



# Open Government Partnership Independent Reporting Mechanism United States Comments Received on the Third Progress Report

[Stephen Buckley](#) I am the #OpenGov rep for the U.S. Chapter of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2-USA) at <http://iap2usa.org> . I just shared this RFC with the U.S. Open Government google-group. And if you want to share your thoughts beyond this page, you can also publicly post to [OpenGovMetrics@googlegroups.com](mailto:OpenGovMetrics@googlegroups.com) (without having to subscribe).

I am encouraged by this report because it recognizes that groups like IAP2, who want to share their decades of expertise in Public Participation, have been largely excluded from doing so (see pages 99-102).

The OGP's report says that the U.S. Government's OpenGov effort (started 2009) should be more open and inclusive in developing its next "National Action Plan" (NAP 4.0), especially with the organizations whose "business" is That Very Thing, i.e., how to engage people in open and public problem-solving in the matters that affect their lives.

That "Action Plan" is being developed right now (for delivery by the end of October). See <https://open.usa.gov> . However, they appear to be repeating the same exclusionary practices that the U.S. team has been told by OGP to change, as evidenced in this report covering the previous plan (NAP 3.0) from 2015-2016.

Ironically, this #OpenGov program was supposed to get federal agencies to be better listeners to the people outside of government, because they know things that the government experts do not. But, over the last eight years, the succession of White House people put in charge of this "listening" program have VERY RARELY acted in a way that had shown they understand the need to "walk the talk" and admit that some people, outside of D.C., hold pieces of the puzzle that they do not possess.

Steve Buckley

<https://twitter.com/OpenGov...>

<https://join.me/opengovernment>

skype: opengov