



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



After-Action Review: 2015 USAID Latin America and the Caribbean Hackathon



Bureau for Management

Office of Management Policy, Budget and Performance, Performance Division

December 2015

Quick Facts: 2015 Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC) Hackathon

After-Action Review Report

In Spring 2015, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) held its first Latin America and the Caribbean Hackathon facilitated by the Bureau for Management (M Bureau).

The two-day event attracted an estimated 100 participants representing a cross-section of stakeholders. Participants worked in teams alongside USAID experts, to develop eight projects using the Agency's [open datasets](#).

Why a Hackathon? The Obama Administration supports the use of Hackathons in fostering government innovation. * Furthermore, [USAID's open data policy](#), found in [Automated Directives System \(ADS\) 579](#), reinforces USAID's commitment to being forward leaning on transparency by making Agency-funded data broadly accessible to the public. The Hackathon is one example of how the Agency is fulfilling this commitment.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to summarize the findings from an internal review of the planning process for USAID's 2015 Latin America and the Caribbean Hackathon.

The findings in this report present lessons learned that will inform future approaches to developing hackathons at USAID, or similar open data gatherings.

The M Bureau coordinated the Hackathon with input provided by subject matter experts from across USAID. Subject matter experts represented USAID's Bureaus for Latin America and the Caribbean; Policy, Planning and Learning; U.S. Global Development Lab; and the M Bureau's Offices of Management Policy, Budget, and Performance and of the Chief Information Officer.

2015 WINNING TEAM

A team of professionals from the [Futures Group – Guatemala](#) created the winning project “Visualizations of Northern Triangle Perceptions of Crime and Violence.” The product is an interactive infographic that provides a demographic snapshot of the residents of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, and depicts the views of the countries' residents about the most pressing societal challenges facing their communities. Findings reveal that residents perceive corruption in social institutions, crime, violence, and the economy as major problems. The winning team created the project based on public opinion data from the [Latin American Public Opinion Project](#), funded by USAID and implemented by Vanderbilt University. **

* For example, the White House has hosted several of its own hackathons ([Announcing We the People 2.0 and a White House Hackathon \(2013\)](#); [Improving Accessibility of Government Websites \(2015\)](#); [Looking Back at the White House Hackathon \(2013\)](#)).

**A panel of experts selected the winner of USAID's 2015 LAC Hackathon based on a set of criteria adapted from the Desarrollando América Latina's hackathon scoring card. A copy of the scorecard used during USAID's 2015 Hackathon is enclosed in Annex A.

Executive Summary: Key Recommendations at a Glance

Table 1 covers recommendations gleaned from conducting the 2015 Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) Hackathon After-Action Review (AAR). This table also identifies a suggested owner to lead the implementation of each of the recommendations. See Annex B for a description of the roles and responsibilities for implementing these recommendations.

Table 1. Recommendations and Suggested Owner

Recommendations		Owner
Issue 1: Lack of a defined problem for the hackers to solve		
1.1	At the onset of the planning process, align the primary objective of the hackathon to contribute directly to USAID’s program, project design, or management operations, and reach a consensus on the purpose with internal stakeholders.	Responsible Operating Unit (OU) Leadership
1.2	Organize the planning team to identify a general framework for integrating the project(s) that will be created during the hackathon into the Agency’s programming and planning activities, and enlist the proper buy-in from internal stakeholders.	Hackathon Project Manager
Issue 2: Internal stakeholder coordination and communications		
2.1	Members of the planning team should regularly convene to discuss the status of the planning process. The project manager should use the discussions as a platform to enlist input, get buy-in, and keep stakeholders updated.	Hackathon Project Manager
2.2	Planners should engage the Office of the General Counsel (GC) to devise a strategy for fielding unsolicited offers from participants and other interested parties looking to provide USAID donations (including in-kind services) for the a hackathon. There needs to be at least one month of lead-time prior to the hackathon to properly follow the Agency’s procedures for accepting donations per ADS 628 “Gifts and Donations and Dollar Trust Fund Management,” and other procedural guidelines outlined by GC.	Hackathon Project Manager
Issue 3: Deliverable timetables and clearly defined clearance channels		
3.1	Once there is planning team consensus and OU leadership approval for the hackathon’s vision and desired outcome, allow at least five to six months to plan and externally communicate the hackathon. When developing the project plan, identify key event milestones that USAID will need to accomplish at project onset, monitor milestone progress, as well as confirm what deliverables will need clearance, who is responsible for completing each deliverable and who should be included in the clearance process.	Hackathon Project Manager
3.2	At the onset of the planning process, incorporate any lessons learned from the planners of other USAID-funded hackathons or similar events.	Hackathon Project Manager

Issue 4: Institutional capacity and role of working-level staff		
4.1	Commit sufficient human resources to the planning process, and divide responsibilities among staff that have the necessary expertise and knowledge.	Responsible OU Leadership
4.2	Consider ensuring that the project manager resides in the OU that will directly benefit from the projects that are created by participants.	Responsible OU Leadership
4.3	Leadership of OUs represented on the hackathon planning team should actively engage and hold staff accountable for participation and for recruitment of external participants.	Responsible OU Leadership
4.4	Prior to the event, test off-site audio and video equipment well in advance; ensure all lines are muted and that phone participants can hear those speaking in the room. A single microphone in a large room may not provide enough coverage for phone participants to hear. Also, provide multiple call-in lines for each break-out group during the event, so that remote participants feel more directly connected to the event and can actively contribute to break-out groups.	Logistics Coordinator
Issue 5: Insufficient representation of desired skill sets and regional and sector knowledge		
5.1	Develop a communications plan that accounts for the Agency or OU's desired outcomes, identify the relevant stakeholder groups best suited to help achieve those outcomes, and tailor event messages to spark interest and encourage attendance.	Communications Lead
5.2	Promote participant buy-in by soliciting their input on the event approach during the planning phase, and inform participants in advance how USAID will judge the hackathon. Maintain a database of kudos received for marketing purposes after the event.	Hackathon Project Manager/Communications Lead
5.3	Ensure a system is in place for tracking attendance and the demographic makeup of the participants to help inform the communication strategy and participant engagement prior to and after the hackathon, and for assigning key subject matter experts to teams at the hackathon.	Logistics Coordinator

Table of Contents

Quick Facts: 2015 Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC) Hackathon After-Action Review Report.....	i
Executive Summary: Key Recommendations at a Glance	ii
Introduction.....	2
Background.....	2
Methodology	3
What did we intend to do?.....	3
What actually happened?	4
Lack of clear problem to solve	4
Ill-defined team structure	4
Unclear guidance to participants and time constraints	5
Unclear communications and clearances.....	5
What went well, and why?.....	6
What can be improved, and how? (Recommendations).....	6
Issue 1: Lack of a defined problem for the hackers to solve	6
Issue 2: Internal stakeholder coordination and communications.....	6
Issue 3: Deliverable timetables and clearly defined clearance channels	7
Issue 4: Institutional capacity and role of working-level staff.....	7
Issue 5: Insufficient representation of desired skill sets and regional and sector knowledge.....	8
Conclusion	8
Annex A: USAID’s 2015 Hackathon Scorecard.....	9
Annex B: Roles and Responsibilities	10
Annex C: Focus Group Participants	12
Annex D: Bibliography	13

Introduction

“The value of data used in strategic planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of programs is enhanced when those data are made available throughout the Agency and to all other interested stakeholders, in accordance with proper protection and redaction allowable by law.”

- [USAID, ADS 579](#)

USAID is committed to transparency and openness in how it fulfills its mission. One way the Agency demonstrates this commitment is through the institutionalization of an Agency-wide open data policy, “ADS 579 – USAID Development Data,” which increases the public’s access to USAID’s foreign assistance data and the results achieved for the dollars spent. This commitment stems from the Obama Administration’s unprecedented pledge to open government by charging federal agencies with making its data readily available by default.¹ USAID upholds this obligation by promulgating a series of policies and procedures that shape practices for making its data more accessible.

USAID’s 2015 Latin America and the Caribbean Hackathon (“Hackathon”) is another example of how the Agency is promoting openness and transparency with the public. This after-action report (AAR) reflects an internal assessment of the planning process leading up to the event. Findings from this report can help the Agency improve the efficiency and effectiveness of future hackathons.

Background

Hackathons are intense, citizen-driven, collaborative efforts among external data experts and computer programmers to generate innovative technology-based projects to improve a societal problem. Hackathons employ an array of new approaches and methodologies within a limited amount of time and resources. The Obama Administration supports the use of hackathons in fostering government innovation²; however, for these events to succeed within the federal government, they should focus on generating products that have utility to the hosting agency.

USAID hosted a Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) Hackathon from April 30, 2015 through May 1, 2015, at the Open Gov Hub in Washington, D.C. An estimated 100 software developers and other individuals from across the United States and LAC region participated in the event as “hackers.” These hackers self-selected into teams and created eight separate projects using USAID’s datasets

¹ In 2012 the White House issued the report “Digital Government: Building a 21st Century Platform to Better Serve the American People” which identified open platforms as a tool to implement innovative measures and methods in fostering government innovation by engaging the public. A listing of the directives is included in the bibliography. Furthermore, the [Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government \(2009\)](#), and the [Executive Order](#) and [OMB Policy on Open Data](#) and other directives as listed in the bibliography have been issued throughout President Obama’s presidency, collectively call for federal agencies to implement innovative measures and methods for promoting transparency, broad participation, and collaboration. As a result, USAID and other agencies are charged with harnessing new technologies, broadly engaging the public, and providing the public with platforms to stay informed about the government’s operations and be civically engaged throughout the decision making process. Hackathons are one example of a mechanism for achieving these goals.

² For example the White House has hosted several of its own hackathons ([Announcing We the People 2.0 and a White House Hackathon \(2013\)](#); [Improving Accessibility of Government Websites \(2015\)](#); [Looking Back at the White House Hackathon \(2013\)](#)).

about Central America and other secondary sources at their discretion. At the end of the competition, a panel of open data experts selected the winning project called the [“Visualizations of Northern Triangle Perceptions of Crime and Violence.”](#) The panel used a set of criteria adapted from the Desarrollando América Latina’s hackathon scoring card to select the winner.

Methodology

This AAR is based on a review of: 1) feedback from the 19 staff who planned the 2015 LAC Hackathon; 2) feedback from the participants; 3) a literature review of online articles about hackathons; 4) internal debriefing and planning documents; 5) external engagement materials; 6) USAID’s open data policy (ADS 579); and 7) a series of Presidential mandates and policy directives.³ A full bibliography and listing of the staff who provided feedback are enclosed (see Annex C).

Staff provided feedback during a series of focus group discussions. Focus groups responded to four standard questions:⁴

- 1) What did we intend to do?
- 2) What actually happened?
- 3) What went well, and why?
- 4) What can be improved, and how?

What did we intend to do?

M/MPBP’s leadership had a three-pronged intended purpose for the LAC Hackathon:

- 1) Promoting public awareness about available open datasets in USAID’s Development Data Library (DDL);
- 2) Exploring linkages between the datasets in the DDL on other USAID data assets such as the [Development Experience Clearinghouse](#) , [Foreign Assistance Dashboard](#), the [Economic Analysis and Data Services](#), and other USAID websites; and
- 3) Exploring how USAID could use a hackathon to enhance Agency programming and reporting.

However, other planning team members’ perspectives of the intent varied depending on factors such as purview, level of involvement

“If a federal agency is going to host a hackathon it takes a lot of planning and collaboration. An agency is going to want to be very deliberate about the way that [sic] set the requirements for a hackathon so that they get good results, because frankly the hackathon culture needs to be part of a pattern of engagement on a larger basis within the agency, for it to work,” said Zachary Bastian, author of [The Power of Hackathons: A Roadmap for Sustainable Open Innovation](#) (qtd. in, Jarvis 2013).

³ President Obama’s Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government (2009); Executive Order, “Making Open and Machine Readable the New Default for Government Information” (2013); the White House strategy titled “Digital Government: Building a 21st Century Platform to Better Serve the American People” (2012); and OMB Memoranda M-13-13 “Open Data Policy-Managing Information as an Asset” (2013), M-10-06 “Open Government Directive”(2009), and M-09-12 “President’s Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government - Interagency Collaboration” (2009).

⁴ The methodology used for the focus group discussions follows the technical guidance covered in [USAID’s AAR report, dated February 2006 \(PN-ADF-360\)](#).

in building out the event, and the amount of previous experience with hackathons. Accordingly, there was no clear consensus as to the 2015 Hackathon's purpose.

Furthermore, in spirit of openness and inclusion, the intent was to encourage widespread participation at the Hackathon. Therefore, certain measures were taken to enable remote participation during the event. A call line was set-up, a microphone was put into place, and video streaming capabilities were established as part of the planning process.

What actually happened?

Few members of the planning team were familiar with hackathons, how the Agency should structure them, or what they could achieve. As a result, few members of the planning team agreed on or understood the purpose of the 2015 LAC Hackathon. This dissonance resulted in four key issues:

- 1) Lack of clear problem to solve
- 2) Ill-defined team structure
- 3) Unclear guidance to participants and time constraints
- 4) Unclear communications and clearances

Lack of clear problem to solve

In July 2014, the Bureau for Management, Office of Management Policy, Budget, and Performance (M/MPBP) leadership approved the concept of an open data hackathon to explore links between USAID and other datasets. Discussions with relevant stakeholders began in August 2014 and continued throughout the fall. By early 2015, the concept of the Hackathon shifted to focus on a problem or problems in the Latin America and Caribbean region (specifically crime). The original concept of exploring linkages between datasets remained as a secondary focus.

M/MPBP coordinated the design and planning of the Hackathon with a team consisting of 28 staff from across USAID, including dataset owners and regional subject matter experts (SME) from the U.S. Global Development Lab, the Bureaus for Policy, Planning and Learning and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), and the M Bureau's Office of the Chief Information Officer.⁵ The organizers also engaged the Department of State's Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources during the design and planning phase.

Planners in all four focus groups noted they were unclear about what to do, and expressed frustration about how the Agency will benefit from doing the Hackathon. Many said the Hackathon's focus was too broad and needed a more narrow focus. Moreover, participants felt uncertain as to how the winning project, or any of the other seven projects, will add value to USAID's programming and decision-making process.

Ill-defined team structure

The Hackathon's staffing model also posed challenges. The planners expressed: 1) there was an insufficient amount of staff dedicated to the project and ill-defined roles and responsibilities; 2) there was a lack of institutional knowledge with facilitating hackathons and not enough time for

⁵ This report refers to the coordinators and subject matter experts as the planners of the Hackathon, unless specified otherwise.

awareness building; 3) the regional experts were not fully engaged throughout the planning process; and 4) technical expertise was not evenly distributed.

The combined lack of project focus and ill-defined roles and responsibilities resulted in team members spending too much time prepping analytical tools that participants underutilized during the event and an insufficient amount of time framing its substance. This manifested a general sentiment that planners spent too much time on activities that did not generate value, which caused frustration amongst the planners.

Unclear guidance to participants and time constraints

There were a few unexpected factors and time constraints that impacted event promotion, planning, and the ability to achieve consensus on the tangible result the 2015 Hackathon would achieve.

The concept of the Hackathon evolved throughout the planning process. The change in concept created time constraints that impeded the Hackathon coordinator's efforts to consult with internal stakeholders on the desired outcome of the Hackathon. This resulted in the lack of clear guidance to participants. For example, once the concept shifted there was insufficient time to promote outreach regarding the [hackpads](#) (e.g., platforms created in advance of the event to share information and allow participants to collaborate) so participants could understand what datasets would be available and conceptualize potential uses and linkages.

Because they did not solidify the judging criteria during the planning process, the planners did not make participants aware in advance of how USAID would judge the projects.

Without clear guidance, participants made limited use of USAID data and had broad latitude in developing projects based on their own ideas and personal interests (for example, use of secondary external datasets as opposed to USAID datasets).

Lastly, the remote participants were unable to hear the speakers consistently during the event. There was one microphone in the room which could not adequately broadcast the voices of all in-room participants. This one microphone was also used when in-room participants split into breakout sessions. As a result, remote participants could not participate effectively in breakout groups and could only hear room noise and a multiplicity of voices as breakout groups convened.

Unclear communications and clearances

There were a multitude of internal team and external stakeholder communication issues mentioned during the focus groups. Planners described the internal team communications and clearance process as fragmented and burdensome at times. This perception resulted from the repeated evolution of the list of officials necessary to clear on Hackathon related communications and outreach materials. As a result, the inefficiencies of the internal clearance communications process negatively impacted the team's ability to disseminate external communications in a timely fashion.

While M/MPBP, along with LAC, widely advertised the event to invite external programmers, data gurus, and tech experts to the Hackathon, the consensus was that there was insufficient time spent on properly framing the event, which led to inconsistent messaging regarding the event's purpose.

For example, at least one hacker perceived the event as serving as a forum for USAID to learn “which additional datasets are needed to improve policy and programmatic decision-making.” Additionally, poor event promotion in the data programmer and regional and sector subject matter expert communities led to insufficient representation by those key stakeholder groups that could have influenced the event’s outcome.

Furthermore, several external parties made unsolicited offers to members of the planning team to provide USAID gifts or in-kind services to host the Hackathon. The planners later discovered they needed at least one month in lead-time in order to properly address these offers per USAID’s gift policies outlined in ADS 628 “Gifts and Donations and Dollar Trust Fund Management,” and other procedural guidelines issued by USAID’s Office of the General Counsel (GC).

What went well, and why?

The Hackathon produced several positive outcomes. Overall, planners thought the event was interesting and ran smoothly. Stakeholders generally saw the gathering as a good outlet to raise public awareness about USAID’s available datasets and foster broad engagement from diverse groups of constituents.

The hacking community shared similar positive perspectives. A planner noted how the hackers seemed genuinely enthusiastic about USAID’s data and the event overall. One hacker emphasized how he was especially impressed that USAID demonstrated its commitment to making its data broadly accessible to the public. Participants also viewed the hackpads as successful and comprehensive, although the information they contained was overwhelming for the hackers to fully process with so little time.

What can be improved, and how? (Recommendations)

The following are opportunities for improvement, organized around five overarching issue areas.

Issue 1: Lack of a defined problem for the hackers to solve

The broad framing created confusion about the scope of the event and the content USAID needed to provide the hackers ahead of time.

Recommendations:

- At the onset of the planning process, align the primary objective of the hackathon to contribute directly to USAID’s program or project design or management operations and reach a consensus on the purpose with internal stakeholders.
- The planning team should collectively identify a general framework for integrating the project(s) created during the hackathon into the Agency’s programming and planning activities, and enlist the proper buy-in from internal stakeholders.

Issue 2: Internal stakeholder coordination and communications

Relevant staff were either not aware of planning meetings, or those that were aware, said the meetings were too episodic and sometimes lacked continuity. This, coupled with a lack of defined purpose, contributed to the shift in focus of the 2015 Hackathon, as those that attended the meetings had more influence over the scope.

Furthermore, the planning process did not take into account the likelihood external parties may make unsolicited offers to provide USAID gifts or in-kind services to host the Hackathon.

Recommendations:

- Members of the planning team should regularly convene to discuss the status of the planning process.
- The project manager should use the discussions as a platform to enlist input, get buy-in, and keep stakeholders updated.
- In addition, planners should engage GC to devise a strategy for fielding unsolicited offers from participants and other interested parties looking to provide USAID donations (including in-kind services) for a hackathon. There needs to be at least one month of lead-time prior to the hackathon to properly follow the Agency’s procedures for accepting donations per ADS 628 “Gifts and Donations and Dollar Trust Fund Management,” and other procedural guidelines outlined by GC.

Issue 3: Deliverable timetables and clearly defined clearance channels

There was a delay of several months between initial project concept and Hackathon planning initiation. As organizers rushed to complete the planning process, they spent too much time on clearances and prepping analytical tools that participants underutilized, failed to establish clear milestones, and did not delegate subtasks.

Recommendations:

- Once there is planning team consensus and OU leadership approval for the hackathon’s vision and desired outcome, allow at least five to six months to plan and externally communicate the hackathon.
- When developing the project plan, identify key event milestones USAID will need to accomplish at project onset, monitor milestone progress, confirm what deliverables will need clearance, who is responsible for completing each deliverable, and who should be included in the clearance process.
- At the onset of the planning process, planners should also incorporate any lessons learned from other USAID-funded hackathons or similar events.

Issue 4: Institutional capacity and role of working-level staff

Many of the planners did not have previous first-hand experiences with hackathons. Some mentioned how the lack of institutional knowledge and limited team experience created roadblocks in the planning process. In addition, several planners felt key regional experts were not fully engaged throughout the duration of the planning process.

Recommendations:

- Commit sufficient human resources to the planning process, and clearly divide responsibilities among staff that have the necessary expertise and knowledge.
- Consider ensuring that the project manager resides in the OU that will directly benefit from the projects that are created by participants.
- Leadership of OUs represented on the hackathon planning team should actively engage and hold staff accountable for participation .

- Prior to the event, test off-site audio and video equipment well in advance; ensure all lines can be muted (preferably from the host location directly) and that phone participants can hear those speaking in the room.
- Provide multiple call-in lines if breakout groups are used during the event, so that remote participants feel more directly connected to the event and can actively contribute.

Issue 5: Insufficient representation of desired skill sets and regional and sector knowledge

Inclusiveness and diversity add value to any decision-making process. There was insufficient representation of two key stakeholder groups at the LAC Hackathon: regional and sector SMEs and data programmers. Planners also did not establish a solid system for tracking registration or assign key Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to teams.

Recommendations:

- Develop a communications plan that accounts for the Agency or OU’s desired outcomes, identify the relevant stakeholder groups best suited to help achieve those outcomes, and tailor event messages to spark interest and encourage attendance.
- Promote participant buy-in by soliciting their input on the event approach during the planning phase, and inform participants in advance how USAID will judge the hackathon. Maintain a database of kudos received for post-event marketing purposes.
- In addition, ensure a system is in place for tracking attendance and the demographic makeup of the participants to help inform the communication strategy and participant engagement prior to and post-hackathon, and for assigning key subject matter experts to teams at the hackathon. In doing so, create a means for tracking actual participation to count the total number of organizations and individuals present, and not simply the number registered.

Conclusion

While USAID implemented a well-executed and attended Hackathon event, the planning process suffered from many challenges. However, it also yielded many valuable lessons learned. Early in the planning phase of future hackathons, USAID should establish a shared vision on the objectives the Agency hopes to achieve. USAID should also design hackathons to allow participants to engage in independent thought and opinion, but still have set parameters that will generate utility from civic innovation. These circumstances are more likely to result in projects and solutions with community buy-in that the Agency can use for improved decision-making.

Moving forward, the Agency should devise a clear plan for executing future events based on this report’s recommendations, and incorporate input from key internal stakeholders throughout hackathon planning, execution, and post-event follow up.

Annex A: USAID's 2015 Hackathon Scorecard

A panel of experts selected the winner of USAID's 2015 LAC Hackathon based on a set of criteria adapted from the Desarrollando América Latina's hackathon scoring card. The judging panel used the scorecard below to select the winner of USAID's 2015 LAC Hackathon.

USAID Hackathon Judge's Scoring Card: an adaption of the hackathon scoring developed by Desarrollando América Latina

- **Design (10%)** Is the user experience good? Does the design make it easy to navigate and understand?
- **Scalability (20%):** How feasible or applicable is the solution? How feasible it is to reuse the project in other contexts (cities, languages, methodologies...)
- **Sustainability – Business Model (20%)** How elaborate is the model and what are the chances for self-sustainability
- **Use and re-use of Open Data (10%)** Is the app using an open data source? Is the app producing any new data that can be re-used?
- **Implementation (20%)** How clear is the understanding of the problem? How clear is the development and marketing strategy?
- **Impact (20%)** What is the overall relevance of the app to solve the problem? (could the problem be solved without an app?)

Annex B: Roles and Responsibilities

Based on lessons learned from the 2015 LAC Hackathon, the following table outlines the essential roles for executing a successful hackathon.

Table 1. Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Description of Tasks
Responsible Operating Unit Leadership	At the onset of the planning process, identifies the primary objective of the hackathon that will directly contribute to USAID’s program management, operations, or an interrelated decision-making process; reaches consensus with internal key stakeholders; commits sufficient human resources to the planning process; divides responsibilities among staff that have the necessary expertise and knowledge; and provides oversight.
Hackathon Project Manager	Facilitates the planning (including incorporating any lessons learned from other USAID-funded hackathons or similar events); identifies key event milestones that USAID will need to accomplish at the onset of the project; monitors milestone progress; confirms who will serve as the approvers for internal clearance processes; orientates speakers/prepares bios and other program materials; and guides the implementation of post-hackathon plans for utilizing the projects that participants created during the hackathon.
Logistical Team	Establishes a system for tracking participation; schedules event; secures the venue space; sets up the physical location for the event, including ensuring audio-visual equipment is in place. Creates a means for tracking actual participation to count the total number of organizations and individuals present, and not simply the number registered. Prior to the event, tests off-site audio and video equipment well in advance; ensures all lines can be muted (preferably from the host location directly) and that phone participants can hear those speaking in the room; and provides multiple call-in lines for breakout groups during the event, so that remote participants feel more directly connected to the event and can actively contribute.
Communications Team	Develops and executes a communications plan by creating internal and external messaging, identifying outlets for internal and external promotions, and informing prospective participants how USAID will judge the projects. A communications plan should take into account the Agency or operating unit’s desired outcomes, identify the relevant stakeholder groups best suited to help achieve those outcomes, reflect messaging points that spark interest and encourage attendance, and outline how social media platforms will be used to promote the event, and be used to engage offsite participants during the hackathon. Maintains a database of kudos received for marketing purposes.

Regional Expert(s) and Subject Matter Expert(s)	Serves as active members of the planning team by helping design the parameters of the hackathon, along with judging criteria; and facilitating tabletop discussions during the hackathon, along with the fielding of technical questions.
Moderator	Serves as the master or mistress of ceremonies for the hackathon.
Keynote Speaker	Delivers a keynote speech that emphasizes the theme of the event and reinforces the primary objective.
Judging Panel	Assesses the quality of the projects produced by the participants against a set of standard criteria.

Annex C: Focus Group Participants

Table 1. Focus Group Participants

Date/Time	USAID OU	Name	Title
June 3, 2015	M/MPBP	Ruth Buckley	Chief, Performance Division
	M/MPBP	Brandon Pustejovsky	Chief Data Officer
	M/MPBP	Maggie Mesaros	Team Lead (Management Performance Analysis and Reporting Team)
	M/MPBP	Scott DePies	Management and Program Analyst
	M/MPBP	Chris Meservy	Management and Program Analyst
	M/MPBP	Maggie Strong	Management and Program Analyst
	M/MPBP	Meghan Meros	Management and Program Analyst
	M/MPBP	Ayla Francis	Management and Program Analyst
	M/MPBP	Roy Miller	Information Architect
M/MPBP	Alana Marsili	Management and Program Analyst	
June 9, 2015	M/CIO	Elizabeth McLean	Knowledge Management Analyst
	M/CIO	Alexandra (Sasha) Marks	Project Manager
	M/CIO	Candice Schibli	Database Manager
	PPL/DE	Andrea Vaughn	Management and Program Analyst
	PPL/DE	Kim Smith	Program Analyst
June 10, 2015	LAC	Gabriela Chojkier	Senior Outreach/Comm. Specialist
	LAC	Vanessa Reilly	Democracy Specialist
June 12, 2015	LAB	Laura Hughes	USAID Fellow
	LAB	Craig Jolley	USAID Fellow

Annex D: Bibliography

Bastian, Z. (2013). The Power of Hackathons: A Roadmap for Sustainable Open Innovation, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/the-power-hackathons-roadmap-for-sustainable-open-innovation>.

- Provides tips and best practices for developing and running a hackathon event

Office of Management and Budget. (2013). Memoranda M-13-13 Open Data Policy-Managing Information as an Asset, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/2013/m-13-13.pdf>.

- Outlines openness and transparency expectations

Office of Management and Budget. (2009). M-10-06 Open Government Directive, https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/memoranda_2010/m10-06.pdf.

- Outlines openness and transparency expectations

Office of Management and Budget. (2009). M-09-12 President's Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government - Interagency Collaboration, https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/memoranda_fy2009/m09-12.pdf.

- Outlines openness and transparency expectations

Tauberer, J. (2015). How to Run a Successful Hackathon Guide, <https://hackathon.guide/>.

- Provides a step-by-step guide for developing and running a hackathon event

USAID. (2006). After-Action Review Technical Guidance, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadf360.pdf

- Outlines the agency's framework for conducting after action reviews

USAID. Automated Directives System Chapter 579: USAID Development Data, March 13, 2015, pp. 3-21, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/579.pdf>.

- Emphasizes USAID's commitment to disseminating open data
- Outlines USAID's rules for making the Agency's data publicly available

USAID. Automated Directives System Chapter 628: USAID Gifts and Donations and Dollar Trust Fund Management, March 26, 2013, pp. 3-14, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/628.pdf>.

- Outlines the Agency's requirements for the management, accounting, and reporting of transactions under USAID's gifts and donations authority, the Reimbursable Development Program, the Foreign Service National Separation Trust Fund, and for all other country financed dollar trust funds

USAID. (2013). Hacking for Hunger: Case Study, http://issuu.com/usaaid/docs/hacking_for_hunger_case_study/10, pp. 10-16.

- Provides a snapshot about USAID's previous experiences with hackathons

USAID. (2015). Open Data Intranet Site, <https://pages.usaid.gov/M/OpenData/resources>

- Provides resources and tips on how to meet USAID's open data requirements

USAID. Open Government Page: Engagement, as of August 2015, <https://www.usaid.gov/open/engagement>.

- Provides information about the projects that were created during the 2015 Hackathon
- Identifies the winning project and creator

USAID. (July 2015). Public Engagement and Open Data: Innovating Development Solutions

- Provides tips on designing public engagement events, such as hackathons
- Identifies additional resources for planning for these events

White House. (2013). "Announcing We the People 2.0 and a White House Hackathon," <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/05/announcing-we-people-20-and-white-house-hackathon>.

- Covers the White House's Petitions 2.0, releasing an API, and inviting a small group to join on February 22, 2013 for the White House Open Data Day Hackathon

White House. (2013). Executive Order, "Making Open and Machine Readable the New Default for Government Information," <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/05/09/executive-order-making-open-and-machine-readable-new-default-government>.

- Identifies how agencies are required to promote transparency and openness

White House. (2015). "Improving Accessibility of Government Websites," <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2015/04/16/improving-accessibility-government-websites>.

- Covers the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy, General Services Administration's 18F team, and the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research, and DC Legal Hackers website accessibility Hackathon which was held on March 31, 2015

White House. (2013). "Looking Back at the White House Hackathon," <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/03/02/looking-back-white-house-hackathon> .

- Covers the White House's hackathon where participants built tools based on the new API for We the People, the White House petitions system

White House. (2009). President's Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government, https://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/TransparencyandOpenGovernment.

- Affirms the Administration's commitment to innovation in government

White House. (2012). Digital Government: Building a 21st Century Platform to Better Serve the American People, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/egov/digital-government/digital-government.html>.

- Outlines openness and transparency strategies