Toward Open Government
Partnership in Eastern Partnership
countries and Russia



Strengthening capacities of the EaP CSOs in using OGP as a tool for fight against corruption

The projects are implemented in the following countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine

What do we expect from the Open Government?

Analysis of the results of the Open Government Partnership Initiative in the Eastern Partnership Countries and Russia (first year of implementation)

Oleksii Khmara Transparency International Ukraine

Ivan Presniakov
Ukrainian Institute for Public Policy







The main point of the project

 Participating countries: Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine

Our focus:

- analysis of OGP national experience: coordination of the interested parties, the content of the plans and their implementation
- searching for common ground: what do the governments expect of the process? What do the donors and civil society expect?
- general agenda development for OGP advance





General conclusions

- Differences are more than substantial:
- different stages of the initiative implementation
- differences in the governments' desire to fulfill the plans
- focal point differences: new technologies of transparency vs.the effort to implement its basic principals
- difference in the existing resources
- NGOs role: spurring into action vs. cooperation





Countries profile

- "Champion countries" Georgia and Moldova
- the plans are approved and being implemented
- basic principles of government transparency and accountability have been already implemented
- •focus on the new transparency technologies and E-governance: data disclosure, on-line services
- will and resources for the plan implementation

- "Tardy countries" Azerbaijan, Armenia Russia, Ukraine
- Initial stage of implementation:
 the plan "has just been adopted"
 (Azerbaijan), "is going to start to be
 implemented" (Armenia); the coordinating
 body "is going to be assembled" (Ukraine)
- The political will is doubtful: the initiatives being taken at odd times contradict the principles of transparency and the plan essence
- Poor focus: basic transparency principals + E-governance
- The issue of resources has not been settled
- NGOs: initiators and "goads" of the process





The projects are supported by UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic

"Champion countries": common problems

- creating the demand for new government transparency technologies within society
- involvement of the wide groups of civil society in the plan discussion and implementation
- civil society participation: 2 3 active organizations
- consultations could have been more transparent and coordination with NGOs more effective





"Tardy countries": problems expected

- Low speed of the plans implementation
- Political turbulence and the lack of financial resources
- Ineffective communication and coordination with the NGOs involved
- Receding from OGP principles in the daily practice of respective governments
- Limited involvement of the civil society in the OGP subject





Governments needs

"Champions":

- resources for technical projects implementation
- NGOs should be more active

Countries	Political will	The civil society agenda	Platform for government and NGOs permanent communicon
Azerbaijan	Moderate	No	No
Armenia	Low	No	No
Georgia	High	Yes	Yes
Moldova	High	No	Yes
Russia	Low	No	No
Ukraine	Moderate	Yes	Yes

 "Tardy": the needs are not recognized or articulated. Especially when implementing basic transparency principles





Searching of common decisions: key issues

- What should the civil society work on? What kind of common initiatives should we expect? In what aspects should they consider peculiarities of each country?
- How and where can donors help? By resources or influence? To the civil society or governments? In what proportions?
- What do we expect from the process in the region? What is realistic for implementation? How successful can it be?



