As citizens demand accountability, governments keep data locked away

The Web Foundation believes that open data must be:

- for everyone — a right for all
- the data people need
- data people can easily use

In this edition of the Barometer, 1,725 datasets from 15 different sectors across 115 countries were assessed. We found that most governments are not meeting the basic Open Data Charter principles. In most cases, the right policies are not in place, nor is the breadth and quality of the datasets released sufficient.

Countries in the region have made significant progress, with South Korea and the Philippines taking the lead.

Only 7% of the key datasets published are fully open.

True impact from open data remains elusive, particularly for the region’s low or middle-income countries.

**General regional highlights and findings**

Countries in the region continue to challenge early open data leaders for top spots, with four countries now ranking in the top 10. South Korea is the top performing country in the region — 5th in the global rankings — while the Philippines leads the lower middle-income countries, ranking 22nd.

But in line with the global trend, progress on open data implementation remains slow. Only 7% of datasets analysed in the region were open, and key datasets that can be used by citizens to hold governments to account — like contracts, companies and spending data — remain closed. Indeed, spending data was the least open dataset in the region.
**East Asia and the Pacific**

**Average Score**
- Readiness average: 59/100
- Implementation average: 39/100
- Impact average: 47/100

**Readiness for open data initiatives**
- Government Policies: 45/61
- Government Action: 44/60
- Citizens and Civil Rights: 53/54
- Entrepreneurs and Business: 43/55

Civil society engagement remains strong - even in countries with a weak history of civil society participation such as Malaysia and Singapore.

Readiness of the private sector to take advantage of open data remains stagnant even though government support for innovation is increasing.

**Implementation of open data programmes**
- Innovation Datasets: 34/42
- Social Policy Datasets: 36/44
- Accountability Datasets: 27/31

Publication of innovation datasets is improving with high-income countries in the region leading the way in using data to drive economic growth.

While budget data is accessible in most countries, contracting and spending data remains closed.

**Impact that open data is having**
- Political Impact: 24/43
- Social Impact: 15/43
- Economic Impact: 16/27

There is increasing evidence that open data is improving government efficiency, both in high-income and in low/middle-income countries.

Open data impact has not yet translated into concrete improvements in the lives of ordinary people, especially for traditionally marginalised groups.

**Indonesia** ranks 38th out of 115 countries in the fourth edition of the Barometer. The country continues to improve its readiness to implement open data policies. Government collaboration with civil society on projects fostering innovation — such as Hackathon Merdeka and Compfest — shows promising support for open data at regional and national levels. However, there remains a lack of progress in the implementation and visible impact of open data in the country.

**Philippines** leads among lower middle-income countries in overall openness, ranking 22nd of 115 countries. While Freedom of Information laws have not been enacted, open data is required to be published by agencies through annual budget legislation.

Several new initiatives have capitalised on this data — with impressive results. These include Bottom-Up Budgeting, Open Reconstruction and Project NOAH, projects that seek to make budgeting and planning inclusive, bring greater scrutiny to donor and government projects, and improve capacity for disaster-preparedness.
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