

Dear Amy and Larry,

Thank you so much for sharing the action plan draft. I have to say I love the overall spirit/philosophy behind the action plan and the commitments, and the way in which you have linked what you heard through the consultations to the commitments. That's quite a unique approach and for sure I will be recommending this to other countries going forward. I also can also see that the IRM recommendations from the previous NAP have informed elements of this new plan. So first off, congratulations to the team for all the effort that's gone into this work.

A few overarching comments/questions below, and more in the attached document for each section and commitment. Please let me know if anything needs further clarification.

- We'd suggest having a clearer specification of the problem each commitment aims to address up front. This is covered to some degree and can be inferred from the status quo/ambition sections but would be good to be clearly lay out "what am I trying to solve" --> "how does the commitment set out to solve it?" which is not always clear from the ambition/status quo. Similarly it would be good to review to what extent the milestones correspond with the ambition and if some can be reframed or stretched further to make the links stronger
- We'd recommend staggering start and end dates so activities build on each other where relevant. Currently a number of commitments just have 2018 and 2020 as start/end dates which will make mid-term progress hard to assess. Similarly suggest specifying months for both start and end dates
- For commitments which have a public engagement component, it would be good to specify what form the engagement might take, and whether inputs will be published so it's easier to later determine to what extent those inputs informed the final policy outcomes.
- A number of the commitments have milestones that are about 'exploring', 'promoting' or 'engaging'. It would be good to review to see if there is an element of verifiability that can be built in. In other words how will you recognise and assess progress and success for these commitments?

Please note our standard caveat for reviews at this stage: This review identifies high-level areas of improvement to make commitments more Specific, Measurable, Answerable, Relevant, Time-bound and results oriented based on guidelines prepared by the Support Unit . This review is not an endorsement of the scope or ambition of open government reforms contained in the action plan, which will be separately assessed by the IRM. This review is not intended to complement or replace the IRM assessment, which is a completely independent process.

Happy to schedule a call to discuss further or answer any questions you may have over email.

Good luck with finalizing the plan!

Best wishes,

Shreya