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Abstract

The Open Government Initiative was meant to be one of the signature initiatives of the Obama Administration. This capstone is a high-level analysis of federal agency implementation of the Initiative. It quantifies quality of participation and attempts to establish a relationship between certain agency characteristics and enhanced compliance with or participation in the Initiative. All federal agencies participating in the Open Government Initiative are considered, regardless of compulsory compliance, entity size, or level. The study found that both agency budget and number of full-time equivalent (FTE) positions affected whether or not an agency chose to participate. Finally, it establishes that some agencies with very limited capacity have participated to some extent with various aspects of the Open Government Initiative.
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Introduction

On January 21, 2009, his first full day in office, President Barack Obama signed the Open Government Initiative (OGI), a call for executive agencies to incorporate a culture of transparency, participation, and collaboration into every aspect of operation. During the 2008 campaign, then-candidate Obama noted the importance of harnessing knowledge through a more open government, saying that: “Knowledge is widely dispersed in society, and public officials benefit from having access to that dispersed knowledge” (Obama as quoted in Sifry, 2010, p. 115).

Agencies are using a variety of methods to achieve these lofty goals. Some common methods include the use of social/new media, more solicitation of public comment, and the publication of datasets both on agencies’ own websites and on data.gov, the government data repository launched in conjunction with the Open Government Initiative.

No previous analysis has been made of the OGI’s implementation across executive agencies. Initial implementation efforts of the OGI have focused primarily on the transparency aspects of the Initiative. This paper exclusively examines agency transparency efforts in online environments and factors affecting agency participation in the OGI. Finally, levels of compliance and enhanced compliance were measured, filling a gap in previous knowledge about agency implementation of the OGI.

Literature

To date, no U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports have been issued directly related to OGI participation by federal agencies. One report that touches on some issues tangentially related to issues included in this study part of the OGI is “Challenges in Federal Agencies’ Use of Web 2.0 Technologies” (2010). This report identifies some of the difficulties that agencies using social/new media have faced and, when known, the agencies’ responses to the challenges.

I was also unable to find any independent reports issued by non-profit groups on this subject. There are many “sunshine” groups that seek to promote government accountability and data transparency and occasionally publish reports about the issues, but I could not locate any studies conducted by these groups regarding the breadth or depth of agency participation in the OGI. Several reports address exemplary or deficient agency plans and implementation methods (Lukensmayer 2011; Jones, French, & Willard 2010; Noveck 2010), but none address overall participation.

Additionally, no tool or metric exists that I could use to quantify or evaluate participation. There is a tool, the Open Government Portfolio Public Value Assessment Tool (PVAT) (Towns, 2011) that analyzes individual open government plans to determine their public value, but it was not applicable for this study because it is intended for internal use by agency personnel to make open government plans more valuable for public use (ibid). As a result, I developed a metric to use while conducting the content analysis used to gather data for this study.

Finally, the White House maintains an “Open Government Dashboard” on the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) website. The Dashboard (previously called the “Scorecard”) shows how Chief Financial Officers Act (“CFO Act”) agencies and participating White House Offices are progressing towards 10 different OGI goals. It only addresses progress among CFO Act agencies, not all participating entities, and was not fully responsive to my needs as a result. A more exhaustive explanation of the CFO Act and its implications on agency transparency can be found in Appendix B, in the list of key definitions.
Methodology

In order to complete this study, I conducted content analysis of the public-facing Open Government webpages of participating agencies. As mentioned earlier, there was no existing tool to evaluate overall OGI compliance/participation. I developed a metric to quantify and analyze some data collected related to OGI participation and compliance.

Data were collected in July 2011 and analyzed between August 2011 and January 2012. In general, there are three key background points to my methodology:

1. I used the entire population of federal agencies (n=161), not a sample.
2. I only attempted to access publicly available information and data using a common web browser. One of the Open Government Initiative’s primary goals is to make government data more accessible to the general public and because of this goal, I chose to base my findings only on data that can be accessed by the general public, without special experience or equipment.
3. I identified compliance minimums of the OGI (Appendix D) and conducted a content analysis of agency websites. Only agencies with an “/open” domain (e.g. www.justice.gov/open) were considered to be “participating in the OGI,” because this is the public-facing open government web address for all federal agencies (for a full list of key definitions, see Appendix B). Without the public-facing open government web address, members of the general public would not know that the agency was participating in the OGI in a meaningful or official way. Finally, if an agency has an /open domain, I considered it as a participant, even if the domain was the only publicly available evidence of participation.

Seven of the eight compliance minimums (plan publication, establishment of a /open page, designation of a senior agency official in charge of data integrity, publication of information online, publication in open formats, and allowance for public comment on the /open page) were Boolean values. Their presence or absence was measured with either 1 or 0 points assigned. For instance, if there was no link to an agency’s open government plan, it yielded 0 points. A link to it yielded 1 point.

Unfortunately, data were collected for another purpose in July, 2011, and by the time the metric was developed, it was impossible to run a test for intercoder reliability, due to the frequently changing nature of information published on agency websites. This was the most significant reliability threat that I encountered.

After determining participation, I used my metric to award quality points to agencies that have exceeded the minimum data publication. Of the eight areas related to transparency in the OGI, the data publication compliance point is quantitative in nature, requiring agencies to publish three high-value datasets. The metric accounts for non-compliance and exceptional compliance for the quantitative areas. Points were assigned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete (basic) compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150% compliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200% compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 200% compliance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Quantitative Metric
Thus, hypothetically, if an agency published 23 datasets on data.gov, 8 of which it had designated as high-value, I would award 3 quality points for data publication.

To better understand factors affecting an agency’s likelihood to have enhanced OGI participation, I used the proposed 2012 federal budget to determine requested agency funding and each agency’s requested full-time equivalent (FTE) positions for the 2012-2013 year. I used two proxies for agency capacity so that I could compare the results of each measure, ensuring that each measure yielded valid results.

Although a federal budget has not been passed since 2010, I chose to use the 2012 fiscal year proposed budgets from the agencies. I chose to use the proposed budgets rather than the continuing resolutions because I believed they would more accurately represent the agencies’ perceived needs. The 2012 budgets were used for both FTE and budget figures.

In combination, the FTE positions and budget variables were used as a proxy for agency size and capacity. I then used statistical software to run t- and chi square tests, determining relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Generally, the dependent variable measured was agencies’ OGI transparency as measured by data and navigation on data.gov and /open domains.

A list of coding elements is attached as Appendix C, but in general, the independent variables that I analyzed were:
- Position in agency hierarchy (explained below);
- Representation on the Open Government Working Group;
- Presence on the White House Scorecard; and
- Capacity (measured by two different variables: number of FTE positions and funding quartiles).

In addition to this analysis, I completed an analysis of participating agencies’ social media presence to determine the rate at which agencies participating in the OGI maintain a social media presence. I chose to do this analysis because social media use is one of ways that the Obama administration has effectively reached new groups of constituents, and arguably one of the most important advancements of the administration (Harfoush, p. 46). Additionally, social media tools commonly used by government entities, such as Facebook and Twitter, are free tools. I was interested to see whether or not social media tools were used by agencies with lower capacity since they require few additional resources. Finally, the terms of service agreements that allow social media use by government entities were negotiated by the U.S. General Services Administration during the Obama administration in response to the Open Government Directive (GSA, “Terms of Service”). To determine social media usage, I looked first on agency /open pages for widgets directing visitors to social media platforms (e.g. “Like us on Facebook!” or “Follow us on Twitter!”). If nothing was found on the /open page, then I searched for the agency on Facebook because it is the most commonly used social media platform (Leggatt).

Content analysis allowed a degree of flexibility in research that would not have been possible if I used a different method (Hsieh & Shannon, p. 1277). I could interpret the text and make statistical comparisons between elements in the textual data (Mehmetoglu, p. 178), then make statistical
comparisons between the elements. Descriptive content analysis is frequently done in the earliest study of a particular area (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, p. 34), making it particularly fitting for this study, as it is the first known one of its kind.

Findings

Participating executive departments, independent agencies and corporations, and boards, commissions, and committees (full list located in Appendix E) were evaluated on several criteria.

The hierarchy of federal agencies is as follows:

I. Executive Department (Cabinet-level; subject to the CFO Act)
II. Independent Agency or Corporation (sub-Cabinet level; wide budgetary range; some subject to the CFO Act)
III. Board, Commission, or Committee (sub-Cabinet level; budgets under $1 billion; none subject to the CFO Act).

Moving down the hierarchy, the entities become less likely to participate in the Open Government Initiative. Figure 1 shows this phenomenon. Likewise, moving down the hierarchy, participating agencies are less likely to meet or exceed the compliance minimums set by the OGI. This could be due to differences in agency mission and culture.

Statistical analysis of the data indicates that both budget and FTE capacity are statistically significant on participation, at the 95% confidence interval. With regard to the FTE capacity indicator, this means that agencies with an FTE level above the overall median (which was 1365 FTE employees) were more likely to participate in the OGI, and agencies with an FTE level at or below the median were less likely to participate. A chart detailing the statistical tests performed and the results is attached as Appendix A.

Budget was also statistically significant. Those agencies in the highest budgetary band (over $1 billion) were far more likely to participate, and those in the lowest budgetary band (under $25 million) were less likely to participate. Analysis of the bands in the middle did not indicate any statistical significance. This chart can be found in Appendix A.

Presence on the OMB Dashboard (White House Scorecard) and representation in the White House Open Government Working Group (a group consisting of senior officials from OGI-participating agencies convened by the OMB) were not tested for statistical significance because the vast majority of the agencies on the Dashboard and represented in the Working Group were Executive Departments, and all of them were required to comply with the OGI.

One purely observational finding is that the agencies in the first and second FTE quartiles of the independent agency designation, as well as participating boards, commissions, or committees may not be meeting the OGI minimum requirements, but they appear to be picking and choosing the part of the OGI that are most useful to their agencies and implementing those. For instance, the Vietnam Education Foundation, with a modest budget of $5 million, has not released datasets on data.gov. They have very few, if any,
high-value datasets to release. However, they are using some techniques—such as social media—which are more intuitive for their mission of outreach and education. Three-quarters of the participating Boards, Commissions, or Committees are using social media, whereas fewer than half of the agencies overall are using social media.

Implications and Recommendations

This study suggests that both agency budget and FTE capacity have an impact on implementation of the Open Government Initiative. Human resources and funding, my measures for agency capacity, appear to each have an impact on the breadth and depth of agency participation, but the study’s results also imply that even small agencies without significant financial or human resources are occasionally choosing to participate in the OGI, at least in some measures.

Participation by agencies with limited capacity indicates that the small agencies are identifying some benefits to participation, even if they do not fully comply with the letter of the Initiative. Even the smallest agencies can apparently benefit from some of the common implementation techniques, and have access to some of the advances made as a result of the implementation efforts of the White House and many of the larger agencies. For instance, many small agencies have developed a social media presence in recent years. The terms of service agreements for many social media platforms were negotiated only after the OGI was signed (U.S. General Services Administration, 2011). This implies that smaller agencies may be picking and choosing what works best for their missions and capacities, rather than straining already limited resources to fully comply with the OGI.

I recommend that further studies be conducted to make concrete recommendations to agencies and government entities with limited resources and capacities about how to employ open government techniques and principles. In particular, two further studies would be useful:

1. A study that determines if participation really is only a matter of funding and resources, or if there are other motivating factors driving participation, such as agency mission and culture (including characteristics of agency leaders and organizational structure).
2. A qualitative study that addresses what participation benefits smaller agencies have identified. My study implies that agencies are identifying some benefits themselves, but I believe that more research would be useful to establish best practices for open government implementation at various agency levels.

These two studies would help open government activists understand why some agencies choose to participate and others do not, even if the agencies appear to be peers. They would also help sunshine groups make a practical case for participation to agencies that remain undecided.

Conclusion

The Open Government Initiative, a major policy initiative of the Obama administration, has been adopted by many federal agencies to varying degrees. This paper examined levels of participation with transparency portions of the OGI in online environments and found that both agency budget and FTE employee capacity are statistically significant in agency participation. Additionally, a steady decline in participation occurs as one moves down the agency hierarchy. This decline also holds true for representation on the OMB Dashboard and in the White House Open Government Working Group. Finally, it suggests that even agencies with limited budget and resources that lack significant data assets may still derive some benefit from participating in the OGI.
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Appendix A: Tests for Statistical Significance

**T-test**
This t-test performed on the budgetary bands shows that the lowest band (band 1, under $25 million) and the highest band (band 6, over $1 billion) were both statistically significant on the dependent variable of participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: T-Test for Statistical Significance</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>budgetband1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-4.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-5.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>budgetband2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>budgetband3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>budgetband4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>budgetband5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>budgetband6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>5.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-Square Test

The Chi-Square test was performed to determine the significance of FTE capacity on participation. The tables below indicate that agencies with more than the median number of employees (1365) are statistically more likely to participate in the OGI. Likewise, those agencies with fewer than the median are less likely to participate.

The case summary table below gives the overview of the total n for the tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Summary of Median Number of FTE Employees</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation * FTEovermedian</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Crosstabulation table below shows the number of agencies above and below the median number of FTEs participating and not participating with the OGI. So, based on this chart, we can see that there are eight agencies with fewer than 1365 FTE employees that are not participating in the OGI at all. Likewise, there are 24 agencies with fewer than 1365 that are participating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Crosstabulation Results of FTE Employees Over Median and Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTEovermedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the Chi-Square test below tests the impact of the number of FTE employees that an agency has on participation. As seen by the chi-square value, the number of FTEs is statistically significant on participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Chi-Square Test for Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correctionb</td>
<td>2.787</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3.992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B: Key Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition and Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boards, Commissions, and Committees</td>
<td>“These organizations were established by congressional or Presidential action, and their functions are not limited to supporting a parent agency.” From: usa.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Act</td>
<td>The CFO Act is a law signed in 1990 by President George H.W. Bush. It was an attempt to create greater financial accountability within 24 high-profile executive agencies. It broadened the responsibilities of OMB and established financial accountability officers (CFO’s) within the agencies affected by the Act. Information and full text located here: <a href="http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/af12194.pdf">http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/af12194.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Agencies were determined to be in compliance with various elements of the OGi if they met the minimum requirements set by OMB in the Directive and Memorandum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Integrity</td>
<td>The appointment of an upper-level manager to be “accountable for the quality and objectivity of, and internal controls over, the Federal spending information publicly disseminated through such public venues as USAspending.gov or other similar websites.” From: USAID /open page, but common definition across many agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Department</td>
<td>Those entities part of the Executive Branch of the government whose heads serve as part of the President’s Cabinet. From: usa.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-value</td>
<td>High value datasets are defined as such by the individual agencies. Generally, “[h]igh value information is information that can be used to increase agency accountability and responsiveness; improve public knowledge of the agency and its operations; further the core mission of the agency; create economic opportunity; correspond to need and demand as identified through public consultation.&quot; From: Kundra via Wendy Ginsberg CRS Report (&quot;Issues for Congress&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Agency or Corporation</td>
<td>&quot;Independent establishments are created by Congress to address concerns that go beyond the scope of ordinary legislation. These agencies are responsible for keeping the government and economy running smoothly.&quot; From: usa.gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government Directive and Memorandum</td>
<td>The memorandum issued by then-OMB Director Peter Orszag on December 8, 2009 to heads of executive agencies that laid out the groundwork for the open government movement in America. Located at: <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/documents/open-government-directive">http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/documents/open-government-directive</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Government Working Group</strong></td>
<td>A group comprised of senior-level officials from executive agencies that meets to address transparency, participation, and collaboration in the Federal Government. Includes representatives from cabinet-level agencies as well as those independent agencies whose missions are sufficiently close to the goals of the Open Government Initiative. Agencies represented on the Working Group are compelled to comply with the OGI. Full list located at: <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/documents/open-government-directive/working-group">http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/documents/open-government-directive/working-group</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/New Media</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Federal agencies are increasingly using recently developed technologies (commonly referred to as &quot;Web 2.0&quot; technologies) that offer flexible, sophisticated capabilities for interaction with individuals, allowing agencies and the public to publish comments, photos, and videos directly on agency-sponsored Web pages.&quot; From: <a href="http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/125110.pdf">http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/125110.pdf</a>. Includes social networking platforms, wiki spaces, and blogs. Specific platforms include, but are not limited to: Facebook, Twitter, FourSquare, LinkedIn, Flickr, MySpace, YouTube, Vimeo, and iTunes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White House Scorecard</strong></td>
<td>Also known as: &quot;White House Open Government Dashboard.&quot; A matrix on the White House Open Government page that tracks the progress of various executive agencies in achieving open government. Located at: <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/around">http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/around</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Coding Elements

The following headings appeared across the top row. Each agency was coded for these elements.

Agency
Main Website /open Page?
Number of Data Sets Released
Data Set Quality Points
Data Integrity
Data Integrity Binary Measure
Public Comment/ Consultation
Social Media Binary Measure
Published Plan
Binary Plan Measure
PLAIN Language Published?
Represented on Working Group?
Binary Working Group Measure
Represented on Scorecard?
Binary Scorecard Measure
FTE Employees (2012 Requested)
FTE Quartile (within Agency level)
Total Budget (2012 requested)
Budgetary Quartile (within Agency level)
Budget over $1 billion (1 or 0)
Budget $500 million - $1 billion (1 or 0)
Budget $100 million - $500 million (1 or 0)
Budget $50 million - $100 million (1 or 0)
Budget $25-50 million (1 or 0)
Budget less than $25 million (1 or 0)
Date Data Accessed

The following headings went down the first column on my code sheet. Each agency designation was populated according to usa.gov.

Executive Department
Independent Agency/Corporation
Board, Commission, or Committee
Other Participating Offices

Note: Entities that fell under the “Other Participating Offices” designation were not included in the statistical analysis, because no comprehensive list of quasi-independent offices exists. The “other participating offices” found were found because of their representation on the White House Scorecard or the Working Group.
### Open Government Directive and Memorandum Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create /open website that includes mechanisms for public to: 1) Give feedback on information published; 2) Provide input on what info to publish (prioritization); 3) Provide input on agency’s Plan.</td>
<td>Increase public awareness of open government activities</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish information online in addition to other formats*</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish 3 new, high-value datasets on data.gov</td>
<td>Increase transparency and access</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Proactively disseminate data&quot; (do not wait for FOIA requests)</td>
<td>Increase transparency and access</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish FOIA report on /open page</td>
<td>Increase transparency and access</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce FOIA backlog by 10% each year</td>
<td>Increase transparency and access</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Presidential open government activities: 1) data.gov 2) eRulemaking 3) IT Dashboard 4) recovery.gov 5) USAspending.gov</td>
<td>Increase transparency and access Create agency buy-in</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and publish an open gov plan</td>
<td>Improve transparency, incorporate participation and collaboration into the culture</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the plan every two years</td>
<td>Improve transparency, incorporate participation and collaboration into the culture</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB will convene a working group</td>
<td>Improve transparency, incorporate participation and collaboration into the culture; create a forum to discuss best practices</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish in open format</td>
<td>Be machine-readable/searchable and promote re-use</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to input received from public</td>
<td>engage citizens</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate a senior official to be in charge of info quality</td>
<td>Improve accountability</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail internal controls over info quality</td>
<td>Improve accountability</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comply with OMB guidelines, report spending quarterly</td>
<td>Increase spending transparency</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIRA, the CIO, and the CTO will review policies to identify impediments to the use of new technologies</td>
<td>Allow the use of emerging technologies for open government; find and eliminate roadblocks</td>
<td>Memorandum, pg. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Points in **bold** were evaluated for this study.
Appendix E: Participating Agencies

Executive Departments:

- Agriculture (USDA)
- Commerce (DOC)
- Defense (DOD)
- Education (ED)
- Energy (DOE)
- Health and Human Services (HHS)
- Homeland Security (DHS)
- Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- Justice (DOJ)
- Labor (DOL)
- State (DOS)
- Interior (DOI)
- Treasury
- Transportation (DOT)
- Veterans Affairs (VA)

Independent Agencies/Corporations:

- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)
- Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
- Corporation for National and Community Service
- Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB)
- Director of National Intelligence (DNI)
- Election Assistance Committee (EAC)
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
- Export-Import Bank of the United States (EXIM)
- Farm Credit Administration (FCA)
- Federal Communications Commission (FCC)
- Federal Deposit Insurance Commission (FDIC)
- Federal Election Commission (FEC)
- Federal Housing Finance Authority (FHFA)
- Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA)
- Federal Reserve Board
- Federal Trade Commission (FTC)
- Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)
- Inter-American Foundation
- International Broadcasting Bureau
- Merit System Protection Board
Millennium Challenge Corporation
National Aeronautics and Space Association (NASA)
National Archives and Records Administration (NARA)
National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)
National Credit Union Association (NCUA)
National Endowment for the Arts
National Endowment for the Humanities
National Labor Relations Board
National Mediation Board
National Science Foundation
National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB)
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission
Office of Government Ethics
Office of Personnel Management
Office of Overseas Private Investment Corporation
Peace Corps
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Railroad Retirement Board
Securities and Exchange Commission
Selective Service System
Small Business Association (SBA)
Social Security Administration (SSA)
Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)
US Trade and Development Agency
US Agency for International Development (USAID)
US International Trade Commission

**Boards, Commissions, and Committees:**

United States Access Board
Morris K. and Stewart L. Udall Foundation
National Indian Gaming Commission
Vietnam Education Foundation