

# A GENERALISED CO-EVALUATION MODEL OF PUBLIC POLICIES

*Research full-length paper*

*Track 08 - User-driven innovation in the public and private sector: participation, engagement and coproduction*

Routzouni, Athanasia, University of the Aegean, Samos, Greece, nroutzouni@aegean.gr

Deligiannis, Athanasios, International Hellenic University, Thessaloniki, Greece,  
a.deligiannins@ihu.edu.gr

Gritzalis, Stefanos, University of the Aegean, Samos, Greece, sgritz@aegean.gr

## **Abstract**

*Formulating government policies involves a wide network of stakeholders and policymakers and numerous techniques and strategies. Moving from policy formulation to policy evaluation, a key challenge is to enable the effective involvement of this network in the evaluation activities that aim to examine the implementation and impact of a public policy. This paper studies the process of evaluating the quality of policy formulation and the effectiveness of its implementation introduced by the Open Government Partnership, a global open government initiative, and illustrates related aspects and challenges. Building on this study, the paper proposes a generalised open and inclusive evaluation model that may be applied for assessing the effectiveness of public policy development and implementation. Although based on the domain of open government, the proposed co-evaluation model may be of wide applicability to other public policy domains thus supporting the new role of government 'as a platform'.*

*Keywords: open government, co-evaluation, co-creation, public policy, innovation, OGP.*

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The participation principle in public policy evaluation

In its essence citizen participation is “a categorical term for citizen power”. It allows the redistribution of power towards those at any time excluded from political and economic processes (Arnstein, 1969). It can be defined broadly, as “*any activity, individual or collective, devoted to influencing the collective life of the polity*” (Alex-Assensoh, 2005). Today, considering research that points to a decline in trust of government (Nye, Zelikow, and King, 1997), civic engagement is seen as a necessary prerequisite and central component of vital democracies.

Public policy is defined here as the combination of basic decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold or influence government positions of authority (Gerston, 2014). A key dimension in this process is the interaction among those who demand change, those who make decisions, and those who are affected by the policy in question. The public policy cycle consists of four phases: initiation, formulation, implementation and evaluation (Ntalakou and Ladi, 2011). This cycle starts by setting an agenda based on an issue or previous decision and ends by handing over the implemented policy to an execution and enforcement layer.

Evaluation is an integral part of the public policy cycle. Consultation activities that may be applied at this phase are intended not only to obtain political support, but also to obtain feedback on the expected impact and effects. Besides various types of ‘in-process’ verification, there is also an evaluation activity in the policy process, which includes various types of ex-post evaluations of the implemented policy (Geurts, 2011). Including stakeholders and interested parties in the evaluation process can significantly enhance the effectiveness of the process. A key success factor of inclusive evaluation approaches is building the monitoring on information that stemmed from “basic facts drawn from the community’s own experience” (Williamson and Eisen, 2016). Participatory evaluation approaches may also be used as a tool to support the new role of government ‘as a platform’, towards the development and evolution of Government 3.0 (Routzouni and Gritzalis, 2018).

There are currently various evaluation approaches for stakeholder involvement. Collaborative evaluations aim to create an ongoing engagement between evaluators and stakeholders and build on a full-scale collaboration with specific stakeholders in every stage of the evaluation. This approach gives emphasis on broader data collection and analysis, and on producing results that stakeholders understand and use. (Rodríguez-Campos and O’Sullivan, 2010). Participatory evaluations are usually jointly designed and implemented by an evaluator and relevant actors. In such processes, the evaluator has the control of the process and the participants are involved in designing the process, developing instruments, collecting and analysing data, reporting and disseminating the evaluation results (Cousins, Whitmore, and Shulha, 2013). In empowerment evaluations the relevant actors and community members have the control of the evaluation while the evaluator supports the process to ensure that it will be kept on track, relevant and responsive (Fetterman and Wandersman, 2010).

Among these approaches, consistent aspects are the high appreciation for stakeholder involvement in evaluation and the usefulness of the evaluation results. A comparison of the different evaluation approaches across twelve core evaluation aspects (O’Sullivan, 2012) indicates that the level of stakeholder participation in planning and implementing evaluations varies. Some participatory evaluation approaches limit the involvement of the stakeholders to the role of data interpreters, while others promote the active engagement of the stakeholders in evaluation implementation, such as instrument developers, data collectors, and data analysers.

## 1.2 The evaluation process used by the Open Government Partnership

Open and participative governance is becoming a significant policy priority in the effort to modernize and reform public administration at a global level. Open government initiatives aim at providing a setting where citizens and public administration can gather information, evaluate and discuss existing content or develop new ideas, concepts, and best practices (Lee, Hwang, and Choi, 2012). One of the most important initiatives to support the global open government movement is the Open Government Partnership (OGP), a multi-stakeholder platform launched in 2011. By 2019, over 75 participating countries have joined OGP thus committing to making their governments more inclusive, responsive and accountable (Frey, 2014). Every two years, each OGP-participating country develops a National Action Plan (NAP) which reflects the open government policy and the relevant initiatives of the country. A NAP is required to be the product of a co-creation effort. Governments work together with civil society organisations to develop concrete, time-bound and measurable open government commitments (OGP Support Unit, 2017).

OGP's Participation and Co-creation Standards (OGP, 2017) identify a set of requirements for engaging civil society, citizens, and other stakeholders and interested parties throughout the OGP process. Standards are also provided to the governments in relation to the development process, the structure and the content to be included in the self-assessment reports (Routzouni et al, 2019). Requirements and standards mainly cover the following three areas:

- **Feedback mechanisms.** A key requirement for the engagement of the public, civil society and other relevant stakeholders in the self-assessment of the NAP is to provide them with timely information about the process and give feedback on how their inputs are taken into consideration in the process.
- **Space for co-creation.** Governments need to provide adequate and effective spaces for dialogue and co-creation activities to facilitate an inclusive dialogue on the assessment of the NAP. Along with ensuring an open and inclusive collaboration environment, governments need to launch a public consultation period for a period of at least two weeks during the development of the Self-Assessment Report.
- **Facilitation of a multi-stakeholder Forum.** A key requirement of the Participation and Co-creation Standards is the formulation of a multi-stakeholder forum with a role to oversee and actively participate in all steps of the OGP process. This forum is considered a key actor that may secure a wider ownership of the OGP co-creation process and the NAP.

OGP evaluation outputs include progress reports produced by independent researchers and self-assessment reports produced by the participating governments. The OGP assessment process may be considered an “empowerment evaluation”. Although evaluations are conducted within the constraints and requirements set out by OGP, participants determine what is the best approach to meet the objectives and requirements that have been set.

In an OECD survey, which collected information on the approaches followed by 53 countries for evaluating open government initiatives, the majority (69%) confirmed that evaluation takes place through the normal evaluation activities of individual institutions (OECD, 2016). In addition, several OGP member countries did not consider the OGP assessments as an evaluation mechanism. Many countries follow various alternative mechanisms. For example, about one-third of the countries carry out citizen and stakeholder surveys and a similar number of countries rely upon independent assessments conducted by non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

### 1.3 Aims and research questions

Current practice, as illustrated above, indicates the lack of broader participatory evaluation models that may be applied at national level to assess the effectiveness of public policy development and implementation.

Recognizing that the process of developing an OGP NAP involves a wide network of stakeholders and policymakers, the paper aims to illustrate the continuous involvement of this network in the evaluation of the NAP quality and the effectiveness of its implementation. The paper also tries to delineate the main procedures of the OGP collaborative evaluation process. The purpose of this analysis is to arrive at defining key characteristics, parameters and priorities of the OGP collaborative evaluation process.

Based on this examination, the paper, ultimately, proposes a generalised open and inclusive model that may be used for evaluating the effectiveness of public policy development and implementation. The proposed co-evaluation model could also be considered as a widely applicable participatory tool in a broader range of public policy domains.

## 2 Methodology

The main OGP collaborative evaluation procedures were captured by recourse to procedures manuals, standards and guidelines documents published by the Partnership, as well as independent research, policy papers and strategy documents. Evaluation data on individual NAP commitments and additional statistical information were derived via the OGP Explorer database which provides access to complete dataset that OGP has collected from the NAP cycle process since 2011.

Two main sources were used to examine the collaborative process: (i) the independent auditing which is performed by the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) of OGP and, (ii) the self-reporting of OGP-participating countries on their reforms and action plan progress. The involvement of policy owners, relevant stakeholders and interested parties in the process was recorded. This analysis also aims to define the key characteristics of these processes to provide new insights into the collaborative and participatory evaluation of public policies. The results of this analysis are used as the basis for formulating a collaborative evaluation model that may be applied during the examination of public policies.

## 3 The two-pronged OGP NAP evaluation process

The OGP evaluation process is comprised of two separate activities; (i) progress reports that are produced by country local researchers working for the Independent Reporting Mechanism of the OGP and (ii) self-assessment reports produced by the participating governments.

OGP-participating countries work in a two-year National Action Plan (NAP) calendar cycle. The cycle, based on specific standards that are provided by OGP (OGP, 2017), includes developing, implementing, monitoring and reporting on a National Action Plan. A key challenge in the OGP process is to enable participation of government officials, civil society and any interested parties. The Partnership also aims to provide the mechanism and technology tools that enable all parties to actively participate in all steps of the two-year action plan cycle. Such mechanisms include the establishment of processes for proposing national commitments, agreeing on the commitments to be included in the NAP and participating in the evaluation of the NAPs.

### 3.1 OGP Independent Reporting Mechanism evaluation

The primary tool in evaluating OGP Action Plans implementation are the two reports produced by the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) of OGP for each two-year action plan cycle, one at mid-point and one on cycle completion. The progress reports present the results of assessing governments on the development and implementation of OGP action plans. They also report on their progress in

fulfilling open government principles and make technical recommendations for improvements (OGP, 2017). Reviewing the government progress is based on a consultative process with government, civil society, and the private sector.

The first progress report is produced at the end of the first year of implementation (IRM progress report) and aims to assess governments on the development and implementation of OGP action plans and progress in fulfilling open government principles and make technical recommendations for improvements. The second progress report is produced at the end of the two-year implementation cycle (IRM end of term report). The end of term report assesses completion at the end of the action plan cycle as well as any changes to government openness during the implementation period.

Apart from the annual independent progress reports, the IRM also releases, in open formats, the underlying data for those reports (OGP, Explorer and IRM data) and technical papers, analyses, and syntheses of any cross-cutting themes and findings. (OGP IRM, 2014).

In order to maintain its status as an independent institution, the IRM reports to different institutions and individuals (Figure 1) for the different elements of its mandate (OGP, 2017).




Figure 1. IRM team structure and cross-functional operation (source: Blomeyer and Sanz, 2017).

### 3.1.1 Key valuable characteristics of the OGP IRM reporting process

IRM reports are intended to stimulate dialogue and promote accountability between member governments and citizens. According to the independent mid-term review which aimed to evaluate the performance of OGP during the first two years of its four-year strategy (University of Southern California, Development Portfolio Management Group - DPMG, 2016), 70% of respondents felt that IRM reviews helped make the current NAP better and directly influenced the next NAP.

A key characteristic of the IRM reports is that they are informed by consultations with a wide range of different stakeholders. Successful participatory policymaking approaches are considered those that manage to involve a large number of citizens and to transmit a strong voice to the political authorities (Smith, 2009). In OGP, the evaluation process records reflective learning for stakeholder empowerment and facilitates a public dialogue on the evaluation findings by governments and civil society. IRM researchers listen to as many people as possible, and make an overall assessment based on these views, information provided by governments (including self-assessment reports), and the expertise of the IEP (Blomeyer and Sanz, 2017). IRM also provides for review and input of assessment findings by

members of civil society before and after publication. The interaction between the IRM unit, IEP and other internal stakeholders of OGP, as well as the interaction with external actors (i.e. Governments and CSOs), is considered critical to advance longer-term impacts in the open government agenda (OGP, Strategic Refresh of the OGP, 2016). In addition, effectively communicating the results of the evaluation is considered an important factor to maintaining the momentum of government reforms and the confidence of the wider public in them (OECD, 2016).

At its core, the IRM is focused on ensuring that countries develop strong commitments in accordance with OGP principles, and deliver on them (OGP, IRM Procedures Manual, 2017). The IRM does not rank countries nor may IRM findings be used as conditional requirements for aid. OGP is not assessing countries against any universal set of standards on open government. This makes it different than other broad assessments of governance like the African Peer Review Mechanism (Kanbur, 2004) or the OECD's Government at a Glance (OECD, 2017). Government Points of Contact (PoC) have also a role in the IRM evaluation process as they need to provide active support to IRM researchers, provide documentation and ensure access to Government stakeholders.

### 3.1.2 Main IRM evaluation steps

The main steps of the IRM process (OGP, IRM Procedures Manual, 2017) are summarized below:

- **Actions before assessment.** IRM hires public policy experts in the governance field through an open process and provides any necessary training.
- **Report preparation.** IRM researchers then review, complete, and return a research plan template produced by IRM staff. Once the research plan is agreed, the IRM researcher reviews the documentation pertinent to the action plan to be evaluated (government's self-assessment report, official websites, news articles, and where they exist, third party reports, studies or research on policy or thematic areas related to commitments in action plan). The IRM researcher then interviews the government officers that are responsible for the implementation of each commitment and the official OGP government Point of Contact (PoC) in the country (OGP Support Unit, 2017). In addition, each IRM researcher carries out stakeholder meetings at the national level. IRM researchers may also conduct a survey to reach a broader audience.
- **Quality control.** The IRM staff tracks and manages the quality for the research at the national level, the methodology followed, and the drafting of the individual progress reports for each OGP participating country according to the relevant standards and guidelines. Quality control also aims to ensure that each national researcher provides adequate evidence for the extent to which country commitments reflect the OGP values and the implementation of commitments matches the identified milestones.
- **Pre-publication review.** Each OGP-participating government and three or four civil society organizations are invited to review a draft form of the IRM reports before they are put out for broader comment. For a period of three weeks, the government and civil society organisations are given the opportunity to identify possible factual errors in their country report.
- **Responding to pre-publication comments.** The IRM evaluates all comments collected during the pre-publication period based on a standard approach. The comments that are gathered from the governments or the civil society organisations fall into one of three categories: Green light (the relevant input will be added in the report); Yellow light (the provided information will be considered and if there is enough evidence will be applied in the report); Red light (the comment will not be considered for modifying the report).
- **Public comment.** For a period of two weeks, OGP publishes the report on the OGP website for broader public comment. At this stage, governments may also provide formal responses and further comments. All the received comments are organised, collated and published except for those con-

taining abusive or off-topic content or where the requester asks to be anonymous. Comments made in this period are published in the final version of the report.

### 3.2 Country Self-Assessment Reports

As part of the OGP evaluation process, governments need also to complete two self-assessment reports for each action plan: one after the first year of implementation, and one upon completion of the two-year cycle. The first year self-assessment focuses on the NAP drafting process, while the second year assesses the implementation of the NAP (OGP, 2017). The two self-assessment reports differ primarily in the time period covered and complement each other. The midterm self-assessment mainly covers the development of the NAP, the consultation process, the relevance and ambitiousness of the commitments, and progress to date. The end-of-term self-assessment focuses on the results of the reforms completed in the NAP, the consultation during implementation, and the lessons learnt. The reports also present the government's approach to ensure participation throughout the OGP cycle, describe the national and local context, discuss the relevant challenges and lessons learnt, and explain how the key recommendations from the latest OGP evaluation report were used in the current NAP cycle.

A review of country practices concerning the publication of their self-assessment process is presented in Table 1. The analysis is based on the OGP online data analysis tool which provides access to the OGP information on the commitments and the NAP cycle processes (OGP Explorer and IRM Data).

According to the information provided by the IRM, for the 56 countries that have submitted reports in 2013 or 2014, 70% (39 countries) have submitted an annual self-assessment report but only 45% of countries have done so on time. Half of them (28 countries) have provided a two-week public comment period with the relevant stakeholders and 59% (33 countries) describe in their self-assessment report the consultation process they followed.

	Yes	No	N/A <sup>1</sup>	NR <sup>2</sup>
Is an annual progress report published?	70%	18%		12%
Is the self-assessment report published according to schedule?	45%	25%	18%	12%
Is a two-week public comment period provided?	50%	20%	18%	12%
Does the self-assessment report review of consultation efforts? Governments should describe the consultation or comment period for the self-assessment and the way in which the comments were included into the report.	59%	11%	18%	12%

Table 1. *Compliance with self-assessment reports standards for NAPs submitted in 2013 or 2014 (56 countries).*

The self-assessment reports should enable OGP stakeholders to better understand the perspective of each government on the OGP process and principles. These reports also aim to provide a clear view of the progress and results achieved during the assessed period. They are also used by OGP to evaluate the development process of a NAP but also the effectiveness of its implementation. However, a recommendation in a recent review of the OGP evaluation process (Blomeyer Sanz, 2017), considers

<sup>1</sup> There was no self-assessment published and no data is available.

<sup>2</sup> Not reviewed because the IRM report that codes for this data is not yet available.

phasing out government self-assessment reporting. According to the recommendation, information included in the self-assessment reports could be retrieved: by online document depositories used by governments. It has also been recommended that the OGP Articles of Governance could include a provision to ensure access of IRM researchers as observers to consultation during the development and implementation of NAPs.

### **3.3 Key characteristics of the OGP evaluation process:**

The key aspects of the OGP evaluation process presented above can be outlined as follows:

- There is a concerted effort to involve a wide spectrum of stakeholders and participants (civil society organisations, government officials, policy owners, citizens) in policy formulation efforts.
- The process combines self-assessment and independent evaluation activities.
- All actors in the process have clear roles.
- All actors perform well documented activities according to a pre-defined plan of action which is publicly available.
- The evaluation is based on pre-defined criteria while also considering recommendations provided during a previous public policy cycle.
- All parts of the policy cycle – initial proposals, formulation, implementation and evaluation – are open and transparent to all stakeholders and subject to collaborative evaluation.
- Evaluation results are made publicly available.
- All stakeholders are involved as soon as possible in the policy development cycle and are contacted often.
- The wider public is involved in commenting before the finalization of the evaluation process.
- Permanent governance and participation structures, such as a self-governing multi-stakeholder forum, are a requirement of the policy creation and evaluation cycle.
- Quality control is carried out for the main process outputs.
- The results of the evaluation are actively communicated to stakeholders and the wider public.

## **4 Towards a Public Policy Co-Evaluation Model**

Recognising that evaluation is a key means to elaborate sound and robust public policies, the paper introduces a generalised collaborative evaluation model (Figure 2) to support the involvement of the multi stakeholder and interested parties in the evaluation of public policies. The proposed Public Policy Co-Evaluation (PPCoEval) model is based on the key characteristics of the OGP evaluation process outlined above. The model re-uses and combines certain roles, components, methods and techniques of the analysed OGP process, and introduces a concrete set of actions for the collaborative evaluation of public policies.

A main actor in the process is the body responsible for the evaluation, the Evaluation Body. The Evaluation Body is providing the key principles, objectives and rules for the overall process, monitors its effective implementation and validates the main outputs of the various steps in order to ensure the highest quality of the evaluation results.






Figure 2. The Public Policy Co-Evaluation Model (PPCoEval).

#### 4.1 Preparation: Specification of Actors, Indicators and key Activities

The first activity is to identify the actors that may be engaged in the collaborative evaluation process. Key actors in the policy cycle (Ntalakou and Ladi, 2011) are the policy owners, a group that may include the policymakers in the government agencies and the Congress or Parliament but also other government officials that are responsible for the formulation, implementation and monitoring of a public policy. Other actors are civic society stakeholders that may represent CSOs, political parties, interest groups and pressure groups. Key actors may also be CSOs and individuals that have been involved in the formulation or the implementation of the evaluated public policy.

An Independent Evaluator who is familiar with the public policy agenda is involved in the process to coordinate the evaluation activities, perform desk-research, analyse the information collected and produce the evaluation report. More than one Independent Evaluators can be assigned to the evaluation if needed. The Independent Evaluator collects policy documents and other reference materials related to the public policy under evaluation.

During the preparation phase, the Independent Evaluator identifies robust and comparable indicators for the evaluation according to the objectives and expected results of the policy under evaluation. The Independent Evaluator drafts a clear and concrete plan of action which, along with the list of core indicators, is presented to the Evaluation Body in order to agree on the exact plan of actions and on the structure of the reports to be produced. A brief presentation of the evaluation plan gets published and shared with stakeholders and interested parties.

#### 4.2 Self-Assessment: Development of a Self-Assessment Report

The policy owners produce a self-assessment report which presents the public policy formulation process and elaborates on the effectiveness of the public policy implementation within the relevant timeframe. The report has a pre-defined structure and is based on pre-defined criteria. The policy owners have the opportunity to describe the policy formulation and implementation process and present the main results achieved along with the impact of the results with respect to the policy objectives. The report also includes a section which maps the core indicators with key public policy implementation activities and results.

In case there are relevant recommendations issued during a previous public policy cycle, the self-assessment report presents how these recommendations have been taken into account during the current cycle. The report also elaborates on the relevant country context, present conditions, problems, lessons learned and the next steps with regard to the public policy agenda. The self-assessment report is officially submitted to the Evaluation Body according to the time plan and gets published and shared with all stakeholders and interested parties.

#### **4.3 Mutli-Stakeholder Assessment: Implementation of collaborative evaluation activities**

There is a wide variety of processes that may assist the involvement of the relevant stakeholders and interested parties in these activities. These can be distinguished between participatory and deliberative processes. Participatory methods aim to activate citizens and civil society actors in order to influence the evaluation process and directly contribute to the outcome. Deliberative processes aim to create public spaces of dialogue between different viewpoints and ideas in order to enable decision making in a constructive and consensual way and take into consideration all the viewpoints on the policy under evaluation (Steiner, 2012).

Effective methods for applying the collaborative evaluation approach may include expert interviews; focus groups; roundtable workshops; surveys among public officials; deliberative surveys among citizens and stakeholders; interviews with domain specific NGOs or private organizations; use of strategic roadmaps with focus on the key policy objectives; social network analysis (Gene and Frewer, 2005; Routzouni et al, 2019). Various techniques may be combined and adapted to suit the local context and the specific objectives and expected results of each public policy.

Maximizing the involvement of all relevant stakeholders and interested parties in the evaluation is a key challenge for the effectiveness of the collaborative evaluation model. Furthermore, establishing a domain-specific Permanent Multi-Stakeholder Forum is considered an effective means for engaging the domain-specific community in all phases of the public policy cycle.

The Independent Evaluator organizes a set of collaborative and inclusive activities for the evaluation of the public policy according to the plan of action. Once these activities are completed, the Independent Evaluator synthesizes all collected information, and produces a first version of the evaluation report. The Individual Evaluator may take into consideration relevant independent assessments being conducted by NGOs, private companies and other organisations that are active in the policy domain. The Independent Evaluator also studies the self-assessment report and incorporates the key points in the draft Co-Evaluation Report.

#### **4.4 Pre-publication review: Internal review of the draft Co-Evaluation Report and quality control**

The draft Co-Evaluation Report is submitted to the Evaluation Body. The Evaluation body performs a quality control procedure and provides the Independent Observer with comments and suggestions for the improvement of the report.

Before the Co-Evaluation Report is put out for broader comment, the policy owners and a few key stakeholders from the SC are invited to review the report in draft form. The government and civil society are given an opportunity to identify possible factual errors in the report. The Independent Evaluator takes into account any pre-publication comments and finalizes the draft report for publication.

#### **4.5 Public consultation: Public commenting on the Co-Evaluation Report**

The Evaluation body publishes the Co-Evaluation Report on a website (or an appropriate online deliberation tool) for broader public comment including formal responses by the public policy owner. Comments received are collated and published, except where the requester asks to be anonymous or the comments contain abusive or off-topic language.

The types of stakeholders that may be engaged in the public consultation include citizens, CSOs, private sector, academics, government departments representatives, subnational government representatives, journalists, interest groups, political parties and the Congress or Parliament. Public participation may also include the use of physical meetings, the submission of an official letter with comments and suggestions, access to online deliberation platforms and other public consultation methods according to the local context and the specificities of the public policy.

#### **4.6 Co-evaluation report launch: Publicity of the collaborative evaluation results**

The Independent Evaluator finalizes the Co-Evaluation Report and submits it to the Evaluation Board for the final quality control before it is put out to the public. The final report includes a brief description of the collaborative evaluation process and presents the profile of the actors that are involved in each step. Comments made in the later public consultation period are published as an Appendix in the final version of the Co-Evaluation Report. Actively communicating the results of the evaluation with the involved stakeholders and the wider public is crucial to maintaining the momentum of the new public policy and people's confidence in the reform it brings with it (OECD, 2016).

### **5 Conclusions and recommendations for future work**

The OGP process is considered an effective mechanism for consultation, involvement, active engagement and empowerment (Francoli, Ostling, and Steibel, 2015). For each OGP-participating country, a collaborative evaluation process is applied to assess the process of developing the NAP and the effectiveness of its implementation.

The key characteristics of the OGP evaluation approach are used as template for the proposed evaluation model, PPCoEval, in an effort to enable an inclusive approach for the effective engagement of relevant stakeholders and interested parties in public policy evaluation processes. The PPCoEval model can be applied as a standalone process for evaluating a public policy or in parallel with existing evaluation approaches, as a complementary activity. Using a collaborative evaluation model in existing evaluation approaches can add an inclusive dimension which may highlight aspects and facts that can only be indicated by the public policy relevant actors and other stakeholders. Introducing an open and inclusive evaluation model can be a means to promote accountability and create an environment of trust between the policymakers and the wider public.

A limiting factor of the proposed approach is that the resulting collaborative evaluation model is mainly based on the evaluation process used by OGP. Further analysis of a broader range of inclusive evaluation processes could provide more insights thus enhancing the proposed model.

Further work could focus on studying and assessing additional evaluation approaches that evidently include an open and inclusive aspect with a view to further enhance the proposed evaluation model. It could also examine and suggest how the proposed model can be incorporated in existing evaluation processes to embed the inclusiveness principle in those processes and focus on defining in more detail specific methods and tools that can be applied in practice under at each step of the PPCoEval model.

## References

- Alex-Assensoh, Y. M. (2005). *Democracy at risk: How political choices undermine citizen participation and what we can do about it*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). "A ladder of citizen participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35, 215-224.
- Blomeyer and Sanz (2017). *IRM Review Report*. URL: [https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/IRM-Review-Final-Report\\_Blomeyer-Sanz\\_20171212.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/IRM-Review-Final-Report_Blomeyer-Sanz_20171212.pdf)
- Cousins, J. B., Whitmore, E., and L. Shulha (2013). "Arguments for a common set of principles for collaborative inquiry in evaluation." *American Journal of Evaluation* 34(1), 7-22.
- Development Portfolio Management Group (DPMG) (2017). *OGP Mid-Term Review*, University of Southern California. URL: [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP\\_MTR-Report\\_Final-Jan26-2016.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP_MTR-Report_Final-Jan26-2016.pdf)
- Fetterman, D. M., and A. Wandersman (2010). "Empowerment evaluation essentials: Highlighting the essential features of empowerment evaluation". In: *American Evaluation Association Conference*. San Antonio: Texas.
- Francoli, M., Ostling, A., and F. Steibel (2015). *From informing to empowering: Best practices and recommendations for improving government-civil society interactions within OGP*. Hivos People Unlimited.
- Frey, L. (2014). Open government partnership four-year strategy 2015–2018.
- Gerston, L. N. (2014). *Public policy making: Process and principles*. Routledge.
- Geurts, T. (2014). *Public policy making: The 21st century perspective*. Apeldoorn: Be informed.
- IAP2. (2007). *Core Values of Public Participation, International Association for Public Participation IAP2*.
- Kanbur, R. (2004). "The African peer review mechanism (APRM): an assessment of concept and design." *Politikon* 31(2), 157-166.
- Lee, S. M., Hwang, T., and D. Choi (2012). "Open innovation in the public sector of leading countries." *Management decision* 50(1), 147-162.
- Ntalakou, V. and S. Ladi (2011). *Public Policy Analysis*, Athens: Papazisi.
- Nye, J. S., Zelikow, P., and D.C. King (Eds.). (1997). *Why people don't trust government*. Harvard University Press.
- O'Sullivan, R. G. (2012). "Collaborative evaluation within a framework of stakeholder-oriented evaluation approaches." *Evaluation and program planning* 35(4), 518-522.
- OECD. (2016). *Open Government. The global context and the way forward*. Paris.
- OECD. (2017). *Government at a Glance*. URL: <http://www.oecd.org/gov/govataglance.htm>
- OGP. (2016). *Strategic Refresh of the OGP*. URL: [http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP\\_Strategic-Refresh\\_Dec2016.pdf](http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP_Strategic-Refresh_Dec2016.pdf)
- OGP. (2017). *IRM Procedures Manual*. URL: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>
- OGP. (2017). *OGP Co-creation Standards*. URL: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards>
- OGP. (2018). *Public List of IRM Researchers*. URL: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qmiRxWpbuqOR4WYwJZiVMDl-mTI6eEh-0FozbOjC-BE/edit#gid=0>
- OGP. (n.d.). *About the IRM*. URL: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism/about-irm>
- OGP. (n.d.). *Explorer and IRM data*. URL: <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism/ogp-explorer-and-irm-data>
- OGP Explorer and IRM Data. (n.d.). *Process Data Table View - Evaluation of country performance on their OGP process*. URL: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer/all-data.html>

- OGP IRM. (2014). *Technical Paper 1 examining key findings of the first two years of OGP action plans*. URL: [https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Technical%20paper%201\\_final\\_0.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Technical%20paper%201_final_0.pdf).
- OGP. (n.d.). *IRM Frequently Asked Questions*. URL: [https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/ogp\\_irm\\_04FAQs.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/ogp_irm_04FAQs.pdf)
- OGP. (n.d.). *Public List of IRM Researchers*. URL: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1qmiRxWpbuqOR4WYwJZIVMDI-mTI6eEh-0FozbOjC-BE/edit#gid=0>
- OGP Support Unit. (2017). *Points Of Contact Manual*. URL: [https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP\\_POC-Manual\\_2017\\_EN.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP_POC-Manual_2017_EN.pdf).
- Rodríguez-Campos, L. and R. O’Sullivan (2010). *Collaborative evaluation essentials: Highlighting the essential features of collaborative evaluation*. American Evaluation Association Conference, San Antonio, Texas.
- Routzouni, A., and S. Gritzalis (2018). *The civil society as and innovation partner in public policy making: co-creating the Greek national action plan on open government*. In: Mediterranean Conference on Information Systems (MCIS).
- Routzouni, A., Deligiannis, A. P., Peristeras, V., and S. Gritzalis (2019). An Intercountry Survey of Participatory Practices Used for Open Government Partnership National Action Plan Development. In *International Conference on Electronic Government* (pp. 82-93). Springer, Cham.
- Rowe, G., and L.J. Frewer (2005). “A typology of public engagement mechanisms.” *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 30(2), 251-290.
- Steiner, J. (2012). *The foundations of deliberative democracy: Empirical research and normative implications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, V., and N. Eisen (2016). *The impact of open government: assessing the evidence*. Brookings.
- Wilson, C. (2017). “Look Who’s Talking: Assessing Civic Voice and Interaction in OGP Commitments.” *JeDEM-eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government* 9(1), 4-30.