IRM Data Release Cohort 1 v1.0

**Data Guide**

This guide to the IRM Data Release spreadsheet (http://bit.ly/19JaAyK) describes each variable, who responded to that variable, and, for coded variables, the possible response values. Questions about this data should be directed to irm(at)opengovpartnership.org

This dataset includes the commitments of seven of the founding eight countries: Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Philippines, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Norway was not included because the report did not include commitment-by-commitment analysis.

For coded variables—marked with an asterisk (\*)—possible values are given in italics.

**1. CaseNo**

This is a unique identifier assigned to each commitment by IRM staff.

**2. Country**

This variable codes for country putting forth commitment. Entered by IRM staff.

**3. Cluster**

In some countries, IRM researcher chose to group similar or related commitments into clusters for ease of reading and research. These were Brazil, UK, and USA. For the other four countries, this value is *none*.

**4.**  **Commitment Title**

This text is the title of the commitment as derived by the IRM researchers from the action plan. Titles were assigned to distinguish commitments from one another in action plans that did not have titles for individual commitments.

**5. Responsible Institution**

The IRM researchers entered this information, whenever the action plan designated an institution to be responsible for each commitment.

**6. Supporting Institution**

The IRM researchers entered this information, according to whether the action plan designated a supporting institution for each commitment.

**7. PoC Specified\***

The IRM researchers responded to this question asking if the action plan specified a specific individual or office as the point of contact for the commitment.

*Possible responses: Yes=1, No=0*.

**8-10. OGP Values\***

This set of binary variable shows whether each commitment involves the OGP value of ‘access to information,’ ‘participation,’ ‘accountability,’ or ‘technology and innovation for transparency and accountability.’ IRM staff and national researchers coded this information.

There are currently no fixed definitions for the OGP values (the Articles of Governance have two very different sets of definitions). To the best of their ability IRM national researchers and IRM staff applied the relevant values based on the versions in the Articles of Governance.

*Possible responses: Yes=1, No=0*.

**12-16. Grand Challenges\***

This set of binary variables shows whether each commitment involves the OGP grand challenges. IRM staff and national researchers coded this information based on the self-described relevant grand challenge. (Often, commitments were relevant to multiple grand challenges, but IRM staff coded these only according to government designated relevant challenges.)

*Possible responses: Yes=1, No=0*.

**17. Specificity\***

This variable considers how specifically and measurably each commitment was framed. IRM staff coded this information based on the following definitions.

* High (Commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal)
* Medium (Commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable, but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables)
* Low (Commitment language describes activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader)

*Possible responses: a. Low, b. Medium, c. High*

**18. Action**

This variable codes whether the commitment involved a concrete action such as initiating a program, carrying out a policy change, or implementing concrete work. IRM staff coded this information.

*Possible responses: Yes=1, No=0*.

**19. Plan**

This variable asks whether the commitment involved designing a plan to undertake future action. IRM staff coded this information.

*Possible responses: Yes=1, No=0*.

**20. Actual Completion**

This variable measures the level of completion of the commitment at the time of the IRM researchers’ analyses, based on the first year of implementation. The IRM researchers responded to this question.

*Possible responses: a. Not started, b. Limited, c. Substantial, d. Complete, NA, Unclear, Withdrawn.*

**21. Projected Completion**

This variable reports the commitment’s projected level of completion at the time of analysis, according to the action plan’s own schedule or, where no such schedule was provided, according to the expertise of the researcher. The IRM researchers responded to this question.

*Possible responses: a. Not started, b. Limited, c. Substantial, d. Complete, NA, Unclear, Withdrawn*

**22. Next Y/N**

This variable codes for whether the researcher recommends further action. The IRM researchers coded this information.

*Possible responses: Yes=1, No=0*.

**23. Next steps**

This variable asks specifically what further action, if any, the commitment requires. The IRM researchers coded this information.

*Possible responses:*

* *Continued work on basic implementation (implementation was not completed, more effort is required to finish it.)*
* *Extension based on existing implementation (a new commitment in the same vein as this commitment)*
* *Significant revision of the commitment (a new commitment on this topic, but one that significantly reformulates the original commitment)*
* *Maintenance and monitoring (no new commitment required)*
* *No further action required*

**24. Full text**

This contains the full text of the commitment, in the original language from the action plan. At times the IRM staff carried out light editing (such as copying headings from above the text) to