

Notes

CHAPTER 1

1. The information in the book is accurate up to January 2021, with a few references added after that date. Because of that, the Russian-Ukraine war is not addressed in this book. The Open Government Partnership did issue a statement, “The Open Gov Community Stands with Ukraine,” on February 28, 2022 (<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/news/statement-from-the-chairs-of-the-ogp-steering-committee-on-ukraine/>).
2. Civil society organization representative, interview with author, Mexico City, April 2018.

CHAPTER 2

1. The material in the chapter further develops arguments we previously made in: Ingrams, Piotrowski, & Berliner (2020).
2. The success of Obama’s transparency policies has been seriously questioned. Scholars have made some probing critiques (e.g., Coglianesse, 2009).

CHAPTER 3

1. Multistakeholder partnerships are thus distinct from the country-to-country partnerships written about by Abrahamsen (2004).
2. All monetary amounts in this section are US dollars, unless otherwise noted.

CHAPTER 4

1. Due to the length of the action plan cycle and the commitment review process, at the time of writing, only data for fully evaluated commitments up to 2016 are available. Data are missing for “ambition” in 2011 and 2016.
2. We included 1,935 commitments for National Action Plans between 2014 and 2018 that have been evaluated and published in the Open Government Partnership Explorer up to

December 2020. Item measurement is as follows: (1) Stars are relevant, completed or substantially completed, and have transformative potential impact. (2) Low-hanging fruit are relevant, completed or substantially completed, and have minor or no potential impact. (3) Pipe dreams are relevant, withdrawn, not started, or have limited completion, and have moderate or transformative potential impact. (4) Flops are not relevant, have minor or no potential impact, and are withdrawn, not started or have limited completion.

3. At the time of the invasion by Russia in 2022, Ukraine was midway through implementation of a Third Action Plan that would see increased efforts to modernize its digital records systems. Given the extreme disruption and violence of the Russian invasion, open government reforms in Ukraine are not likely to be top priorities for the near future.
4. While there is not space to replicate the full Global Open Data Index here, comparison of the index with Open Government Partnership member lists also shows that fewer countries further down the index are Open Government Partnership members. Data on the index is available at <https://index.okfn.org/place/>, and Open Government Partnership members at <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/our-members/>.
5. Slaughter, Anne Marie (@SlaughterAM), “Open Government Partnership is ‘a social network for reformers’ Juan Pardinás at #pdf12 @OpenGovPart,” Twitter, June 11, 2021, 12:21 p.m.
6. The Web of Science keyword search included all peer review articles across all scientific fields with the words *open government* in the title or abstract.

CHAPTER 5

1. This chapter draws on analysis and evidence that also appears in more abbreviated and thematic form in our previously published work, Berliner, Ingrams, & Piotrowski (2021).
2. As explained later in this chapter, we indicate for each interview quotation the organization type of the interviewee. We use CSO to reflect civil society organization representatives.
3. The Independent Reporting Mechanism only reviewed thirty-six of the thirty-seven commitments, as the final one—a “Transparency Innovation Prize”—was not part of the Open Government Partnership consultative process but added separately by the government (Open Government Partnership, 2013c, p. 8).
4. Even the *Economist* (2015) commented on ideological divides among Mexican civil society in 2015, noting that “grassroots organisations can be dismissive of their more technocratic brethren, labelling them neoliberal and government stooges.”
5. In 2017, IMCO received the Templeton Freedom Award for “exceptional and innovative contributions to the understanding of free enterprise, and the public policies that encourage prosperity, innovation, and human fulfillment via free competition” (Atlas Network, 2017).
6. Notably, the well-known Grupo Oaxaca that was closely involved in the original 2002 passage of Mexico’s access to information law (Michener, 2011a) was largely a coalition of journalists

and academics rather than civil society groups from different ideological and sectoral backgrounds. It also did not persist as an organized coalition engaged in sustained activities.

7. However, this may be exaggerated, as civil society groups decried their exclusion from the opening ceremony of the summit, which was held at a different location than the rest of the event (Garduño, 2015).
8. Two authors were present at the summit.
9. The Independent Reporting Mechanism only reviewed thirty-six of the thirty-seven commitments. See note 3.

CHAPTER 6

1. To demonstrate, we performed a keyword search in the Web of Science digital library across all social science journals for words that capture the central open government norms: *transparency* and *participation*. Since 2011, large upward growth is shown in all areas, with a 196 percent growth in articles with a *transparency* keyword and 136 percent with a *participation* keyword.

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/13984.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/13984.001.0001)

The Power of Partnership in Open Government

Reconsidering Multistakeholder Governance Reform

By: Suzanne J. Piotrowski, Daniel Berliner, Alex Ingrams

Citation:

The Power of Partnership in Open Government: Reconsidering Multistakeholder Governance Reform

By: Suzanne J. Piotrowski, Daniel Berliner, Alex Ingrams

DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/13984.001.0001

ISBN (electronic): 9780262372091

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2022

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from the authors



The MIT Press

© 2022 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND license.

Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding from the Lois and Samuel Pratt Program for Freedom of Information at Rutgers Law School and the Institute of Public Administration at Leiden University.

The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Adobe Garamond and Berthold Akzidenz Grotesk by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Piotrowski, Suzanne J., 1973– author. | Berliner, Daniel, author. | Ingrams, Alex, author.

Title: The power of partnership in open government : reconsidering multistakeholder governance reform / Suzanne J. Piotrowski, Daniel Berliner, and Alex Ingrams.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2022] | Series: Information Policy Series / edited by Sandra Braman | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022007845 (print) | LCCN 2022007846 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262544597 (Paperback) | ISBN 9780262372084 (ePub) | ISBN 9780262372091 (PDF)

Subjects: LCSH: Transparency in government. | Administrative agencies—Mexico—Management—Case studies. | Organizational change. | Organizational effectiveness.

Classification: LCC JC598 .P56 2022 (print) | LCC JC598 (ebook) | DDC 352.8/8—dc23/eng/20220630

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022007845>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022007846>