AUSTRIA ITA	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• European Parliament/ STOA Panel (for STOA projects) • National parliament not yet directly	• European Parliament (through STOA/ETAG) • National parliament not yet							• Occasional members of project advisory boards appointed by the institute
Government	• Depending on specific project	• Budget of the Ministry of Science via the Austrian Academy of Sciences • Individual national projects • EU Framework projects	• Indirectly through the evaluation of the Austrian Academy of Sciences • EU evaluations	• One Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) member sent by Ministry of Science • Informal body advising ITA since 2012 consisting of representatives of key ministries				• On a project level, representatives of government are occasionally involved	• On a project level, members of the administration are often involved • Members of project advisory boards appointed by the institute, sometimes by the ministry soliciting the project
Science	• Via academic articles • Presentations at conferences	• Budget of the Ministry of Science via the Austrian Academy of Sciences • Research funds (national, international, supranational)	• Formal evaluation all six years • Evaluation Committee appointed by mother institution (Academy of Sciences) with exclusively science representatives as members; no interviewing of stakeholders	• Scientific Advisory Board (SAB), meeting biannually, consists of 6 internationally renowned TA experts • SAB appointed by the mother institution (the Academy)	• Monitoring by staff • Annual adjustment of three year working program duringf a two-days workshop • review by SAB members biannualy	• Scientists employed	• Research is carried out in-house and if necessary by sub-contracting	• Expert participation	• Member of the project advisory boards appointed by the institute, sometimes by the ministry soliciting the project
Society	• New task: “Gesellschafts beratung” (advice to society), without any further specification		• Internal evaluation criteria		• Annual adjustment of three year working program with the aid of a two-days workshop, (for which stakeholders are not yet invited)	.	.	• On a project level, representatives of civil society (e.g. social partners) are often involved	• Member of the project advisory boards appointed by the institute

CATALONIA (SPAIN) CAPCIT	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• 'Procedurally embedded in regional parliament • Informing and stimulation of opinion forming		• By regional parliament • New regional elections directly relevant	• Half of the CAPCIT committee consists of MPs • All parties are represented	• CAPCIT committee sets priorities	• Some parliamentary administrative support			
Government									
Science		• Contributing research institutes pay out of their own pockets	• Regional research institutes represented in the CAPCIT committee participate on a voluntary basis	• Half of the committee consists of representatives from the regional science community	• CAPCIT committee sets priorities		• Research carried out by institutes on a voluntary basis	• Optionally organized by institution, carrying out the research	• Optionally organized by institution, carrying out the research
Society	• Informing regional society							• Exceptionally, hooking up to external participatory events	

EU STOA	Formal clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• European Parliament solely	• European Parliament	• European Parliament	• STOA Panel, consisting of fifteen MEPs	• By STOA Panel • Any Member, committee, or other body of the European Parliament may propose • Committees are invited, every year, to suggest topics	• STOA Secretariat (10 people, including 4 administrators and a seconded national expert with scientific background, employed by the European Parliament)	• Selected by STOA Secretariat (one responsible administrator per project), under the supervision of one or more Panel members per project. • All contracts signed by Director responsible for STOA	• One or more Panel Members supervise the execution of each project	• Selected by STOA
Government									
Science					• Most STOA Panel members have a background in science and/or technology		• All studies outsourced, through framework contract (consisting of 8 lots), currently with four first-ranked contractors, including KIT (5 lots), IEEP (1 lot), ISIS (1 lot) and Technopolis (1 lot), and three second-ranked contractors, including KIT (3 lots), Consultrans (1 lot) and IVAM UvA BV (1 lot). • Several events are co-organised by STOA and outside organisations or (e.g. Annual Lecture) by STOA alone.	• Expert participation	• Expert audits of STOA projects (JRC, European scientific or technical organisations/ associations, potentially also through a framework contract)
Society								• Stakeholder participation	

Finland Committee of the Future	Clientele	Funding	Institutional Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Primarily the Committee of the Future • Other standing committees; efforts to create joint steering groups with them	• Annual (research, printing and translation) budget as determined by Parliament	• No formal evaluation of the Committee's work; only internally, on the initiative of the secretariat, including Committee members and some external experts	• It is the Committee of the Future guiding its own work, consisting of 17 members, meeting twice a week	• Themes are set by the Committee itself at the beginning of each parliamentary term • Discussion of parliamentary documents referred to it • Once per term: general exploration of the state of Finland	• 3 parliamentary staff members (the secretary of the Committee plus two permanent experts	• Secretariat • Steering group, consisting of MPs		• It is the Committee itself reviewing
Government	• Constant dialogue with Government: The thematically corresponding Ministers and mainly the Prime Minister (chairing the Research & Innovation Council) are addressed by the Committee's work; regional Meetings are jointly organized by the Committee and government • Government Foresight network, foresight forums etc. as a cooperation partner				• Response to the Government's Foresight Report (but government has no formal say re. working program)				
Science	• The Committee involves science to a large extent via the Futures Research Centre (Turku Univ.), the Futures Academy network and the Society for Futures Studies; • Academy of Finland; Tekes, the Innovation Fund	• Occasional additional external funding for special projects • Science is contributing on its own cost (it is an honorable task)					• Sometimes reports are written solely by external experts	• Usually external experts	
Society	• Regional centers for economic development, transport and the environment, regional councils • "Unofficial" Committee meetings in the regions • Cooperation with business world increases • Open popular discourses on the Internet							• Sometimes stakeholders involved	

Sources:

- Tiihonen, Paula (2011) Revamping the work of the Committee for the Future. Publication of the Committee for the Future 7/2011, brochure, 18pp. http://web.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=yf14511143357746&cmd=download
- EPTA (ed) (2012) Parliamentary Technology Assessment in Europe. An Overview of 17 institutions and how they work, http://www.eptanetwork.org/documents/2013/EPTABooklet2013.pdf and http://www.oeaw.ac.at/ita/fileadmin/epta/default.html
- direct e-mail feedback from P. Tiihonen in November 2013

FLANDERS (BELGIUM), until 2012 IST	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Information and attitudes translated into knowledge and recommenda-tions for parliamen-tarians' use • Filtering on relevance for the decision-making process in regional parliament • European Parliament/ STOA Panel (for STOA projects)	• Approval of proposed final annual budget by plenary session in the regional parliament • Approval of proposed indicative multiannual (4 years) budget by plenary session in the regional parliament • Half yearly control of the budget by the regional parliament • Board decides on the budget first (consisting half of MPs) • Some funding on a project level from European Parliament (through STOA/ETAG)	• Regional parliament commis-sions the external evaluation (included in the Decree founding the institute) • The board proposes the evaluators and the regional parliament approves the evaluators	• Half of the board consists of MPs • All political parties represented • Chairman board= MP	• Parliamentary committees are consulted • Working Program approved of by the board			• MP's are invited to take part in events and outreach activities • Project results are fine tuned with and presented first in parliamentary committee(s)	• Seldom there are MPs in project advisory committees • After the 2007/2008 evaluation the board does not play an advisory role on project level during Board meetings (corporate governance structure)
Government		• Some funding on a project level from European Commission (through Framework Programmes)			• Representatives from governmental bodies are consulted during the multiannual trend analysis and monitoring, and during preparatory phase of new project proposals to avoid overlap and to stimulate information exchange				• Project advisory Committee, consisting of some representatives from governmental bodies when applicable

FLANDERS (BELGIUM), until 2012 (cont.) IST	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Science		• Board (consisting half of science representatives) decides on the budget first	• Three scientists appointed in the external evaluation committee • Some scientific members of the board are interviewed during the evaluation	• Half of the board consists of representatives the strategic research councils	• Monitoring of trends by TA staff, consulting other (international) TA practitioners • Working Program approved of by the board (consisting half science representatives)	• TA staffers employed by IST • Staffers have s strong background in research	• IST staffers design project and manage the project's life cycle • Most part of the actual TA research is outsourced. • TA advise activities are coordinated internally by IST but project experts can be invited to participate in parliamentary committee hearings • Participatory methods, and/or the organization of public events are developed and implemented by IST staffers	• Expert participation	• Project advisory Committee, with some scientists when appropriate • After the 2007/2008 evaluation the board does not play an advisory role on project level during Board meetings (corporate governance structure)
Society	• Initiate a constructive debate with relevant stakeholders… • … and possibly with the general public				• Several stakeholders consulted		• Involvement of science journalists	• Stakeholder participation • Citizen participation • Organization of public events	• Project advisory Committee, with some representatives from wider society when applicable

DENMARK (as from 2012) DBT	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Communicate work to parliament • Optionally, parliamentary Research Committee as liaison • European Parliament/ STOA Panel (for STOA projects) • Regional and Municipality parliaments a project clients • Demand-driven project based relation to Parliament and its committees is expected to be set up	• Funding for 1½ year transition into foundation structure • At moment of reporting, unsure for period afterward • Optionally, funding on project basis from Committees, Regions, Municipalities, European Parliament (through STOA/ETAG)	• Board of Foundation • Board of Representatives through 2 yearly meetings • Evaluation in autumn 2013 on the project based relation to Parliament expected	• Parliament can appoint 1 member if it wishes so • Parliament can appoint 2 members of the Board of Representa-tives. • Thematic platforms will be set up with potentially participants from MP's, MEP's, Regions, municipalities (and other actors – see below)	• Through membership of the two boards			• Parliamentary hearings • Future Panel with parliamenta-rians • Collaboration scheme for projects expected	• Depends upon project setup
Government	• Communicate work to government • Client on a project basis	• Grants to foundation possible		• Not likely for internal Boards. • May join thematic platforms	• Through thematic platforms				• Depends upon project setup
Science		• Grants to foundation possible • Funding from (European) research programs	• Through Board of Representatives membership, on yearly assembly	• Yes, in Board of Representa-tives • May join thematic platforms	• Through Board of Representa-tives membership. • Through thematic platforms	• Independent corporate foundation carrying out Technology Assessment	• Employees • Contracted experts possible • Voluntaries from thematic platforms	• Interdisciplina-ry expert assessments	• Depends upon project setup • Internal evaluations • Reviewing through seminars • Evaluation by participating experts
Society	• Communicate work to political decision-makers in society • Communicate to Danish population • Can establish programs /projects with any societal actor, including organizations, enterprises, unions, international organisations etc.	• Grants to foundation possible • As a Corporate Foundation, income from commercial activities will be used to fund common good activities of the Foundation	• Through Board of Representa-tives member-ship, on yearly assembly. • Optionally, user surveys & feedback on satisfaction	• Yes, in Board of Representa-tives • May join thematic platforms.	• Through Board of Representa-tives member-ship. • Through thematic platforms.	• Independent foundation carrying out Technology Assessment.	• Voluntaries from thematic platforms	• Participatory assessments • Interdisciplina-ry expert and stakeholder assessments.	• Depends upon project setup • Review through seminars • External planning group • Involvement of external process consultants • Evaluation by participants

NORWAY NBT	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• The Norwegian Parliament is a key recipient of assessments and advise from the NBT	• Final approving of annual, national budget, herein the NBT budget	• Politicians were interviewed in the evaluation procedure	• Active MPs excluded from the Board	• Ongoing parliamentary debates and topics "rising" on the political agenda are important when assessing project ideas		• Not part of project team, but indirect influence on projects through parliamentary debates, meeting etc.	• MPEs involved at seminars, and through separate meetings with MPEs and standing committees in Parliament	
Government	• The Government is a key recipient of assessments and advise from the NBT	• Annual budget through the Ministry of Trade and commerce	• In 2010 the government appointed a research group to evaluate the NBT ("one-of –a-kind evaluation") • A Steering Committee, with also members from the Ministry of Trade and Commerce represented, lead the evaluation	• Board appointed by the government, formally through the Ministry of trade and commerce	• NBT staff have informal talks with government representatives about possible topics		• Not part of project team, but TA-staff interacts with members of government and employees of ministries. This may be input to on-going projects. Employees of governmental agencies may occasionally take part in expert groups	• At times, open hearings or scenario workshops are organized	
Science			• A research group was appointed to evaluate the NBT in 2010 • A Steering Committee, with also members from the Research Council represented, lead the evaluation • Experts were interview	• Representatives from the scientific community represented in the board	• Monitoring of trends by TA staff • Board heavily involved • Experts are invited for brainstorm	• Secretariat employed for carrying out Technology Assessment. Staff members with background from science, business, and ministries	• Projects team from NBT staff, strongly supported by expert groups, who play a key role in most NBT projects. The groups have partici-pants from academia/ science, indu-stry, NGOs	• Expert groups play a central role in NBT projects. NBT staff strongly interacts with group members • At times, open hearings or scenario workshops are organized	• The expert groups contribute to assessments and serves as advisors to the projects. • Additional feedback from the board, with several representatives from the science community
Society	• Actively stimulate public debate • Thereby raise public awareness • Communicate results to the wider society		• Stakeholders were interviewed	• Representatives from business and wider society	• Stakeholders are invited for brainstorm • Public call for input on the website	• Secretariat employed for carrying out Technology Assessment; staff members with background from science, business, and ministries	• TA-staff strongly interacts with expert group, wherein stakeholders are represented	• TA-staff strongly interacts with expert group, wherin stakeholders are represented • At times, open hearings or scenario workshops are organized • Citizen participation	• TA-staff strongly interacts with expert group, stakeholders are represented • Additional feedback from the board, with some representatives from wider society

GERMANY TAB	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Procedural embedment in national parliament • Informing and sketching alternative policy options	• Funding earmarked in annual budget of national parliament	• National parliament decides on new contract call for operational TA unit, every 3 – 5 years	• The Steering Committee consists of MPs completely • All political parties are represented	• Formal initiative by parliamentary groups(s) in the Steering Committee • Other parliamentary committees may ask the Steering Committee to set up a TA study on a certain subject				• Interaction with parliamentary Steering Committee
Government									
Science					• Monitoring of trends by TA staff • Interaction between parliamentary TA rapporteurs and TA staff	• A research organization is contracted for carrying out Technology Assessment (TAB)	• A substantial part of the research is carried out in-house • In addition, other researchers are contracted	• Expert participation	• Peer review on reports
Society					• Societal groups may approach MPs for getting their interests reflected in TAB's agenda			• Stakeholder participation (to some extent)	

NETHER-LANDS RATHENAU I.	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Stimulation of the formation of political opinion in Second Chamber… • … and in the First Chamber… • … and in the European Parliament	• Some funding from European Parliament on a project level (through STOA/ETAG)	• One former politician in 2012 external Evaluation Committee	• Active MPs excluded • At least one board member with ties to politics appointed	• Program Council, consisting of people with ties to politics, advices • Involvement of board • Working Program sent to Parliament by Minister of Science			• At times, meetings are organized for parliament	
Government	• Some work carried out for ministries or administrations • The Dutch Cabinet is a formal client for the Science System Assessment department	• Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) • Some additional funding from other ministries or administrations at a project level	• Ministry of OCW installs the external Evaluation Committee	• Ministry of OCW the board members, after consultation of the Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW) and the Scientific Advisory Council on Government Policy (WRR) • At least one board member with ties to politics appointed	• Program Council, consisting of people with ties to politics, advices • Involvement of board • Working Program to be approved of by Minister of Science			• Some participation of representatives from government in projects	• Optionally, representatives from governmental bodies take part in a project advising committee
Science		• Governmental budget earmarked at the Royal Academy of Sciences • Some European research funding at the project level	• Self-evaluation by staff • Three scientists in the 2012 external Evaluation Committee	• The Royal Academy of Sciences (KNAW) and the Scientific Advisory Council on Government Policy (WRR) advices on appointments • Mainly scientists in the Board	• Monitoring of trends by TA staff • Involvement of board, with mainly representatives from science	• Rathenau Institute installed for doing TA • Mainly researchers employed	• Substantial research is carried out in-house • In addition, external expertise is hired in	• Expert participation	• Representatives from science in majority in project advising committee
Society	• Stimulating societal debate • Strong media focus		• One science journalist in 2012 external Evaluation Committee	• Some representatives from wider society represented in the board	• Involvement of the board, with some representatives from wider society	• Support from separate communication department	• Strong support from communication staffers • Science journalists may be contracted for support	• Stakeholder participation • Citizen participation • Public events	• To some extent, stakeholders are represented in project advising committee

FRANCE OPECST	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Work carried out only on formal request by National Assembly and Senate	• Through annual budget, with an equal contribution from National Assembly and Senate	• No formal evaluation: OPECST is considered as Parliament-in-action will only be changed when parliament decides to change existing structures and routines	• Consisting half of deputies and half of senators (equal representation of both chambers — 18 each). • Proportional representation of political groups, on a voluntary basis	• Work carried out only on formal request by National Assembly and Senate	• MPs in charge of TA projects • Two parliamentary secretariat agencies available: one in the National Assembly and one in the Senate	• MPs (rapporteurs) in charge of carrying out TA projects. Usually two rapporteurs (with an attempt to respect a balance between National Assembly and Senate, majority and opposition). • Assisted by OPECST'staff parliamentary civil servants	• Optionally, parliamentary debate on the subject before the report is final	• Report validated by the Board of OPECST
Government									
Science								• Expert hearings are organized • Public hearings when deemed necessary	• Parliamentary rapporteur surrounded by heterogeneous steering committee • In addition, OPECST has a Scientific Council for support (24 members)
Society								• Stakeholder hearings are organized • Public hearings when deemed necessary • NGOs may be invited	

SWITZER-LAND TA-SWISS	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Studies, abridged versions and recommendations are directed to decision makers in politics (diffusion via personal contacts, conferences, Politiker-Apero or presentation in Committees)	• Parliament validate or amend the budget proposed by the Government (TA-SWISS budget is part of the budget for Education and Research)	• No formal evaluation request by Parliament • Govern-ment proposes a budget, which is approved, amended or rejected by the Parliament every four years on the basis of a status report (whas has been achieved an the description of the objectives/activities for the next 4 years)	• Active MPs are excluded • A few former MPs are represented	• No formal role of Parliament • Strong involvement of Steering Committee, where off-charge politicians may be represented • MPs can give some inputs, e.g. during informal contacts			• In some projects, MPs may be interviewed or take part in workshops	• MPs can take part in project advising group (very rare)
Government	• Studies, abridged versions and recommendations are directed to decision makers in politics (via personal contacts, conferences, Politiker-Apero etc.)	• Government is funding TA-SWISS (Federal Office for Education and Science) • Other administration departments may financially contribute to projects related to their activities	• No formal evaluation request by Govern-ment • Govern-ment proposes a budget every four years based, inter alia, on a status report (see above)	• No members of Government • Members of administration departments as guests, i.e. with consultative voice	• No formal role of government • Members of the government (ministries, administration departments) can give some inputs, e.g. as guests in the Steering Committee or during informal contacts			• When a public administration is co-funding a project: contribution to the project definition and communication • In some projects, members of administration may be interviewed or take part in workshops	• Members of public administration can take part in project advising group

SWITZER-LAND (cont.) TA-SWISS	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Science	• Reports of interdisciplinary studies are directed to the scientific community, as they provide scientific assessment of technologies or analysis of technology-related problems (diffusion via scientific conferences, scientific journals, etc.) • Some recommendations are directed to scientists	• Governmental budget earmarked at the Academy • Optional additional funding from public research institutions • Some European research funding	• Related to its quality control task, the Steering Committee (with scientists being represented) may commission an evaluation of the institution (until now, every 8-10 years)	• Mainly scientists in Steering Committee	• Monitoring and proposal of themes, as well as of plans by TA-SWISS project managers (scientific background) • Strong involvement of Steering Committee (with representatives from the scientific community)	• Project managers with scientific background	• Most research is outsourced to researchers from universities or research bureaus • Participatory projects are conducted internally, by project managers	• Project team • Expert participation in workshops, interviews, etc.	• Scientists from various fields take part in project advising group
Society	• Studies, abridged versions and recommendations are directed to decision makers in the economy… • … and to the wide public (diffusion of results via medias and public events, personal contacts, etc.)	•	• Related to its quality control task, the Steering Committee (with stakeholders and journalists being represented) may commission an evaluation of the institution (until now, every 8-10 years)	• Stakeholders are represented in the Steering Committee (representative of NGOs, trade unions and industry) • Media representatives are sitting in the Steering Committee (journalists)	• Monitoring and proposal of themes, as well as of plans by TA non-scientific staff (e.g. communication officer) • Strong involvement of Steering Committee, with representatives from NGOs, trade unions, industry and media	• Communication officer (journalist background)	• Communication projects and events are conducted internally, by communication officer	• Stakeholder participation in workshops, interviews, etc. • Citizens taking part in participatory methods	• Various stakeholders take part in project advising group • Representatives of media can take part in project advising group

UNITED KINGDOM POST	Clientele	Funding	Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Informing House of Commons and House of Lords	• Annual budget ~£600,000 approved by both Houses in ration Commons 70%, Lords 30%	• No regular scheduled evaluation • POST automatically reviewed when the entire administration of Parliament is assessed, done by the administration (not MPs or peers) • A complexity is that the administrations of House of Lords and House of Commons do their reviews independently • Last review was in 2007, for the House of Commons. No review expected on short notice	• 10 MPs and 4 Lords • Political balance between political colors and independents (Lords) • Four representatives of parliamentary administration	• Priorities of work program approved of by board	• Director and six permanent researchers divided into three teams: health and bioscience; environment and energy and physical sciences and IT • Administrative support (2 people)	• Usually one, sometimes two, of permanent research staff and/or visiting postgraduate fellows	• Usually as on left, sometimes members of any review group	• For some projects, a review group of parliamenta-rians (usually Lords) and external members set up
Government					• Some governmental representatives consulted on draft program				
Science				• Four external board members to represent major fields of science & technology	• Priorities of work program approved by board • Science community consulted on draft program	• POST office installed • Temporary presence of PhD students and post-docs as fellows - ~20-25 a year	• POST researchers form the project team • Temporary presence of PhD students and post-docs	• Contributions from wider science community on a voluntary basis	• Peer review of draft reports by external experts on a voluntary basis • At times: scientists represented in a small steering group
Society					Members of public occasionally request that POST conducts a study, either directly or through their MP				

USA GAO	Clientele	Funding	Institutional Evaluation Committee or Group	Board, Committee, Panel or Platform	Working program	Staff	Project team	Project participants	Project Advising and/or Reviewing Group
Parliament	• Provide products to both houses of Congress to support congressional oversight, insight, and foresight responsibilities • TA requests may come from committees or sub-committees from either house of Congress	• Annual budget as deter-mined by Congress	• Congressional authorizers and appropriators provide direct oversight • GAO produces an annual performance and accountability report for the entire institution • GAO-wide reviews performed internally	• Congressional authorizers and appropriators provide some guidance, as do other committees • TA product line falls under purview of Comptroller General's Advisory Board	• Work performed upon a request or mandate from Congress • Work may be conducted on GAO authority as an independent congressional oversight agency	• Work is requested or mandated by congression al staff, but indepen-dence require-ments for all GAO work mean only GAO staff are allowed to work directly on reports			
Government	• GAO products may include matters for Congressional consideration and/or recommendations for government actions		• Formal peer-review of GAO reports conducted by an international group of supreme audit institutions			• GAO staff has expertise in government programs and operations	• GAO staff and management have expertise in government programs and operations	• Expert participants often include knowledgeable government officials	• Relevant federal agencies may review draft reports. Their reviews are typically included as an appendix to the report
Science	• Non-profit/academic science and technology policy community		• GAO Technology Assessments generally require external engagement/ review with U.S. National Academies			• GAO personnel conducting TA work have expertise in the natural sciences and engineering	• Project team is internal to GAO and includes personnel with expertise in science/engi-neering	• Expert participants often include scientists in academia, industry, or government	• U.S. National Academies and other selected experts review draft reports for technical accuracy
Society	• GAO products are typically made publically available at www.gao.gov					• GAO personnel supporting TAs have expertise in social sciences (e.g., survey method-logy) and communica-tions	• Additional GAO staff provide social science and communica-tions support	• Stakeholder participants can be from non-governmental organizations, nonprofit groups, or, through the use of surveys, the general public	