Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): Indonesia Design Report 2018–2020

Ravio Patra, Independent Researcher

Table of Contents

Open
Government
Partnership

Executive Summary: Indonesia

Indonesia's fifth action plan included a range of commitments that aimed to open government in a variety of sectors, with particular focus on information disclosure and data governance. The plan also included five commitments under the open parliament initiative. The collaborative action plan development process, led by civil society, yielded two commitments of nineteen with transformative potential impact. Future action plan development could benefit from clearer definition of the role of the multistakeholder forum, more frequent meetings of the forum, and stronger communication and outreach to ensure that the development process is open to all stakeholders.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Indonesia joined OGP as a Founding Member in 2011. Since, Indonesia has implemented five action plans. This report evaluates the design of Indonesia's fifth action plan.

General overview of action plan

The Open Government Indonesia (OGI) National Secretariat is the coordinating agency for OGP activities Indonesia. The Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas) leads coordination with OGI and mandates a multi-stakeholder forum comprising representatives from both government and civil society stakeholders to oversee the action plan development.

Development of Indonesia's fifth action plan began in May 2018 with a joint workshop to inform stakeholders of the process and gather feedback on the stages of development. OGI published all relevant information pertaining to the development of the action plan on a repository hosted on ogi.bappenas.go.id.

Table 1. At a glance
Participating since: 2011
Action plan under review: 2018–2020
Report type: Design
Number of commitments: 19

Action plan development

Is there a Multi-stakeholder forum: Yes
Level of public influence: Collaborate
Acted contrary to OGP process: No

Action plan design

Commitments relevant to OGP values: 19 (100%)
Transformative commitments: 2 (11%)
Potentially starred: 2 (11%)

Action plan implementation

Starred commitments: *N/A*
Completed commitments: *N/A*
Commitments with Major DIOG*: *N/A*
Commitments with Outstanding DIOG*: *N/A*

DIOG: Did it Open Government?

Collaborative working groups with government and civil society members drafted commitments within different themes for inclusion in the action plan. Consultation process was centralized in Jakarta with minimum participation from subnational governments and other local stakeholders. A series of bilateral meetings involving government, civil society, and other stakeholders helped

shape the commitments included in the action plan. However, beyond the early stage of action plan development, the multi-stakeholder forum was absent from the remainder of the process.

In December 2018, Indonesia submitted its fifth action plan with a total of 19 commitments, 5 of which are part of the open parliament initiative. These open parliament commitments were developed through an entirely separate process led by the House of Representatives (DPR) and the Indonesian Parliamentary Center (IPC), a civil society organization. Data governance and disclosure continued to be the major themes incorporated throughout the action plan, but the much-needed Presidential Regulation on One Data Indonesia had remained unsigned and stuck in a bureaucratic and political limbo.

Table 2. Noteworthy commitments

Commitment description	Moving forward	Status at the end of implementation cycle
1. Improvement in Data Management and Compliance of Extractive, Forestry, and Plantation Sectors Expand the use of the Beneficial Ownership database, including the registration of beneficial ownership in the extractive, forestry, and plantation sectors.	The government could establish a clear mechanism for intragovernmental coordination in the implementation of the registry and ensure strong collaboration with civil society to advance to an open registry after the initial stages of implementation.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of action plan cycle.*
10. Quality Improvement on Public Service Complaints Resolution through LAPOR!-SP4N Integrate additional government institutions, increase complaint response rates, and enhance compliance with standards through LAPOR!-SP4N.	The government could engage the Information Commission to ensure transparency of the complaints management process; establish standard guidelines for government institutions to respond to public complaints; and raise awareness among the public to encourage greater use of the system and monitoring of public service delivery.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of action plan cycle.*

Recommendations

The IRM recommendations aim to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan.

Table 3. Five key IRM recommendations

Strengthen the multistakeholder forum through a comprehensive government decree.
Establish a clear intragovernmental mechanism for coordination throughout action plan development, implementation, and evaluation processes.
Facilitate participation of local government and civil society stakeholders.
Include commitments responding to shrinking civic space and public disinformation in the next action plan.
Accelerate the implementation of the Presidential Regulation on One Data Indonesia across all policy sectors.

About the Author

Ravio Patra is an independent researcher based in Jakarta, Indonesia who works in human rights and legislation advocacy.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.

Open
Government
Partnership

I. Introduction

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. Action plan commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their own progress and determine if actions have made an impact on people's lives.

Indonesia joined OGP in 2011. This report covers the development and design of Indonesia's fifth action plan for 2018–2020.

The Independent Reporting Mechanism of OGP has partnered with Ravio Patra, an independent researcher, who carried out this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of the IRM's methodology please visit opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism.

II. Open Government Context in Indonesia

Indonesia submitted its fifth OGP action plan ahead of the 2019 election season.[1] The House of Representatives took a major step by declaring its Open Parliament initiative following verbal commitment made at the 2018 OGP Global Summit in Tbilisi, Georgia. However, a string of high-profile attacks on underrepresented groups and prosecutions of activists, journalists, and citizens using internet defamation law signalled shrinking civic space in the country.

Indonesia was one of the cofounding members of OGP along with Brazil, Mexico, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States in 2011. Soon after cofounding the partnership, the government established the Open Government Indonesia (OGI) National Secretariat under the administration of the now-defunct Presidential Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4). In 2015, after changes in leadership following the 2014 election from Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono to Joko Widodo, the government moved OGI under the administration of the Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas), the coordinating OGP ministry in the country.

In December 2017, Indonesia hosted the Asia-Pacific Leaders Forum (APLF) on Open Government for Inclusive Development in Jakarta.[2] The forum exchanged knowledge and best practices from across the region on how open government can facilitate inclusive development. The forum discussed promoting economic growth, reducing poverty, delivering effective and efficient public services, and promoting sustainable development.

Overall, the action plan continues to focus on similar themes as the fourth action plan, such as information disclosure, data governance, citizen participation, and public service delivery. New commitments cover topics such as beneficial ownership, open contracting, access to justice, and open election. Additionally, following the country's Open Parliament declaration in August 2018,[3] the action plan also includes commitments specifically related to opening up parliamentary processes.

Anticorruption remains a top priority with the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) maintaining a high level of trust from the public[4] albeit not without opposition. Among the most critical voices is Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives, Fahri Hamzah, who has repeatedly called for the disbandment of the KPK[5] due to a perceived overlap in the KPK's law enforcement and prosecution functions. Hamzah has also led an attempt in Parliament to amend Law No. 30/2002 on the Eradication of the Criminal Acts of Corruption, popularly known as the KPK Law, as it is KPK's foundational law.[6] On the other hand, during his state of the nation address in August 2018, President Joko Widodo reiterated his support for the KPK to continue the fight against corruption.[7]

Indonesia's vulnerability to corrupt public officials can be exemplified by recent corruption scandals that the KPK has exposed. The list includes the ongoing probe into the electronic ID graft scheme involving then-Speaker of the House of Representatives (DPR) Setya Novanto and many other politicians,[8] as well as the arrests of 41 out of 45 members of the City House of Representatives (DPRD) of Malang in East Java related to the city's fraudulent 2015 budget amendment. Meanwhile, the government has cited Indonesia's slightly improved marks on Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index (CPI) from 37 in 2017[9] to 38 in 2018[10] to suggest that its anticorruption strategy has been successful.[11]

In November 2017, the government issued Government Regulation No. 45/2017 on Public Participation in Local Government.[12] Along with Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure,[13] Law No. 25/2009 on Public Services,[14] and the Circular of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform No. 56/2017,[15] the regulation added another layer of legal framework to encourage public participation in policy-making, albeit with a focus on the subnational level.

Much of the government's public participation efforts have seen progress thanks to the inclusion of various e-government and open data commitments in its OGP action plans. The United Nations, through its E-Government Development Index (EDGI), noted Indonesia's improving e-government policy and implementation. In 2018, Indonesia rose 10 places to rank 107 for e-government and 22 places to rank 92 for e-participation.[16]

Similar to global trends, the Indonesian government has also been busy combating 'fake news' and hoaxes,[17] especially as incumbent President Joko Widodo sought re-election in 2019.[18] Among others, the government has often resorted to using Law No. 11/2008 on Electronic Transaction and Information, commonly referred to as the ITE Law, to prosecute people suspected of spreading false information.

The ITE Law, however, has attracted criticism from various organizations. Freedom House's 2017 Freedom on the Net Report[19] and 2019 Freedom in the World Report[20] found that freedom of expression, particularly on the internet, has declined in Indonesia. The reports specify that defamation cases have seen steep increase because of the problematic ITE Law.[21] In a broader context, the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)[22] also reported a decline in voice and accountability between 2016 and 2017 in Indonesia. In addition to public participation in selecting government, this dimension also captures perceptions on freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media.[23]

These reports are consistent with findings published by the Southeast Asia Freedom of Expression Network (SAFEnet). The advocacy group reported that a total of 264 defamation cases against internet users have been filed since the ITE Law was signed into law in 2008.[24] A large portion of these cases—194 (74%)—were filed during President Joko Widodo's administration. The vague[25] defamation clause included in the ITE Law has been frequently used to prosecute activists, members of the academic community, and journalists despite the country's 1945 Constitution guaranteeing freedom of expression and Law No. 40/1999 endorsing freedom of the press.[26] High-profile cases from 2019 include prosecutions of a sexual harassment victim for taping unwanted sexual advances intended to be used as evidence in West Nusa Tenggara,[27] a journalist investigating an allegation of a graft scheme involving a police official in North Sumatera,[28] and a board member of Amnesty International Indonesia for voicing criticism of the military during a human rights rally in Jakarta.[29]

Off the internet, SAFEnet also reported at least 64 violations of freedoms of assembly and expression between January 2015 and 2018.[30] The majority of these incidents—53 out of 64 (83%)—involved intimidation, persecution, raids, and attacks targeting public discussions with survivors of the 1965 Communist Party of Indonesia's (PKI) disputed massacre and members of sexual minority groups. Another example included the launch of a government-sanctioned exorcism program[31] targeting members of the LGBT+ community in the City of Padang in West Sumatera.

Despite evidence indicating shrinking civic space, particularly for underrepresented groups, members of the press, and voices critical of authorities, no commitments included in Indonesia's fifth action plan addressed these problems. This continued the government's lack of focus on civic space issues in the OGP process. Findings by the 2019 OGP Global Report[32] also showed that Indonesia has not used the OGP process to address civic space concerns, particularly on freedom of assembly, freedom of association, and the defense of journalists and activists. Future action plans, therefore, need to better reflect the state of open government to truly use the OGP process to respond to major problems in priority areas.

---

[1] This report focuses on the political context that was relevant at the time of Indonesia's fifth action plan development process. The report aims to provide an accurate explanation of the prevailing priorities and dynamics that influenced both government and civil society stakeholders in designing commitments at that time.

[2] "Asia-Pacific Leaders Forum on Open Government 2017: Open Government for Inclusive Development" (Ministry of National Development Planning, 2017), https://www.bappenas.go.id/id/berita-dan-siaran-pers/asia-pacific-leaders-forum-open-government-2017-keterbukaan-pemerintah-untuk-pembangunan-yang-inklusif/.

[3] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "DPR RI Deklarasikan Open Parliament Indonesia" (2018), https://ogi.bappenas.go.id/news/260/dpr-ri-deklarasikan-open-parliament-indonesia.

[4] Alexander Haryanto, "ICW Sebut Masyarakat Puas terhadap Kinerja KPK" (Tirto, 3 Aug. 2017), https://tirto.id/icw-sebut-masyarakat-puas-terhadap-kinerja-kpk-ctT8.

[5] Ronna Nirmala, "Ihwal Usulan Fahri Soal Pembubaran KPK dan Komnas HAM" (Beritagar, 2017), https://beritagar.id/artikel/berita/ihwal-usulan-fahri-soal-pembubaran-kpk-dan-komnas-ham.

[6] Stanley Widianto, "Revisi UU KPK Bergulir Kembali, KPK Berpegang Komitmen Jokowi" (Tempo, 2017), https://nasional.tempo.co/read/902687/revisi-uu-kpk-bergulir-kembali-kpk-berpegang-komitmen-jokowi.

[7] Kristian Erdianto, "Pidato Kenegaraan, Presiden Jokowi Tegaskan Dukungan terhadap KPK" (Tempo, 2018), https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2018/08/16/11595271/pidato-kenegaraan-presiden-jokowi-tegaskan-dukungan-terhadap-kpk.

[8] Krithika Varagur, "Indonesian Corruption Sentence Hailed as Turning Point" (Voice of America, 2018), https://www.voanews.com/a/indonesian-corruption-sentence-hailedasturning-point/4367398.html.

[9] Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index 2017* (2017), https://www.transparency.org/cpi2017.

[10] Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index 2018* (2018), https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018.

[11] Eva Mazrieva, "Indeks Persepsi Korupsi Indonesia Naik, Bukti Keseriusan Pemberantasan Korupsi?" (Voice of America, 2019), https://www.voaindonesia.com/a/indeks-persepsi-korupsi-indonesia-naik-bukti-keseriusan-pemberantasan-korupsi-/4764712.html.

[12] Government of Indonesia, "Peraturan Pemerintah No. 45/2017 tentang Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemerintah Daerah" (2017), https://www.lhokseumawekota.go.id/aturan/PP%2045%202017.PDF.

[13] Government of Indonesia, "Undang-Undang No. 14/2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik" (2008), http://dpr.go.id/doksetjen/dokumen/-Regulasi-UU-No.-14-Tahun-2008-Tentang-Keterbukaan-Informasi-Publik-1552380453.pdf.

[14] Government of Indonesia, "Undang-Undang No. 25/2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik" (2009), http://pelayanan.jakarta.go.id/download/regulasi/undang-undang-nomor-25-tahun-2009-tentang-pelayanan-publik.pdf.

[15] Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, "Surat Edaran No. 56/2017 tentang Pembentukan Forum Konsultasi Publik dalam Rangka Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik" (2017), https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HsWFpbaFZ0B0qu7vuXVrbe0qYhxM34K_.

[16] United Nations, "United Nations E-Government Knowledgebase" (2016), https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Data/Country-Information/id/78-Indonesia/dataYear/2018.

[17] Stanley Widianto, "Indonesian Police Intensify Crackdown on Fake News" (Voice of America, 2018) https://www.voanews.com/a/indonesian-police-intensify-crackdown-on-fake-news/4667758.html.

[18] Nithin Coca, "Will 'Fake News' Determine Indonesia's Next President?" (The Diplomat, 2018), https://thediplomat.com/2018/11/will-fake-news-determine-indonesias-next-president/.

[19] Freedom House, "Freedom on the Net 2017: Indonesia" (2017), https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/FOTN%202017_Indonesia.pdf.

[20] Freedom House, "Freedom in the World 2019" (2019), https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/Feb2019_FH_FITW_2019_Report_ForWeb-compressed.pdf.

[21] Freedom House, "Freedom on the Net 2017: Indonesia."

[22] Daniel Kaufmann & Aart Kraay, "Worldwide Governance Indicators" (The World Bank, 2017), http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Southeast Asia Freedom of Expression Network, "Daftar Kasus Netizen yang Terjerat UU ITE" (2019), https://id.safenet.or.id/daftarkasus/.

[25] Vindry Florentin, "Pemerintah Didesak Hapus Pasal Karet UU ITE" (Tempo, 2018), https://nasional.tempo.co/read/1143103/pemerintah-didesak-hapus-pasal-karet-uu-ite.

[26] Government of Indonesia, "Undang-Undang No. 40/1999 tentang Pers" (1999), https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/45370/uu-no-40-tahun-1999.

[27] Beh Lih Yi, "Anger as Indonesia Jails Teacher Who Documented Sexual Harassment" (Reuters, 2018), https://www.reuters.com/article/us-indonesia-women-rights/anger-as-indonesia-jails-teacher-who-documented-sexual-harassment-idUSKCN1NK26J.

[28] Jumadi Mappanganro, "Wartawan di Medan dan Sulut Dijerat UU ITE, Ini Sikap Jurnalis dan Aktivis di Makassar" (Tribun News, 2018), http://makassar.tribunnews.com/2018/03/08/wartawan-di-medan-dan-sulut-dijerat-uu-ite-ini-sikap-jurnalis-dan-aktivis-di-makassar.

[29] Stanley Widianto, "Indonesian Rights Activist Arrest Is Reminder of Authoritarian Past" (Voice of America, 2019), https://www.voanews.com/a/indonesian-rights-activist-arrest-is-reminder-of-authoritarian-past/4817205.html.

[30] Southeast Asia Freedom of Expression Network, "Daftar Pelanggaran Hak Berkumpul dan Berekspresi di Indonesia" (2018), https://id.safenet.or.id/pelanggaranekspresi/.

[31] Gavin Butler, "Pemkot Padang Gelar Program Ruqyah Paksa Demi 'Sembuhkan' Komunitas LGBT" (Vice, 2018), https://www.vice.com/id_id/article/3k95x5/pemkot-padang-gelar-program-ruqyah-paksa-demi-sembuhkan-komunitas-lgbt.

[32] Open Government Partnership, "Open Government Partnership Global Report: Democracy Beyond the Ballot Box Volume 2" (2019), 111, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Global-Report_Volume-2.pdf.

III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process

Civil society took the lead in shaping the agenda and priorities of Indonesia's fifth action plan. The multistakeholder forum convened in the beginning of action plan development, albeit with minimal high-level government representation. Unclear roles and mechanisms led to the absence of the multistakeholder forum throughout the rest of the development process.

3.1 Leadership

This subsection describes the OGP leadership and institutional context for OGP in Indonesia.

To coordinate OGP activities, including the development and implementation of action plans, the government established the Open Government Indonesia (OGI) National Secretariat. The Ministry of National Development Planning coordinates with the OGI National Secretariat along with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the President's Executive Office.[1]

The Deputy Minister of National Development Planning and the Deputy Chief of Staff of the President's Executive Office kicked off the co-creation process.[2] A representative of the Civil Society Secretariat for OGP Indonesia noted that engaging the Deputy Minister helped civil society remove several bureaucratic hurdles throughout the process.[3] However, high-level participation was less consistent during commitment development and depended on the commitment's theme.[4] This echoed challenges in the previous action plan cycle, although more rigorous advocacy by civil society prevented the action plan from completely losing momentum.

Eventually, this minimal participation by high-level government resulted in government confusion in detailing their implementation of commitments. For example, Commitment 1, stops short of establishing an open beneficial ownership registry. Commitment 9 which repeats a similar commitment from a prior action plan without accounting for the pre-existing consultation process already in place across different levels of government.

President Joko Widodo is known for his set of nine priorities commonly dubbed the "*Nawa Cita*" vision.[5] This includes an aim to "establish a clean, effective, and trusted democratic governance."[6] This priority became one the foundations of the 2015–2019 Mid-Term National Development Plan (RPJMN), which outlines policies regarding democracy, women's representation, transparency, bureaucratic reform, and public participation in government process.[7] Although the government did not publish specific, itemized budget information for OGP activities, a small amount of funding was allocated to support staff members of the OGI National Secretariat under the Directorate of State Apparatus of the Ministry of National Development Planning.[8]

After hosting the Asia-Pacific Leaders Forum in December 2017, development of Indonesia's fifth action plan was significantly delayed following the resignation of all OGI staff members due to undisclosed reasons. Leadership transition also occurred within the Ministry of National Development Planning, with a new Director of State Apparatus replacing the former Director who had been engaged in OGP process since 2015.

The action plan development process did not resume until May 2018, when the government hired a consultant assigned to OGI and hosted a workshop with civil society.[9] This workshop identified key priorities included in the government's 2019 Annual Work Plan (RKP)[10] that were relevant to commitments in the action plan, including open data for poverty alleviation and health care, access to quality education, public service delivery, and government accountability.[11] After action plan development began, the government contracted a total of four new staff members to support the OGI National Secretariat in coordinating the plan's development.

Indonesia's fifth action plan also includes five additional Open Parliament Indonesia (OPI) commitments. This indicates an opening parliamentary process, although due to the separation of executive and legislative powers,[12] the development of these open parliament commitments occurred separately at the House of Representatives.

Overall, development of these OPI commitments did not have the same level of participation and co-creation as the process coordinated by the OGI National Secretariat. The Indonesian Parliamentary Center led the process with Parliament's Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee (BKSAP) without participation from any other stakeholders.[13] These commitments mostly address issues within Parliament and are limited to internal consolidation of the open parliament initiative with heavy emphasis on access to information. As such, the scope and level of ambition of these commitments are relatively weaker compared to the other 14 commitments that were developed through the regular OGP process coordinated by the OGI National Secretariat.

3.2 Multistakeholder Process throughout Action Plan Development

In 2017, OGP adopted the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards intended to support participation and co-creation by civil society at all stages of the OGP cycle. All OGP-participating countries are expected to meet these standards. The standards aim to raise ambition and quality of participation during development, implementation, and review of OGP action plans.

OGP's Articles of Governance also establish participation and co-creation requirements a country or entity must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to the OGP process. Indonesia did not act contrary to OGP process.[14]

Please see Annex I for an overview of Indonesia's performance in implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan development.

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply to OGP.[15] This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for "collaborate."

Table 4. Level of public influence

Level of Public Influence		During Development 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	

Multistakeholder Forum

During the action plan development, the multistakeholder forum (MSF) met twice, in May[16] and August[17] 2018 to launch the co-creation process. The OGI National Secretariat invited key civil society representatives, partner organizations and donors, as well as government staff. Steering Committee members of the MSF, however, were largely absent in these meetings. (The MSF did not meet again,[18] including when the action plan was finalized and submitted to the OGP Support Unit.) In these two meetings, the MSF discussed key areas covered by the action plan, but high-level government representatives were not directly involved in shaping commitments. Instead, they participated by giving general directives at the beginning of each meeting by breaking down how the OGP action plan can utilize the RPJMN to gain momentum and support.

Despite the MSF being largely absent in developing individual commitments, Indonesia's fifth action plan recorded a higher level of ambition. This is reflected by the involvement of more relevant institutions, inclusion of commitments in priority areas such as anticorruption and data governance, and clearer specificity in success indicators for each commitment. Evidence strongly indicates that direct engagement and advocacy between civil society and government leadership, albeit not always within the formal process, played a pivotal role in filling the gap left by the MSF's absence.

In June 2018, the Minister of National Development Planning issued a Ministerial Decree on the Formation of Strategic Coordination Team for the Implementation of Open Government Indonesia Action Plan.[19] The Decree served as the legal basis for the MSF's leadership and membership. The Minister of National Development Planning chaired the forum with leaders from other government agencies and one civil society representative from the International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID) as cochairs.[20] As members of the forum, the Decree designated only seven civil society representatives compared to 17 government representatives from different offices. The civil society representatives included in the decree consisted of those who supported the co-creation process of Indonesia's previous action plan.

The government involved civil society in drafting the forum's mandates[21] as outlined in the Decree. Members of the forum include key leaders from several government offices as well as a few civil society leaders appointed by this Decree. They are responsible for drafting an open government action plan, monitoring and evaluating its implementation, and facilitating communication between and coordinating stakeholders. Meanwhile, the MSF Steering Committee must develop an open government strategy and remove barriers that hamper the plan's implementation.

The Decree, however, did not provide any mechanism for the MSF to perform these strategic mandates. There was lack of clarity among stakeholders in terms of the meeting frequency, leadership, authorities, and budget allocation for the forum. While representatives from both government[22] and civil society[23] expressed expectations for the MSF to actively lead the development of the action plan, the Ministry of National Development Planning did not convene the MSF beyond the early stage of the process.

Participation and Engagement throughout Action Plan Development

In May 2018, the government hosted a workshop with civil society to discuss action plan development. The government presented the themes, targets, policy directions, and priorities of the 2019 Annual Work Plan.[24] Additionally, the OGI National Secretariat presented a co-creation toolkit[25] for both government and civil society stakeholders.

The toolkit included a detailed timeline for the action plan development, procedures for drafting commitments, suggested thematic working groups, and possible participation methods which included formal discussions, internal workshops, teleconferences, in-person public consultations, and digital public consultations.[26]

Civil society took a more active role in shaping the action plan development. While the OGI National Secretariat was in vacuum due to staffing issues, a group of civil society organizations (CSOs), which included MSF members as well as other groups involved in the previous OGP cycle, met monthly to discuss key themes to be proposed for the action plan.[27] Once the government launched the co-creation process, civil society proposed their action plan framework.[28]

This framework shaped the themes that were selected for the working groups. Each working group was tasked to draft specific commitments within the selected themes to be considered for inclusion in the action plan. These themes included public service delivery, open data, public accountability, poverty alleviation, beneficial ownership, and subnational government.[29]

After the kick-off meeting in August 2018, the action plan development process continued with a series of thematic meetings. A mix of government and civil society representatives met separately to discuss commitments they were drafting for the action plan. A number of stakeholders who

were not part of the regular OGP process, such as the TIFA Foundation, Wahana Visi Indonesia (WVI), the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI), USAID, and the National Democratic Institute (NDI) also participated in this process.

At the end of the co-creation process, the action plan included all commitments put forward by the civil society, albeit with adjusted indicators of success after a series of discussions with government stakeholders. A proposed commitment to continue work on the OGI Roadmap and Strategic Plan was not included as both government and civil society representatives agreed it was not relevant[30] to OGP values given its lack of a public-facing element. However, work on the Roadmap and Strategic Plan would still continue as part of the Ministry of National Development Planning's internal process in consultation with civil society.

During the consultation process, most government entities were represented by staff from their Planning Bureau, which is in line with the coordination mechanism of the National Development Planning Ministry. According to the OGI National Secretariat, this was the best approach considering the role of the Ministry of National Development Planning in the process. However, the lack of high-level participation during commitment drafting received criticism from civil society. For example, some ministries and agencies sent different representatives to meetings throughout the process.[31] A lack of coordination[32] between these representatives resulted in inconsistencies of the government's approach to each commitment.

After consultations, the government published a draft action plan for an online public consultation period.[33] Seventeen responses were received,[34] with commitments on budget disclosure, local e-legislation, and public consultation forums receiving the most comments. A general response was published on the OGI website addressing key insights garnered from the public comments[35] and commitment-specific comments were brought to their relevant discussion groups, as recorded on OGI's online repository.[36] A representative from MediaLink who coordinates civil society participation in the OGP process stated that while the government suggested many adjustments of each commitment's success indicators to align with the government's work plan, the final action plan contains all the thematic priorities proposed by civil society.[37] In addition, efforts to engage civil society groups outside of the "usual suspects" paid off with the inclusion of an access to justice commitment championed by the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI) and TIFA Foundation.

Overall, the 14 commitments included in the action plan represented the thematic priorities captured by civil society's proposed commitments.[38] However, after the consultation process, the multistakeholder forum failed to meet to provide feedback for the draft action plan. In December 2018, the government submitted the action plan without being preceded by a meeting of the multistakeholder forum.[39] Additionally, while some commitments continued efforts to open up subnational governments, the entire development occurred in the capital city of Jakarta without any participation opportunities for other regional government and CSO representatives. While there were opportunities to provide online feedback, it is important that the government actively engages stakeholders from outside the capital region, particularly given the inclusion of commitments focusing on subnational governments.

Additionally, the government created an internal non-OGP action plan commitment to enhance government processes at the subnational level through a series of smart city initiatives.[40] This decision allowed the fifth action plan to maintain better focus on the thematic priorities under the central government's coordination while at the same time continuing the process of establishing open governance at the subnational level. For this commitment, the OGI National Secretariat collaborates with the President's Executive Office, the Ministry of Communications and Informatics, and the Ministry of Home Affairs as well Transparency International Indonesia, Indonesia Corruption Watch, MediaLink, Indonesian Parliamentary Center, and the International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID).

Upon submission, the action plan included five additional commitments from the open parliament agenda. The House of Representatives created these open parliament commitments with the Indonesian Parliamentary Center (IPC), a civil society group, as a follow-up to the Open

Parliament Indonesia declaration in August 2018.[41] The IPC shaped the agenda of the open parliament commitments with more focus on improving access to information on parliamentary processes as well as developing the framework to sustain the open parliament initiative. Since the commitments were developed separately from the regular government process, the process did not have a multistakeholder forum and also did not involve any stakeholders other than Parliament and the IPC.

Co-Creation and Participation Recommendations throughout Development

Indonesia showed evidence of achievement and strong performance in its multi-stakeholder mandate and composition. The Ministerial Decree appointed a group of key government and civil society leaders with clear mandates from a diverse range of sectors.

Some areas where Indonesia can improve are:

- Multistakeholder conduct and procedure, including ensuring regular meeting frequency as well as taking a more active and consistent role in overseeing the development of the action plan; and
- Communications and outreach during development, including publishing action plan information and documents on the OGI repository before the action plan is finalized and making the process open to all stakeholders.

In order to improve performance on these areas, the IRM researcher suggests to:

- Conduct a baseline study on the impact of OGP action plans to determine key priorities for the next plan and best approaches for its implementation;
- Develop a strategy to proactively disseminate information on public comment opportunities before finalizing the action plan;
- Establish clear mechanism and procedure for the conduct of the multistakeholder forum;
- Encourage more high-level participation from government to gain clearer strategy and consistency in action plan implementation; and
- Facilitate participation of subnational government and other local stakeholders by hosting satellite consultations outside Jakarta and/or enabling remote participation.

[1] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Peran Sekretariat Nasional OGI" (accessed Mar. 2019), https://ogi.bappenas.go.id/about/2/sekretariat-nasional-ogi.
[2] Tities Eka Agustine (Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat), interview by IRM researcher, 4 Mar. 2019.
[3] Darwanto (MediaLink), interview by IRM researcher, 7 Mar. 2019.
[4] Agustine, interview.
[5] General Elections Commission, "Visi, Misi, Program Aksi Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla," (2014), https://www.kpu.go.id/koleksigambar/Visi_Misi_JOKOWI-JK.pdf.
[6] Ibid.
[7] UNDP Indonesia, "Converging Development Agendas: 'Nawa Cita', 'RPJMN', and SDGs" (2015), http://www.id.undp.org/content/dam/indonesia/2015/doc/publication/ConvFinal-En.pdf.
[8] Agustine, interview.
[9] Tities Eka Agustine (Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat), interview by IRM researcher, 12 Feb. 2019.
[10] Government of Indonesia, "Peraturan Presiden No. 72/2018 tentang Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Tahun 2018," https://www.bappenas.go.id/files/rkp/PERPRES%20NO.%2072%20RKP%20TAHUN%202019.pdf.
[11] Ministry of National Development Planning, "Tema, Sasaran, Arah Kebijakan, dan Arah Prioritas Rencana Kerja Pemerintah (RKP) Tahun 2019" (2018), https://drive.bappenas.go.id/owncloud/index.php/s/KWHf5trDZmKfvMG#pdfviewer.
[12] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Acting Contrary to Process - Country did not meet (1) "involve" during the development or "inform" during implementation of the NAP (2) government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance.
[15] IAP2 International Federation, "IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation" (2018), https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum_8.5x11_Print.pdf.
[16] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Catatan Workshop" (2018), https://drive.bappenas.go.id/owncloud/index.php/s/KWHf5trDZmKfvMG#pdfviewer.

[17] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Notulensi Kegiatan Kick-Off Pembahasan Rancangan Rencana Aksi Nasional Keterbukaan Pemerintah Indonesia 2018–2020" (2018), https://drive.bappenas.go.id/owncloud/index.php/s/wvOZD79dQglmqG2#pdfviewer.

[18] Tities Eka Agustine (Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat), interview by IRM researcher, 4 Mar. 2019.

[19] "Keputusan Menteri tentang Pembentukan Tim Koordinasi Strategis Pelaksanaan Rencana Aksi Open Government Indonesia," Ministry of National Development Planning, 2018, http://jdih.bappenas.go.id/peraturan/detailperaturan/515.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Darwanto (MediaLink), interview by IRM researcher, 7 Mar. 2019.

[22] Agustine, interview, 4 Mar. 2019.

[23] Darwanto, interview.

[24] Ministry of National Development Planning, "Tema, Sasaran, Arah Kebijakan, dan Arah Prioritas Rencana Kerja Pemerintah (RKP) Tahun 2019."

[25] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Toolkit Rencana Aksi Nasional Open Government Indonesia" (2018), https://drive.bappenas.go.id/owncloud/index.php/s/KWHf5trDZmKfvMG#pdfviewer.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Darwanto, interview.

[28] Civil Society Organizations for Open Government Indonesia, "Rumusan Usulan Rencana Aksi Open Government Indonesia – CSO 2018–2020" (2018), https://drive.bappenas.go.id/owncloud/index.php/s/KWHf5trDZmKfvMG#pdfviewer.

[29] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Catatan Workshop."

[30] Darwanto, interview.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Bagi Aspirasimu untuk Rencana Aksi Keterbukaan Pemerintah Indonesia 2018–2020" (2018), https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSf1BbR_gN-84rH4yCm4R7EdyBPE_LQQV_i08wkTCQfJSJQpnA/viewform.

[34] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat, "Tahapan Penyusunan Renaksi 2018–2020: Konsultasi Publik Secara Online" (2018), https://ogi.bappenas.go.id/renaksi/5/2018-2020.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Darwanto, interview.

[38] Hendrik Rosdinar (YAPPIKA-ActionAid), interview by IRM researcher, 9 Mar. 2019.

[39] Darwanto, interview.

[40] Open Government Indonesia National Secretariat "Rencana Aksi Keterbukaan Pemerintah Indonesia 2018–2020" (2018), 51, https://drive.bappenas.go.id/owncloud/index.php/s/GQUMgWpFeeGBpPT#pdfviewer.

[41] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.

IV. Commitments

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each government's unique circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP-participating countries.[1] The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[2] A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

- **Verifiability:**
  - Not specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, do the objectives stated and actions proposed lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
  - Specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, are the objectives stated and actions proposed sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?

- **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
  - Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
  - Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions or policies?
  - Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve public facing opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
  - Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?

- **Potential Impact:** This variable assesses the potential impact of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:

- Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
- Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
- Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.

- **Completion:** This variable assesses the commitment's implementation and progress. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the IRM Implementation Report.

- **Did It Open Government?** This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice, in areas relevant to OGP values, has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the IRM Implementation Report.

What Makes a Potentially Starred Commitment?

A potentially starred commitment has more potential to be ambitious and to be implemented. A good commitment is one that clearly describes the:

1. **Problem:** Describe the economic, social, political, or environmental problem, rather than an administrative issue or tool (e.g., "misallocation of welfare funds" is more helpful than "lacking a website").

2. **Status Quo:** What is the status quo of the policy issue at the beginning of an action plan (e.g., "26% of judicial corruption complaints are not processed currently")?
3. **Change:** Rather than stating intermediary outputs, what is the targeted behavior change that is expected from the commitment's implementation (e.g., "doubling response rates to information requests" is a stronger goal than "publishing a protocol for response")?

Starred Commitments

One measure, the "starred commitment" (✪), deserves further explanation due to its particular interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating governments. Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- Potential star: the commitment's design should be **verifiable**, **relevant** to OGP values, and have **transformative** potential impact.
- The government must make significant progress on this commitment during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of **substantial** or **complete** implementation.

This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *Implementation IRM report*.

General Overview of the Commitments

Indonesia's fifth action plan consisted of fourteen commitments from the government and an additional five commitments from Parliament. Themes such as enhancing transparency and accountability, enabling civic participation, strengthening access to information and quality of data governance, as well as improving public service delivery continued to be the major focus. Notably, this action plan also introduced Indonesia's first commitment that specifically addressed beneficial ownership transparency.

---

[1] Open Government Partnership, "Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance" (2012 (updated Mar. 2014, Apr. 2015, and Jun. 2019)), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/OGP_Articles-of-Governance_2019.pdf.
[2] Open Government Partnership, "IRM Procedures Manual," (2017), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

Open Parliament Indonesia Commitments

1. Improvement of Data Management and Legislative Information Services

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

- To increase the data and information speed and quantity of ongoing legislative activities.
- Promoting public participation in legislative activities.

Milestones:

1. Formulation of Assessment Guidelines and Reports.
2. Advocacy of the recruitment of more functional staff members.
3. Capacity building of the Secretary General in the management of data and information.
4. Periodic monitoring and evaluation of publications of the legislative information system.
5. Serial Workshop, public testing, monitoring and evaluation of publications of the legislative information system.
6. Development of Sileg application.
7. Serial Focus Group Discussion (FGD), Workshop, Monitoring and Evaluation.

Start Date: September 2018　　　　　　　　　　　**End Date:** August 2020

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Improvement of Data Management and Legislative Information Services		✔	✔			✔			✔		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The House of Representatives (DPR) or the Parliament of Indonesia has three different functions: legislation, budgeting, and oversight of the government. As the legislative authority, the House incorporates public will into law. However, given Indonesia's archipelagic geography, determining the public will directly from its citizens is challenging for members of Parliament.

With technological advances, communicating with constituents has become easier. Citizens can access public information on Parliament's website at dpr.go.id and learn of legislation being drafted. However, the information on Parliament's website is mostly limited and outdated.[1] It is possible for Parliament to have already concluded legislation before citizens have access to information they need in order to participate in the process. Additionally, Parliament's information disclosure policy does not specifically regulate what legislative information should be made available concurrently with the legislation process.

Opening up public access to information is mandated by Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure.[2] The Law explicitly states that the purpose of disclosing information to the public is important to encourage greater citizen participation in the process of policy-making.

Within Parliament, information disclosure is regulated further by House Regulation No.1/2010 on Information Disclosure.[3] The regulation specifies that all information pertaining to the organizational structure, programs, activities and performance, as well as an audited report of the House budget are deemed public information[4] that must be made available to the public. Exceptions[5] are made only for sensitive information that (i) may endanger national security, (ii) private information, (iii) confidential information, and (iv) undocumented information. Despite this regulation, Parliament has not consistently provided the most updated and recent public information on its website. Therefore, it has remained difficult for citizens to comprehensively inform themselves of House legislation.

Despite the Law and the House Regulation mandating proper information disclosure, Parliament has never established a clear compliance mechanism. For example, as access to legislative information remains low, citizen participation has also been strictly limited to conventional means, such as in-person participation and mail correspondence.[6]

To overcome this problem, Parliament developed a Legislative Information System (Sileg). It was intended to make it easier for citizens to access up-to-date and comprehensive legislative information. However, Parliament has not maintained the application[7] and it's information is outdated and limited. A representative from the Indonesian Parliamentary Center (IPC)[8], which helped develop this commitment, stated a main problem was the lack of an enforcement mechanism to ensure Parliament's compliance.

This commitment aims to redesign the Sileg application to better cater to the needs of an open parliamentary process. The current practice within Parliament is to publish legislative information after the legislative process has ended. This prevents the public voice from being considered during the legislative process. Therefore, the application will be designed to specifically ensure that Parliament publishes legislative information during the drafting stage, allowing citizens to access a draft law and form their opinions. The application will have a comment box for citizens to submit feedback directly.

Additionally, this commitment will build capacity of Parliament's secretariat staff in managing legislative information and data. The House Secretariat will conduct routine evaluations to ensure compliance across Parliamentary work units.

Next Steps

This commitment presents equal challenges for both Parliament and citizens. Parliament must improve its information disclosure compliance.

In implementing this commitment, Parliament should focus on the following:

- Develop a clear information disclosure mechanism for all Parliamentary work units and commissions. This includes a clear, standard procedure for all units to follow when producing, developing, and publishing legislative information through the website and Sileg. The mechanism could specify the detailed procedure for how each information is disclosed, the format of documents to be used, a reasonable time gap between the publication of a legislative information and the schedule of subsequent activity relative to that legislation, and the inclusion of a clear narrative of the legislation being drafted; and
- In conjunction with development of the public feedback features on the Sileg application, Parliament can consider establishing a procedure that requires members of Parliament to provide reasoned responses to public comments. Additionally, the application might enable citizens to request feedback on how their opinion was taken into account or incorporated into legislation.

Furthermore, Parliament could also look into opportunities to either improve or integrate the following existing portals to encourage greater citizen participation:

- Parliament's online public complaints registration and tracking portal (pengaduan.dpr.go.id),
- Parliament's information service desk (PPID) portal (ppid.dpr.go.id), and
- Parliament's electronic procurement (LPSE) portal (lpse.dpr.go.id).

---

[1] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.
[2] Government of Indonesia, "Undang-Undang No. 14/2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik" (2008), http://dpr.go.id/doksetjen/dokumen/-Regulasi-UU-No.-14-Tahun-2008-Tentang-Keterbukaan-Informasi-Publik-1552380453.pdf.
[3] House of Representatives, "Peraturan DPR No. 1/2010 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik di DPR RI" (2010), http://dpr.go.id/doksetjen/dokumen/-Regulasi-Peraturan-DPR-RI-No.-1-Tahun-2010-Tentang-Keterbukaan-Informasi-Publik-di-DPR-RI-1552380559.pdf.
[4] Ibid., 3.
[5] Ibid., 4.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Hanafi, interview.
[8] Ibid.

2. Promotion of Utilization of Parliamentary Information Technology

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

- Improving integration of web-based data and information.
- Developing an application to improve services in information and public participation in legislative activities.
- Improving service delivery mechanism in information and public participation of the developed application.
- Developing a specific online application for public participation and information on parliamentary performance.

Milestones:

1. Research Assessment.
2. Website redesign.
3. Public launching of the application.

Start Date: September 2018   **End Date:** August 2020

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
2. Promotion of Utilization of Parliamentary Information Technology		✔	✔			✔		✔			Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Parliament comprises a multitude of work units with a variety of functions. In carrying out their functions, each work unit is mandated by the Information Disclosure Law[1] and the House Regulation on Information Disclosure.[2] Parliament uses tech-enabled platforms such as websites, portals, and mobile-applications to disclose public information.

Parliament's website, dpr.go.id, publishes news, agendas, legislative programs, documentation, Parliament members' profiles, archives, and the recent addition of an Open Parliament section. However, throughout the website, the type and format of published information is inconsistent. According to the Indonesian Parliamentary Center (IPC)[3] who co-designed this commitment, this inconsistency hinders citizen access to parliamentary information.

Overall, Parliament's website and other portals indicate an evident commitment to opening public access to information and providing opportunities to participate in the parliamentary process. However, as noted in the action plan, this commitment seeks to assess challenges that prevent citizens from accessing information and participating. Findings from this assessment will be the baseline to redesign the website and portals. While they conducted the assessment, Parliament was not yet able to confirm details for the public participation online application.[4]

This commitment carries minor potential to change parliamentary process. The main issue is that Parliament aims to improve use of these information websites and portals without any clear strategy to raise public awareness of these tools. Nonetheless, by streamlining disclosure mechanisms in the House, this commitment could potentially minimize disinformation of parliamentary processes.

Next Steps

Successful implementation of this commitment relies heavily on the internal process taking place within Parliament. In order to redesign its website for better user experience and easier access, Parliament needs to coordinate information managers across Parliamentary work units. This would minimize the number of duplicate publications from different work units.

Parliament should engage CSOs and think-tanks with parliamentary expertise to assess greater public participation in parliamentary processes. The Indonesian Centre of Law and Policy Studies (PSHK), for example, studied the extent and impact of public participation in parliamentary processes.[5]

While increasing access to information is important, there are other elements to ensuring that public participation in parliamentary processes is meaningful and impactful. Some steps that Parliament should take include:

- Collaborate with CSOs to develop online participation applications using the results from the assessment of current challenges to citizen access and participation in parliamentary processes;
- Expand efforts to promote the use of parliamentary information technology platforms to reach members of the general public; and
- Develop a clear mechanism to build the capacity of information managers across parliamentary work units to ensure compliance with Parliament's information disclosure policy.

---

[1] Government of Indonesia, "Undang-Undang No. 14/2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik" (2008), http://dpr.go.id/doksetjen/dokumen/-Regulasi-UU-No.-14-Tahun-2008-Tentang-Keterbukaan-Informasi-Publik-1552380453.pdf.

[2] House of Representatives, "Peraturan DPR No. 1/2010 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik di DPR RI" (2010), http://dpr.go.id/doksetjen/dokumen/-Regulasi-Peraturan-DPR-RI-No.-1-Tahun-2010-Tentang-Keterbukaan-Informasi-Publik-di-DPR-RI-1552380559.pdf.

[3] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ronald Rofiandri, "Memperluas Cakupan Partisipasi dalam Proses Legislasi" (Indonesian Centre of Law and Policy Studies, 2015) https://pshk.or.id/blog-id/memperluas-cakupan-partisipasi-dalam-proses-legislasi.

3. Promotion of Public Information Transparency of the Parliament

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

- Developing infrastructure for parliamentary transparency, in line with the Public Information Transparency Law.
- Increasing the amount of information uploads on the parliamentary website.
- Providing up-to-date minutes of meetings of at least the last 3 working days.
- Improving the delivery of web-based information service (e-PPID).
- Availability of information transparency rating tools for Complementary Organs of the House and Secretary General on a regular basis. This commitment will be demonstrated by the Information and Documentation Management Officials (PPID) collaborating with civil society.

Milestones:

1. Workshop on guidelines on public information management.
2. Development of evaluation tools.
3. Implementation of evaluation tools.
4. Launching of a rating tool.
5. Revision of Regulation of the Indonesian House of Representatives.

Start Date: September 2018   **End Date:** July 2020

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
3. Promotion of Public Information Transparency of the Parliament		✔	✔			✔		✔			Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Similar to the first two commitments in the open parliament action plan, this commitment also aims to improve public access to information. However, this commitment focuses on strengthening Parliament's capacity to monitor and evaluate information disclosure within Parliament.

Prior to this commitment, Parliament had initiated efforts to develop an evaluation tool to measure the implementation of information disclosure by its work units. The initiative reached a trial stage, but was never institutionalized. Through this commitment, Parliament hopes to renew development of this tool and institutionalize it as an official mechanism.

The evaluation tool will come with standardized publication guidelines for all Parliamentary information managers. The tool will allow monitoring of meeting minutes to ensure they're published within a certain period of time following the meeting. By doing this, citizens will have

access to more relevant information. (The current lag between a meeting and its minutes' publication leaves citizens with irrelevant information.)[1]

To eliminate the long wait for publication of session and meeting notes, Parliament has been working on implementing a new method for note-taking. This new method allows minutes of meetings to summarize the most relevant information and omit repetitive or redundant details. Trial runs of this method resulted in a massive 2,726% increase in the number of minutes published by the eleven Commissions of the House from 183 briefs in 2016 to 5,171 briefs in 2017.[2]

Through this commitment, Parliament will implement this same policy across other Parliamentary work units and committees. To add incentive, the guideline will include a reward scheme for work units with the best information disclosure records as determined by the evaluation tool. The evaluation tool will be developed and implemented within the next two years as a peer-review mechanism[3] with staff and Parliament members rating the performance of information managers.

By the end of this action plan cycle, the focus of this commitment will be to propose and pass a Revision to the House Regulation on Information Disclosure. With the declaration of the Open Parliament Indonesia initiative, Parliament believes that revising this regulation is imperative.

This commitment carries minor potential impact to improve parliamentary openness. While the activities are mostly internal, the trial runs of publishing briefs instead of verbatim minutes suggest a strong potential to increase the amount of information available for the public. However, the brief format could allow Parliament to omit and self-censor the information released.

Next Steps

Going forward, Parliament should focus on training information managers to comply with the guidelines that will be developed. Since one milestone is to revise the House Regulation on Information Disclosure, Parliament could prioritize the following aspects for inclusion in the revision:

- Update Parliament's Public Information List (DIP). It is important to carefully assess all types of information that are not currently included on the list. An impact assessment on parliamentary information could help ensure that Parliament properly complies with the principles of information disclosure;
- Update regulation around the structure, tasks, and functions of Parliament's PPIDs to reflect recent changes and also to match public demand for making more information available upon request;
- Establish a clear, standardized information management procedure for Parliamentary work units. Standardize the format of documents released to the public; and
- Incorporate public participation in monitoring and evaluating Parliament's information disclosure practice.

---

[1] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

4. Formulation of the Open Parliament Indonesia Roadmap

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

Formulating the Open Parliament Indonesia (OPI) Roadmap for the next 5 years. This Roadmap will be used in the formulation of OPI National Action Plan in the future.

Milestones:

1. A baseline survey on constituents.
2. Formulation of the roadmap document.
3. Discussions on Open Parliament Indonesia Roadmap.

Start Date: September 2018   **End Date:** August 2020

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
4. Formulation of the Open Parliament Indonesia Roadmap		✔	✔	✔					✔		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Commitments included in the open parliament action plan focus heavily on improving parliamentary transparency. This focus on improving information disclosure compliance can be understood by looking at Parliament's record of past transparency.

In 2014, the Central Information Commission (KIP)[1] ranked the House of Representatives twelfth among all public institutions in terms of information disclosure compliance. The report gave the parliament's information disclosure a 65.5% compliance score.[2] While the KIP did publish subsequent reports after 2014[3], none included the House of Representatives in the ranked list.

During an interview with the IRM researcher, the Indonesian Parliamentary Center (IPC) reiterated the need to reform Parliament's information disclosure compliance.[4] The first three commitments will improve information disclosure compliance within Parliament. This commitment will address the problem at the strategic and policy level. The Open Parliament Indonesia Roadmap will be a key component in the implementation of the open parliament initiative.

The Roadmap will cover a five-year period to align with the government's National Mid-Term Development Plan (RPJMN). It will be the reference strategic document for all programs and activities related to the objective of opening up Parliament. Currently, Parliament has had to resort to research provided by academia and think tanks. To streamline public will and input on improving parliamentary processes, multiple actors will be involved in developing this Roadmap. Additionally, the Roadmap will mandate the incorporation of a public participation element in parliamentary processes.[5]

The formation of the Roadmap will include a public survey. Through this survey, Parliament hopes to gather information on the most urgent needs and demands of the public as well as feedback on how citizens can participate meaningfully in parliamentary processes.[6] The survey results will factor into the strategic direction of the Roadmap. Afterward, stakeholders involved in parliamentary processes will adopt the Roadmap to develop the strategies relevant to their respective functions. Beyond the survey, however, the scale and scope of the process are still unclear. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if this process will provide an opportunity for public voices from different groups and sectors to be included in the design of the Roadmap.

Next Steps

In implementing this commitment, Parliament could focus on the following aspects:

- Consult the Central Information Commission (KIP) to gather feedback on how Parliament can improve its information disclosure compliance;
- Consult the OGI National Secretariat to learn from its experience on developing the Open Government Indonesia Roadmap; and
- Proactively include voices from the academic community, civil society, government, private sector, and under-represented groups to capture their perspectives on how the Roadmap could contribute to improving the lives of citizens.

---

[1] Central Information Commission, "Hasil Pemeringkatan Keterbukaan Informasi di Badan Publik 2014" (2014), 12, https://komisiinformasi.go.id/?portfolio=laporan-hasil-pemeringkatan-2014.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Central Information Commission, "Hasil Pemeringkatan Keterbukaan Informasi di Badan Publik Publik 2015" (2015), https://komisiinformasi.go.id/?portfolio=keputusan-tentang-hasil-pemeringkatan-keterbukaan-informasi-publik-tahun-2015; "Hasil Pemeringkatan Keterbukaan Informasi di Badan Publik 2016" (2016), https://komisiinformasi.go.id/?portfolio=laporan-hasil-pemeringkatan-2016; "Hasil Pemeringkatan Keterbukaan Informasi di Badan Publik 2017" (2017), https://komisiinformasi.go.id/?portfolio=laporan-hasil-pemeringkatan-2017.

[4] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

5. Establishing the Open Parliament Indonesia Institution

Language of the commitment as it appears in the action plan:

Establishing the Open Parliament Indonesia, which shall include Members of the Indonesian House, as well as representatives from the Secretariat General of the House and civil societies.

Milestones:

1. Formulation of a policy paper on OPI model institution.
2. Formulation of a Decree of the Organizational Structure of Open Parliament Indonesia based on the principles of collaboration and co-creation.
3. Formulation of the OPI implementation mechanism.
4. Monitoring and evaluation.
5. Making reports.

Start Date: September 2018 **End Date:** June 2020

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
5. Establishing the Open Parliament Indonesia Institution		✔		✔					✔		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The House of Representatives of Indonesia declared the Open Parliament Indonesia (OPI) initiative in August 2018.[1] This marked a major step in furthering interparliamentary cooperation in Indonesia. Before joining the open parliament initiative, the House of Representatives was already active in other international frameworks such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC).

Shortly following this declaration, Parliament created five open parliament commitments for inclusion in Indonesia's fifth action plan. In this particular commitment, Parliament aims to establish an Open Parliament Indonesia institution to support the implementation of the open parliament initiative.

According to the IPC, an OPI institution is necessary for a variety of reasons:[2]

- Sustaining open parliament implementation, regardless of transitions in House leadership, through a mechanism that mandates the parliament allocate budget and resources to enact and support open parliament activities;
- Creating an incentive for civil society to participate in open parliament initiatives through a clear mechanism for collaboration between Parliament and civil society; and
- Coordinating the development and implementation of open parliament action plans across Parliamentary work units and civil society representatives.

Before establishing the OPI institution, the House will collaborate with civil society to study open parliament implementation in other countries. In an interview, the IPC explained that Parliament has been exploring several options that can work for an OPI institution. Ideally, the institution would be incorporated as an official work unit within the parliament, such as with the Open Governance Permanent Parliamentary Council[3] in Georgia. The OPI institution will then be formalized through a House Regulation. Additionally, the creation of an implementation mechanism could also help establish clear rules of procedure for future open parliament action plans.

This commitment carries moderate potential impact to change the landscape of citizen engagement in parliamentary process as well as establishing a clear avenue for civil society to collaborate with the parliament in achieving open parliament objectives. However, as this would mean establishing an entirely separate process from the existing OGI-coordinated mechanism, OPI would need to start building the open parliament framework in Indonesia from scratch. The 2019 election season could also bring leadership changes that restrict the implementation of this commitment.

Next Steps

Indonesia's participation and leadership in a wide array of international initiatives to open up parliamentary processes indicate Parliament's commitment to abide by global standards of openness and transparency. In November 2018, Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives for 2014–2019 Fadli Zon met with Anthony Smith, Chief Executive Officer of the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD) at the Indonesian Embassy in London.[4] In this meeting, WFD reiterated its intention to continue the partnership with the House in improving parliamentary transparency and citizen engagement in Indonesia.

To achieve strong implementation, Parliament must continue to nurture such partnerships. Not only do they provide an opportunity to be part of a global forum working on a similar goal, but Parliament can learn from the best practices and failures that parliaments in other countries have experienced. By doing so, Parliament can ensure an effective and efficient implementation of open parliament in Indonesia.

In implementing this commitment, Parliament should consider the following steps:

- Explore the opportunities to streamline the open parliament process with the OGI National Secretariat by collaborating on the creation of standard references;
- Consult the OGI National Secretariat to learn from its experience in coordinating OGP process as well as in developing the National Strategy for the OGI National Secretariat; and
- Replicate a mechanism similar to OGP's multistakeholder forum to gain and maintain high-level support and engagement for the open parliament initiative.

---

[1] House of Representatives, "Open Parliament Dekatkan DPR dengan Rakyat" (2018), http://www.dpr.go.id/berita/detail/id/21853/t/Open+Parliament+Dekatkan+DPR+Dengan+Rakyat.
[2] Ahmad Hanafi (Indonesian Parliamentary Center), interview by IRM researcher, 8 Mar. 2019.
[3] Parliament of Georgia, "Open Governance Permanent Parliamentary Council" (accessed Mar. 2019), http://www.parliament.ge/en/saparlamento-saqmianoba/komisiebi-da-sabchoebi-8/ppcotg.
[4] Puguh Hariyanto, "DPR RI dan WFD Sepakat Dukung Keterbukaan Parlemen di Level Global" (Sindo News, 17 Nov. 2018), https://nasional.sindonews.com/read/1355398/12/dpr-ri-dan-wfd-sepakat-dukung-keterbukaan-parlemen-di-level-global-1542384983.