Hopes

Ideally, every agency implementing a commitment will identify it and an accountable official at agency.gov/open so there is both transparency and accountability in the process. The GSA could lead by example here with usgsa.gov/open and the commitments you are implementing, with a point of contact

Accountability

To veriify the completion of each activity, all activities should be listed in advance, with a planed date for completion

I hope that you all look beyond existing commitments as it feels odd to be focused only on the tracker in such a collaborative way when the NAP committments themselves could have been created in a more collaborative manner.

Tracking all groups that are supposed to opening up data but aren't or are not updating their data

It would also be excellent if the GSA would include the lead institution that is accountable for implementing a given commitment and point of contact at that agency; all of those fields are currently empty on the OGP commitment pages.

a best practice is to identify the responsible agency, desk, name of public servant and an email

Here is a good practice by an OGP commitment-tracker, from Argentina: https://metas.argentina.gob.ar/

Evaluate is subcommitments are milestones or independent.

In the commitment structure it is vital to know and describe how the agency expects the intervention to know if the commitment changed anything or if we are meeting progress.

A good practice would be that with every update, the responsible agency makes a public commitment to the update and thaves qeustions and interaect with the public.

We can add colors to signal commitments progress and promote healty competition and agency ownership

OGP Policy and NAP

Tracking outcomes rather than deliverables

Enabling notifications to alert interested parties so they don't need to go looking for it

Consider regular updates via newsletter, social, and press releases to highlight progress

Functionality

Process fro verification of data

way to report outdated or incorrect data

Data versioning

Data Quality

Look into ODI's best practices

Knowledge base to help with findability of the data

APIs so tracker info can be incorporated into other tools

Tracking and Alerts

there are notifications for each update on progress, maybe under subscription basis

how how commitments from the first four NAPs opened US government, linking to final self-assessments, so the American public can understand why the administration is now pursuing these commitments in a fifth plan.

How has public engagement in developing past Open Gov National Action Plans evolved? What successes and failures have informed your current approach to inform other open federal initiatives?

Interactive near real-time dashboard to explore data

Clear and granular filter

better data mining apfunctions

hope the information is easy to use

Archiving data at internet archive so data can survive different regimes

Understanding how Open Gov Plan informs and supports other open and participatory federal legislations and priorities (citizen science, EJ, public access)

Fears

data formats are compatible for some time - not having to restore data "manually "

Data Safety

lack of Open Data standards resulting in unusable or in accurate data

Hope the information can't be changed by others - so that the data can't be stolen

data will be pulled down when no longer prioritized

No Data Versioning or lack of traceability

"Ticking the box"/ Engagement & Collaboration

I fear this session re: the tracker will be seen as serving the purpose of co-collaboration for developing NAP committments

Open government is too narrowly focused on open access to data. Hoping it includes open science and innovation initiatives.

is this about Open Data or more specific? - clarity

Collaborative now but is it "putting the cart before the horse?" - after the fact

he commitments in this plan were not co-created with civil society

One of my fears is that the new #OpenGov Team will have so much of an "Optimism Bias" .. that they will ignore "lessons-never-learned" by their predecessors.

One fear is that agencies will claim any progress without anything to compare or evaluate if they are following what they planned

no clear accountability or traceability of data

"User Experience"

the content managerment U/I is npyuser friendly

Lack of findability

Poor interfaces to the data that limits functionality

too much data and unable to sort

the response time is slow or times out

Not user friendly terminology - "Governmentese"