks or monthly)
- To a moderate extent (progress updates were proactively published after significant developments)
- To some extent (progress updates were provided on request)
- Not at all (progress updates were not proactively published or made available on request)

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

2. PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

In order to evaluate all aspects of participation in the process, there are three sub-sections to this section: 2.1 Consultation, 2.2 Government-Civil Society Partnership, and 2.3 Government Commitment to Partnership.

Our approach is based on the consideration that an ideal OGP process needs to cater for three different groups: the heavily engaged, the partially engaged, and the potential one-off engagers. Opportunities for ongoing involvement are needed for those who wish to be heavily engaged in the process to work with the government to develop the National Action Plan, and this needs to be transparent and accessible enough for those who wish to be only partially engaged to dip-in-and-out of the process as and when they see fit. In addition, there needs to be opportunities for other organisations, networks and individuals to be able to have their say at key points of the process, but not requiring high levels of effort or ongoing engagement on their part.

Therefore, the government-civil society partnership sub-section (2.2) covers opportunities for civil society organisations to engage deeply in the content, detail and implementation of a National Action Plan over an extended period of time. The consultation sub-section (2.1.) on the other hand, covers one-off opportunities for less engaged stakeholders to influence a National Action Plan, including via a consultation process open to anyone to respond and targeted outreach to engage particular groups and/or citizens. The final sub-section evaluates government's commitment.

2.1. CONSULTATION

As stated above, this subsection refers to open and straightforward opportunities for any stakeholder to influence a National Action Plan, and targeted outreach to engage particular groups and/or citizens.

1. To what extent was a public consultation (i.e. an open opportunity for any interested parties to respond to questions or a draft action plan) of a suitable duration held on the action plan?

- To a large extent (a 12 week or more public consultation was conducted)
- To a moderate extent (a 6-11 week public consultation was conducted)
- To some extent (a public consultation of less than 6 weeks was conducted)
- Not at all (no public consultation was conducted)

2. To what extent were inputs to the public consultation on the National Action Plan published?

- To a large extent (all inputs to the process were proactively published, with the submitter identified)
- To a moderate extent (all inputs to the process were proactively published, without the submitter identified)
- To some extent (a report summarising inputs was proactively published)
- Not at all (no information on inputs was proactively published)
- Not applicable

3. To what extent was it communicated why inputs to the public consultation were or were not taken into account?

- To a large extent (the government responded to each input individually, stating the reasons it could or could not be adopted)
- To a moderate extent (the government published a general but detailed response to the public consultation inputs)
- To some extent (the government published a general and non detailed response to the public consultation inputs)
- Not at all (the government was not forthcoming about why inputs were or were not adopted)
- Not applicable

4. To what extent did government make attempts to engage citizens and grassroots (i.e. community and local level) civil society groups in the National Action Plan consultation process?

- To a large extent
- To a moderate extent
- To some extent
- Not at all

Please give details:

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

2.2. GOVERNMENT - CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP

As stated above, this sub-section refers to ongoing opportunities for civil society to be heavily involved in the content, detail and implementation of an action plan, that is transparent and accessible enough for organisations to drop-in and out easily.

LEVEL OF ENGAGEMENT AND DIALOGUE

1. To what extent was civil society free to self-organise?

For example, consider the extent to which civil society was free to decide: if/how civil society structured itself; whether a civil society forum/network/steering group was established and who its membership was; and who represented or coordinated civil society organisations.

- To a large extent (civil society was entirely free to self-organise)
- To a moderate extent (civil society was mostly free to self-organise)
- To some extent (civil society had limited freedom to self-organise)
- Not at all (civil society had no freedom to self-organise)

2. To what extent did civil society organisations have a significant level of involvement and influence in the development of the framing and narrative (i.e. the story that connects the commitments and describes the country's approach to open government) for the action plan?

- To a large extent (government and civil society co-drafted the narrative for the action plan)
- To a moderate extent (civil society was able to comment on the draft narrative with the the government taking on board a majority of comments)
- To some extent (civil society was able to comment on the draft narrative with the the government taking on board a minority of comments)
- Not at all (civil society had no involvement in the development of the narrative for the action plan)

3. To what extent did civil society organisations have involvement in the development of commitments for the action plan?

- To a large extent (government and civil society worked together to develop all of the commitments within the action plan)
- To a moderate extent (government and civil society worked together to develop the majority of commitments within the action plan)
- To some extent (government and civil society worked together to develop a minority of the commitments within the action plan)
- Not at all (civil society had no involvement in the development of commitments)

4. To what extent did civil society organisations have influence over which commitments were included in the action plan?

- To a large extent (government and civil society jointly agreed which commitments should or should not included in the action plan)
- To a moderate extent (government took into account the views of civil society to a significant extent when deciding which commitments should or should not be included in the action plan)
- To some extent (government took into account the views of civil society to some extent when deciding which commitments should or should not be included in the action plan)
- Not at all (civil society had no influence over which commitments were or were not included in the final plan)

5. To what extent was the political space for reform communicated to engaged civil society organisations?

- To a large extent (government communicated the political space for reform on all proposed commitment areas)
- To a moderate extent (government communicated the political space for reform on the majority of proposed commitment areas)
- To some extent (government communicated the political space for reform on a minority of the proposed commitment areas)
- Not at all (government communicated the political space for reform on none of the proposed commitment areas)

6. To what extent was it communicated to civil society organisations why inputs were or were not taken into account regarding specific commitments?

- To a large extent (the government responded to each input, stating the reasons they could or could not be adopted)
- To a moderate extent (the government responded to the majority of inputs, stating the reasons they could or could not be adopted)
- To some extent (the government responded to a minority of inputs, stating the reasons they could or could not be adopted)
- Not at all (the government was not forthcoming about why inputs were or were not adopted)

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

INCLUSIVITY OF GOVERNMENT - CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP

7. To what extent were there frequent meetings between civil society organisations and the government on the action plan?

- To a large extent (meetings were held frequently)
- To a moderate extent (meetings were held semi-frequently)
- To some extent (meetings were held infrequently)–
- Not at all (no meetings were held)

8. To what extent were the details of meetings (i.e. date, time, venue, topic) publicised beyond those civil society organisations actively involved?

- To a large extent (all meeting details were openly publicised)
- To a moderate extent (the majority of meeting details were openly publicised)
- To some extent (the minority of meeting details were openly publicised)
- Not at all (meeting details were not openly publicised)

9. To what extent were opportunities provided for remote participation in meetings?

- To a large extent (approximately 80% or more meetings allowed for remote participation)
- To a moderate extent (approximately 50%-80% of meetings allowed for remote participation)
- To some extent (less than 50% of meetings allowed for remote participation)
- Not at all (no meetings held allowed for remote participation)

10. To what extent were any meetings or events held outside of the capital?

- To a large extent (meetings or events were held in five or more different locations)
- To a moderate extent (meetings or events were held in two to four different locations)
- To some extent (meetings or events were held in one other location)
- Not at all (no meetings or events were held outside of the capital)

11. To what extent were minutes of meetings between civil society organisations and government on the National Action Plan published in an accessible place and format appropriate to local context?

- To a large extent (80% or more published with significant detail such as attendees, key discussion points, actions agreed and responsible persons and are available in an easily accessible place and format)
- To a moderate extent (50%-80% published and provide good detail such as attendees, actions agreed and responsible persons and are available in an easily accessible place and format)
- To some extent (less than 50% published or provide no detail, or are not easily accessible)
- Not at all (no minutes were published)

12. Of those civil society organisations actively engaged, which [open government topics](#) were covered? [tick any that apply]:

- Access to information
- Aid transparency
- Anti-corruption
- Asset disclosure
- Budget transparency
- Citizen participation
- Corporate accountability
- E-Government
- Legislative openness
- Media freedom
- Natural resources
- Open data
- Political financing
- Public procurement
- Public service delivery
- Rule of law
- Sub-national governance
- Whistleblowing

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

2.3. GOVERNMENT COMMITMENT TO PARTNERSHIP

1. To what extent was a suitable amount of staff time devoted to coordinating the process of developing the action plan by government?

Consider whether the amount of staff time was suitable for coordinating the chosen process in the given context.

- To a large extent (the process would not have benefitted from more staff time)
- To a moderate extent (the process would have benefitted a little from more staff time)
- To some extent (the process would have benefitted significantly from more staff time)
- Not at all (the process was very poor due to lack of staff time)

2. Which government departments/ministries were involved in the development of the action plan?

- Business
- Education
- Defencing
- Finance
- Health
- Justice
- Office of the President / Prime Minister
- Office of the Deputy / Vice President / Prime Minister
- Transport
- Other:

3. To what extent was the OGP Point of Contact and other lead government officials willing to push for internal change?

- To a large extent (lead officials acted as internal advocates for the general principles of open government and made the case for the inclusion of commitments identified as priorities by civil society)
- To a moderate extent (lead officials acted as internal advocates for the general principles of open government)
- To some extent (lead officials expressed support for the general principles of open government but did not proactively advocate for government reforms)
- Not at all (lead officials did not advocate for open government reforms)

4. How would you rate the quality of the engagement process regarding the National Action Plan as compared to other experiences of civil society engagement by government?

Consider how the government would typically score on the previous questions to inform your choice

- Superior (the level of involvement of civil society, inclusivity of involvement, and commitment to engagement from government far exceeded engagement processes on other policy issues)
- Better (the level of involvement of civil society, inclusivity of involvement, and commitment to engagement from government were better than engagement processes on other policy issues)
- Similar (the level of involvement of civil society, inclusivity of involvement, and commitment to engagement from government were similar to engagement processes on other policy issues)
- Worse (the level of involvement of civil society, inclusivity of involvement, and commitment to engagement from government were worse than engagement processes on other policy issues)

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

3. ONGOING GOVERNMENT - CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP

1. In your opinion, how would you judge the strength of the partnership between key government officials and engaged civil society organisations?

- Very strong (government and civil society developed productive and strong working relationships with **at least** a high level of trust **and** disagreements were negotiated with mutually agreeable solutions found in **all** cases)
- Strong (government and civil society developed fairly productive and strong working relationships with **at least** a moderate level of trust **and** disagreements were negotiated with mutually agreeable solutions found in **most** cases)
- Moderately Strong (government and civil society developed a basic working relationship with **at least** a low level of trust **and** attempts were made to negotiate disagreements with mutually agreeable solutions found in **some** cases)
- Weak (government and civil society were not able to establish a working relationship **and/or no** attempts were made to negotiate disagreements)

2. In your opinion, how would you judge the level of energy and momentum of the process?

- High energy (the development of the action plan gained significant momentum with high and consistent engagement from government and civil society)
- Moderate energy (the development of the action plan gained momentum with moderate and mostly consistent levels of engagement from government and civil society)
- Low energy (the development of the action plan gained little momentum with low levels or inconsistent engagement from government and civil society)
- No energy (the development of the action plan gained no momentum with no engagement from government and civil society)

IMPLEMENTATION

3. To what extent were those officials responsible for implementing commitments engaged in the process of developing and agreeing them?

- To a large extent (those responsible for implementing the commitment were involved throughout its development and agreement)
- To a moderate extent (those responsible for implementing the commitment were involved regularly during its development and agreement)
- To some extent (those responsible for implementing the commitment were involved intermittently during its development and/or agreement)
- Not at all (those responsible for implementing the commitment were not involved at all in its development and/or agreement)

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

4. FURTHER COMMENTS

Please use this space to record any further comments on the process of developing your country's National Action Plan.

PART B: IMPLEMENTATION; QUALITY AND AMBITION OF THE NATIONAL ACTION PLAN

INTRODUCTION TO PART B OF THE REVIEW

The Open Government Partnership states the OGP action plans should contain "concrete and measurable commitments undertaken by the participating government to drive innovative reforms in the areas of transparency, accountability, and citizen engagement." The following questions are intended to assess the implementation, and quality and ambition of your country's National Action Plan.

WHO YOU ARE

As the lead CSO, please provide your:

Name

Organisation

Country

Contact email address

Contact phone number

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN

1. To what extent is there ongoing collaboration between government officials and civil society on the implementation of individual commitments?

- To a large extent (meetings are held between relevant government officials and relevant civil society organisations on **at least** 80% of commitments, **at least** once every 4 months)
- To a moderate extent (meetings are held between relevant government officials and relevant civil society organisations on 50-80% of commitments, **at least** once every 6 months)
- To some extent (meetings are held between relevant government officials and relevant civil society organisations on **less than** 50% of commitments **or less than** once every 6 months)
- Not at all (**no** meetings are held with government officials to review progress)

2. To what extent is there an ongoing joint process in place to monitor the progress of the implementation of the action plan?

- To a large extent (meetings are held at least every 3 months with a senior official or minister to review overall progress on implementation)
- To a moderate extent (meetings are held every 3 to 6 months with a senior official or minister to review overall progress on implementation)
- To some extent (irregular meetings are held with government officials to review overall progress on implementation)
- Not at all (no meetings are held with government officials to review overall progress on implementation)

3. To what extent was there there a joint process put in place to review the consultation and engagement process by government and civil society?

- To a large extent (government and civil society jointly evaluated the process)
- To a moderate extent (government conducted its own evaluation, with input from civil society)
- To some extent (government conducted its own evaluation with no opportunity for civil society input)
- Not at all (no evaluation was conducted)

4. If an evaluation of the process was conducted, were the results published?

- Yes
- No

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

2. QUALITY AND AMBITION OF THE PLAN

For the following questions you will need to pick the five commitments that correspond to the five numbers given to you by the international civil society coordinator. These are selected at random using <http://www.randomizer.org/form.htm>.

Which commitments were selected at random?

Commitment 1:
Commitment 2:
Commitment 3:
Commitment 4:
Commitment 5:

2.{1-5}. EVALUATING COMMITMENT {1-5}

Answer the following questions based on each Commitment (these are repeated 5 times in the actual survey):

1. To what extent does the commitment describe the specific activity that will be undertaken?

- To a large extent (the description is entirely clear)
- To a moderate extent (the description is slightly ambiguous)
- To some extent (the description is very ambiguous)
- Not at all (there is no description)

2. To what extent does the commitment describe the problem it is trying to solve?

- To a large extent (the problem and rationale for the commitment are described in detail)
- To a moderate extent (the problem and rationale for the commitment are described in basic detail)
- To some extent (the problem is outlined, but no rationale is provided)
- Not at all (the problem is not described)

3. To what extent does the commitment include a breakdown of interim milestones and final deadlines?

- To a large extent (milestones and deadlines are listed and outline clear outputs)
- To a moderate extent (milestones and deadlines are listed, BUT outputs are ambiguous)
- To some extent (final deadlines are listed, BUT interim milestones are not)
- Not at all (neither milestones nor deadlines are listed)

4. To what extent does the commitment set out measurable and verifiable outputs and outcomes against which it can demonstrate fulfillment and improvement?

- To a large extent (output and outcomes are clearly defined, can be measured AND refer to internationally recognised standards)
- To a moderate extent (outputs and outcomes are clearly defined and can be measured)
- To some extent (outputs and outcomes are ambiguous AND/OR can't be measured)
- Not at all (outputs and outcomes are not listed)

5. To what extent does the commitment specify who has ownership and responsibility for its implementation?

- To a large extent (including the official, minister, team and department)
- To a moderate extent (including the team and department)
- To some extent (including the department)
- Not at all (information not provided)

6. To what extent does the commitment specify all government, civil society, multilateral or private sector partners?

- To a large extent (all partners are listed, including details of their involvement and responsibility)
- To a moderate extent (all partners are listed, but with no details of their involvement or responsibility)
- To some extent (some but not all partners listed)
- Not at all (information not provided)
- Not applicable

7. Which OGP open government core principle(s) does the commitment address?

[Tick any that apply]

- Transparency - information on government activities and decisions is open, comprehensive, timely, freely available to the public and meets basic open data standards (e.g. raw data, machine readability)
- Participation - governments seek to mobilize citizens to engage in public debate, provide input, and make contributions that lead to more responsive, innovative and effective governance.
- Accountability - there are rules, regulations and mechanisms in place that call upon government actors to justify their actions, act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and accept responsibility for failure to perform with respect to laws or commitments.
- Technology and Innovation: governments embrace the importance of providing citizens with open access to technology, the role of new technologies in driving innovation, and the importance of increasing the capacity of citizens to use technology.
- None

8. Which OGP grand challenge(s) does the commitment address? [Tick any that apply]

- Grand challenge 1: Improving public services
- Grand challenge 2: Increasing public integrity
- Grand challenge 3: More effectively managing public resources
- Grand challenge 4: Creating safer communities
- Grand challenge 5: Increasing corporate accountability
- None

9. To what extent do you consider the commitment to be sufficiently challenging?

Consider its degree of challenge politically (e.g. the degree to which it challenges existing political power), technically (e.g. the degree to which it is challenging to practically implement), and culturally (e.g. the degree to which it challenges existing institutional working practices).

- To a large extent (the commitment is very challenging)
- To a moderate extent (the commitment is moderately challenge)
- To some extent (the commitment is a little challenging)
- Not at all (the commitment is not at all challenging)
- Unrealistic (the commitment is not achievable)

In what ways do you feel the commitment is or is not sufficiently challenging?

10. If the commitment is related to a commitment from a previous NAP, do you consider it to be a significant improvement?

- To a large extent (the new commitment makes a significant improvement to the earlier commitment)
- To a moderate extent (the new commitment makes a moderate improvement to the earlier commitment)
- To some extent (the new commitment makes a small improvement to the earlier commitment)
- Not at all (the new commitment makes no improvement to the earlier commitment)
- Not applicable

In what ways do you consider the commitment to be an improvement or not?

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

3. EVALUATING THE NATIONAL ACTION PLAN AS A WHOLE

Please answer these questions for the plan as a whole.

1. To what extent does the action plan match open government priorities identified by civil society?

- To a large extent (the plan covers all of the priorities identified by civil society)
- To a moderate extent (the plan covers a majority of the priorities identified by civil society)
- To some extent (the plan covers some of the priorities identified by civil society)
- Not at all (the plan covers none of the priorities identified by civil society)

2. Which [open government topics](#) does the plan cover?

- Access to information
- Aid transparency
- Anti-corruption
- Asset disclosure
- Budget transparency
- Citizen participation
- Corporate accountability
- E-Government
- Legislative openness
- Media freedom
- Natural resources
- Open data
- Political financing
- Public procurement
- Public service delivery
- Rule of law
- Sub-national governance
- Whistleblowing

3. Which OGP grand challenges does the plan cover?

- Grand challenge 1: Improving public services
- Grand challenge 2: Increasing public integrity
- Grand challenge 3: More effectively managing public resources
- Grand challenge 4: Creating safer communities
- Grand challenge 5: Increasing corporate accountability

4. In your opinion, how would you judge the extent to which the government is sincere in its commitment to being an open government?

- To a large extent (the government is doing all of the right things)
- To a moderate extent (the government is struggling with some elements but moving in the right direction)
- To some extent (the government appears to be doing the bare minimum)
- Not at all (the government does not seem committed to abiding by the OGP's principles)

5. To what extent are the broader plans and activities of government consistent with the principles of open government and contents of the action plan?

- To a large extent (all government policies and practice is consistent with the principles of open government)
- To a moderate extent (the majority of government policies and practice is consistent with the principles of open government AND no policies or practice significantly contradict those principles)
- To some extent (the majority of government policies and practice is consistent with the principles of open government BUT some policies or practice significantly contradict those principles)
- Not at all (a significant amount of government policies and practice is inconsistent with the principles of open government)

Use this box for points of clarification on your answers in this section.

Please restrict to most critical and reference the specific questions you address by their number.

4. FURTHER COMMENTS

Please use this space to record any further comments on the quality and ambition of your country's National Action Plan.

