

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information

AGENCY: COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ACTION: Final Guidelines

SUMMARY: These guidelines implement Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 106-554; H.R. 5658). Section 515 directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to issue government-wide guidelines, followed by individual agency guidelines, to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information, including statistical information, disseminated by the agency and to establish administrative mechanisms allowing affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information maintained and disseminated by the agency that does not comply with such guidelines. Each agency must also report periodically to the OMB director on the number, nature, and resolution of complaints received by the agency in regards to these requirements.

The guidelines published below would implement these requirements for the Council on Environmental Quality. They are intended to comply with both the statutory requirements noted above and the final guidelines published by OMB on February 22, 2002 (Vol. 67 *Federal Register* No. 36, at 8452).

DATES: Effective October 18, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dinah Bear, General Counsel, Council on Environmental Quality. Telephone: (202) 395-7421 or by e-mail to dinah_bear@ceq.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554, hereinafter referred to as Section 515) directs the Office of Management and Budget to issue government-wide guidelines that “provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by Federal agencies.” Agencies are required to issue their own implementing guidelines addressing these requirements and also establishing administrative mechanisms allowing affected persons to seek and obtain corrected of information alleged to not meet the agency’s guidelines. The Council on Environmental Quality’s guidelines will be posted on the agency’s web site at www.whitehouse.gov/CEQ, along with a docket of requests and corrections made under these guidelines, including information about who has requested a change, the nature of the request, any specific corrections that were made and any appropriate supporting documents.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established by Congress in 1969 through passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 USC §4321 *et. seq* and is an agency within the Executive Office of the President (EOP). The Chairman of

CEQ, who is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, serves as the principal environmental policy adviser to the President. CEQ coordinates federal environmental efforts and works closely with agencies and other White House offices in the development of environmental policies and initiatives. CEQ also oversees federal agencies implementation of NEPA through promulgation of regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR §§1500-1508) and through interpretation of statutory requirements. CEQ also has a variety of other responsibilities under NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 and other statutes, including some authorities in the area of environmental data, information and trends.

The Council appreciates the comments it received on the draft guidelines. Four organizations submitted comments; two comments specifically addressed CEQ's guidelines. Issues identified in those comments are addressed immediately below.

Objectivity and Utility of Information:

One commentator applauded CEQ's pre-dissemination review process, especially the specificity with which CEQ has identified those responsible for information quality. However, the commentator also states that all information disseminated by CEQ, regardless of original source, should comply with the data quality law, the OMB guidelines and the CEQ guidelines. The Council believes that the statement that, "CEQ will ensure that all information it disseminates to the public meets all applicable standards of quality, including objectivity, utility and integrity" sufficiently covers this concern.

This commentator noted that Section A.4(c) of the CEQ proposed guidelines requires the responsible CEQ staff member to determine “where the final decision shall be made”, and suggests that the meaning of this provision be clarified in final guidelines. The final guidelines modify this provision to state that the CEQ staff member will determine “who will be responsible for making the final decision.”

The same commentator applauded CEQ’s commitment to ensuring that transparency of information has been appropriately addressed and provided for when transparency is relevant for assessing the information’s usefulness from the perspective of the users of information, including the public. However, the commentator suggested more specificity in this provision would be useful. Given that CEQ does not have a regular program of information dissemination, it is difficult to be more precise at this point in time.

Experience with these guidelines may prove useful in defining further specificity.

The same commentator expressed “serious concerns” regarding the proposed provision in Section A.3 that states, “In determining the appropriate level of transparency, CEQ should consider the types of data that can practicably be subjected to a reproducibility requirement given ethical, feasibility, and confidentiality constraints.” Specifically, the commentator expressed concerns about a possible proprietary claim made by a third party that generated the information, pointing to the possibility of an enormous loophole in the guidelines if CEQ relied on a great deal of proprietary information. The commentator proposed that CEQ modify its draft guidelines to state that information subject to third party proprietary claims be used only in extraordinary circumstances, when an information product is not otherwise available or attainable. CEQ appreciates this

concern and has modified the guidelines at A.5 to reflect a preference for publicly available information, all else being equal in terms of the quality of the information and usefulness to the decisionmaking process.

The same commentator applauded CEQ's identification of responsible personnel within CEQ and the proposed definition of integrity to cover accidentally corrupted information.

Another commentator expressed concern that CEQ keep the requirements of the Data Quality Act in context, recalling its responsibilities to implement its core substantive mission, within current budget constraints, along with the benefits of timely dissemination in carrying out its core mission and the general goal of democratic openness. CEQ agrees with these statements. Indeed, in carrying out its responsibility to oversee the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, CEQ has institutionally maintained a principle of considerable public accessibility and openness. Further, CEQ's regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA state in pertinent part that information made available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken, "must be of high quality. Accurate scientific analysis, expert agency comments, and public scrutiny are essential to implementing NEPA." 40 C.F.R. §1500/1(b).

Administrative Process for Correction of Information.

One commentator expressed deep concern with the provision in the draft guidelines establishing a 90 day period for any person affected by information disseminated by CEQ to seek a correction of that information. This commentator argued that the deadline

undercut CEQ's stated commitment to data quality. The commentator believes that no deadline should be set, but rather that any affected person should be able to seek a correction of information at any time. Another commentator supported the time limitation. In accordance with government-wide OMB guidance, the 90-day deadline has been eliminated.

A commentator recommended that CEQ modify its proposed guidelines to state that when a correction to information is made pursuant to a challenge, the correction should be disseminated in the same manner and to the same extent as was the original information. CEQ agrees, and has included this provision in Section B.4 accordingly. That provision now states that subject to applicable law, rules, and regulations, CEQ may take correct measures through any appropriate and effective means, including personal contacts via letter or telephone, form letters, press releases, or posting on the CEQ web site, but at a minimum should include, to the extent feasible, the means of dissemination used originally for the information deemed to be in need of correction.

The same commentator also expressed concern about CEQ's provision in the draft guidelines in Section B.2 stating the CEQ may decline to respond to requests that appear to be frivolous and/or duplicative. The commentator recommends that this provision be struck or, if retained, strictly limited to those prior requests that were made on the precise factual basis as a new request made by the same requestor. Another commentator believes that this same provision in the draft guidelines needs to be made more restrictive to avoid the agency from becoming burdened with minor data disputes, bad faith requests and frivolous, repetitive, or non-timely claims. This commentator cautions against

adding any extra process to the guidelines other than what is required in the Data Quality Act. In particular, the commentator recommends that the provision be modified to state that CEQ can reject a request if it is a similar request (as opposed to precisely duplicative), and recommends that CEQ should specifically state that the response to correction requests will be proportional to the significance and importance of the information in question. After further consideration, the CEQ guidelines simply state that the nature of the agency's response will be proportional to the nature of the request, and the agency will generally not respond substantively to duplicative requests.

A commentator recommends that CEQ clearly state that the burden of proof lies with the requestor to demonstrate both that they are an affected party and that the information in question does not comport with the OMB guidelines. CEQ agrees and is including such a provision. The same commentator recommends that the administrative mechanisms in the guidelines apply only to correction of factual data and information as opposed to interpretations of facts and data. CEQ believes that is the intent of these guidelines and has clarified that point in Section 4(a) of the definitions.

The same commentator recommended adding a provision that addresses the integration of information quality issues into existing administrative mechanisms. CEQ agrees, and is adding a provision to provide that when an affected person wishes to challenge information that is disseminated in the course of rulemaking or another administrative process that provides for public input, challenges to information should be brought forward within the context of public participation under the existing administrative framework. Further, for any proposed collection of information that falls under the

requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act and is intended to be disseminated to the public, CEQ will discuss in its Paperwork Reduction clearance submission to OMB how the proposed collection of information will result in information that will be collected, maintained, and used in a way consistent with OMB and CEQ information guidelines.

The commentator also recommended that CEQ limit complaints regarding data quality standards to information available at the time of dissemination (i.e., the “best available evidence”) at the time of dissemination. CEQ agrees with this recommendation, while noting that the “best available evidence” could potentially change during the course of dissemination, and that affected persons should not be restricted to challenges based on the “best available evidence” at the time of the original dissemination.

The same commentator recommends that the agency reconsideration process should be informal and limited in scope to determining whether the original review was conducted with due diligence. The commentator also recommends a 30 day time limit on the ability to request reconsideration. The final guidelines retain the 60 day period for filing requests for reconsideration and the scope of reconsideration, however, remains the same as the original review.

The same commentator asks that CEQ establish a public docket of requests and changes, including information about who has requested a change, the nature of the request, any specific changes made, why they were made, and any appropriate supporting documents. CEQ agrees and notes above that it will maintain such a docket on its website.

Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments and Risk Assessments

One commentator approved of CEQ's basic formulation regarding adaptation of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) standards, but recommended that the provision be expanded to indicate that the methods used to develop data underlying risk assessment must be made public because methodologies can be of critical importance in decision-making. Further, it is recommended that CEQ clarify the provision in the draft guideline that caveated CEQ's commitment to provide sufficient information about methodology with the statement that the commitment is subject, "to an acceptable degree of imprecision and subject to ethical, feasibility and confidentiality restraints." This commentator argues that CEQ must clarify what degree of imprecision is considered acceptable. CEQ agrees that an understanding of the methodology used in an analysis is important, and should be made public, subject to appropriate caveats. The final guidelines delete the reference to "an acceptable degree of imprecision".

Another commentator states that CEQ should make it clear that it will comply with its underlying statutes and explain how current practice fits in with the principles of the Safe Drinking Water Act. CEQ does not, as a matter of practice, perform risk assessments. Given its lack of experience in this area, the guidelines at this point will not provide for further details for risk assessments per se.

One commentator recommended that CEQ provide more detail regarding peer review, including a statement that peer review is not required for all "influential information" subject to the adapted standards under the Safe Drinking Water Act, and that when used, the agency commit to using appropriately balanced peer review panels and avoiding conflicts of interest. Further, the commentator urges that information about peer

reviewers be made public. CEQ believes the language in the draft guidelines, (“CEQ will also determine whether peer review would be appropriate and, if necessary, coordinate such review” make it clear that peer review is not always required. When peer review is used by CEQ, information about the peer review process will be made publicly available, absent ethical, feasibility or confidentiality constraints. Language has been added to address balance and conflict of interest concerns.

Definitions

One commentator approved of the definition of “dissemination”, but asked CEQ to reconsider the exception in Section C(2)(b) of the draft guidelines for information or materials that are intended for U.S. government agencies, and the exception in Section C(2)(d) for correspondence or other communication limited to individuals or to other “persons” as defined in the guidelines themselves. In particular, this commentator argues that CEQ is often aware that information it provides in correspondence to trade associations, corporations and other entities are intended for wider distribution. The final guidelines retain the exception in Section C(2)(b) for communications intended for U.S. government agencies, but caveats the exception in Section C(2)(d) to state that the exception does not apply if the responsible CEQ employee clearly knows prior to communicating the information that the intended recipient intends to disseminate the information provided by CEQ.

The same commentator was troubled by some of the exceptions to the definition found in Section C(4) of the draft guidelines for the term “information”. The commentator agreed that the exception in Section C(4)(b) of the draft guidelines for hyperlinks on CEQ’s

website to outside information is acceptable, but suggested that the publication of reports of advisory committees published on CEQ's website constitutes an implied endorsement of information contained in the reports and thus should not be exempted from the definition of information. The commentator also suggested that the phrase, "provided CEQ not expressly rely upon it" is confusing and needs clarification. Section C(4)(b) in the final guidelines makes it clear that "information" for purposes of these guidelines applies to information disseminated from CEQ itself, but not when the agency is merely acting as a conduit of information. The final guidelines also state that CEQ will indicate on its website when information is in fact merely being provided as a service rather than being sponsored by CEQ or being relied on in the course of a decisionmaking process.

The same commentator also found the national security exception in Section C(4)(e) to be confusing, and strongly objected to the exception in Section C (4)(g), regarding testimony or comments of CEQ officials before Congress, courts, administrative bodies, or the media, terming it "unacceptable" and unsupported by the OMB guidelines. The final guidelines clarify that the exemption applies to press and testimony before Congress, courts and administrative bodies when the information has been disseminated in another way, and deletes the national security exemption, since those concerns would typically be addressed in the context of classified information that is not intended for dissemination.

Finally, the commentator objected to the wording of the exception in Section C(4)(i) relating to statements, "which are, or which reasonably may be expected to become the subject of litigation, whether before a U.S. or foreign court, in a dispute resolution

proceeding.” The commentator argues that this provision is overly broad. CEQ has refined this provision so that it applies only to material prepared for litigation or other conflict resolution proceedings.

Waiver of Data Quality Standards

One commentator states that CEQ “guts” the data quality standards in the context of its waiver provision at Section A(10) in two ways. First, the commentator commends the identification of the Chair, General Counsel and Chief of Staff as officials able to waive the applicability of these guidelines, but decries the addition of “or his/her designee in urgent situations” and urges its deletion. CEQ is a very small agency that has sometimes had under ten professional staff and that needs flexibility to delegate internally in emergency situations. The final guidelines retain this provision, but specifies that any such delegation must be a matter of public record.

Second, the commentator argues that the definition of “urgent situations” needs more clarity. In particular, the commentator is concerned that “significant environmental impact” is too broad.

The final guideline is modified slightly to read, (“e.g., imminent and significant threats to public health and safety, homeland security, environmental quality and natural resources.)

Judicial Review

A commentator recommends that CEQ should state in the data quality guidelines that the guidelines are not judicially reviewable and do not provide any new adjudicatory authority. Additionally, the commentator recommends a statement that CEQ is not legally bound by the guidelines and reserves the right to depart from them when appropriate. CEQ does not, in fact, believe that the guidelines are judicially reviewable, nor do they provide new adjudicatory authority. However, the agency intends to follow the guidelines, which do provide for flexibility in their implementation..

CEQ also received various comments that addressing the generic Data Quality guidelines, OMB's guidelines implementing the statutory requirements, and EPA's guidelines. We appreciate receiving these comments and have considered them in developing the final guidelines.

The following are CEQ's "Final Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by the Council on Environmental Quality":

A. CEQ will ensure that all information it disseminates to the public meets all applicable standards of quality, including objectivity, utility and integrity. CEQ hereby adopts this standard of quality as a performance goal, and adopts the following procedures for the incorporation of information quality criteria into CEQ information dissemination activities.

1. Objectivity and Utility of Information

As defined in Section C, below, "objectivity" is a measure of whether disseminated information is "accurate, clear, complete, and unbiased;". "Utility" refers to the usefulness of the information to its intended audience. CEQ is committed to disseminating reliable and useful information. Before disseminating information, CEQ staff and officials

will ensure that the information has been reviewed in an information quality review process that is proportional to the importance of the information. It is the primary responsibility of the professional staff person drafting information intended for dissemination or supervising the preparation of such information to pursue the most knowledgeable and reliable sources reasonably available to confirm the objectivity and utility of such information.

2. Much of the information CEQ disseminates consists of or is based on information submitted to CEQ by other Federal agencies. Prior to dissemination of such information, responsible CEQ staff will obtain a written statement from the agency submitting the information attesting that the information meets the agency of origin's information quality guidelines.
3. In seeking to assure the "objectivity" and "utility" of the information it disseminates, CEQ will generally follow the basic clearance process established internally by the Chief of Staff and, where, appropriate, the government-wide clearance process coordinated by OMB. Where appropriate, substantive input will be sought from within CEQ, other offices within the EOP, other government agencies, non-government organizations, and the public. When CEQ determines that the transparency of information is relevant for assessing the information's usefulness from the perspective of the users of the information, including the public, CEQ shall ensure that transparency has been appropriately addressed and provided. In determining the appropriate level of transparency, CEQ should consider the types of data that can practicably be subjected to a reproducibility requirement given ethical, feasibility, and confidentiality constraints.
4. The CEQ staff member or official responsible for the dissemination of information should generally take the following basic steps to assure the "objectivity" and "utility" of the information to be disseminated:
 - a. Preparing a draft of the document after consulting the necessary parties, including government and non-government sources, as appropriate;
 - b. Determining necessary clearance points;
 - c. Determining who will be responsible for making the final decision.
 - d. Determining whether peer review would be appropriate and, if necessary, coordinating such review;
 - e. Obtaining clearances; and
 - f. Overcoming delays and, if necessary, presenting the matter to higher authority.

5. For information regarding risks to human health, safety and the environment and information that is considered to be “influential” as defined in Section D (3) of these guidelines, CEQ adapts the standards set forth by Congress in the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 300g-1(b)(3)(A) & (B)). Thus, CEQ will use the “best available, peer-reviewed science and supporting studies conducted in accordance with sound and objective scientific practices”, and “data collected by the accepted methods or best available methods (if the reliability of the method and the nature of the decision justifies use of the data.”) Such information shall be presented in a manner that is comprehensive, informative, and comprehensive.

CEQ will also determine whether peer review would be appropriate and, if necessary, coordinate such review. CEQ will assure that any peer review process for influential information will be conducted in a manner that utilizes the best expertise and, if applicable, a diversity of views. Further, peer reviewers will be screened for financial conflicts of interest prior to selection.

CEQ will provide sufficient information about such methods as related to influential information that a qualified member of the public could reproduce the analysis, subject to ethical, feasibility and confidentiality constraints. CEQ will use publicly available information when such information provides equal quality and usefulness to the decisionmaking process.

6. CEQ will disseminate information only after appropriate internal clearances are obtained from the Office of General Counsel and the Chief of Staff.
7. “Integrity” refers to the protection of information from unauthorized, unanticipated, or unintentional modification, thus preventing information from being compromised by corruption or falsification. Within the EOP, the Office of Administration has substantial responsibility for ensuring the “integrity” of information as defined in these guidelines. CEQ also has an Administrative Officer that coordinates and works with the EOP Office of Administration to ensure the integrity of information. These offices implement and maintain new computer software and hardware systems and provide operational support for systems and system users.
8. Computer security is the responsibility of the EOP Office of Administration’s Chief Information, Information Assurance Directorate. This Office oversees all matters relating to information integrity, including the design and implementation of the security architecture for the EOP, periodic audits of security architecture components, and review and approval of changes to the technical baseline.

9. As an agency under the EOP, CEQ is an integral part of the overall EOP network, and is an active participant in all aspects of information integrity at EOP. CEQ adheres to both law and OMB IT security policies, along with EOP security policies and operational processes for the protection of data and information.
10. Information quality standards applicable to the dissemination of information by CEQ may be waived temporarily by the Chair of CEQ, the General Counsel, the Chief of Staff, or his/her designee in urgent situations (e.g., imminent and significant threats to public health and safety, homeland security, or environmental or ecological quality) to the extent necessary to respond to the urgent situation. Any waiver shall provide for public notice, to the extent practicable under the circumstances of the waiver, that includes a statement of the reason for the waiver, who made the decision to waive the guidelines, and a determination of the point at which the normal application of information quality standards will resume.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS FOR CORRECTION OF INFORMATION

1. The burden of proof lies with the requestor to demonstrate that he or she is an affected party and that the information in question does not comport with CEQ's or OMB's guidelines.
2. Any request for correction must be submitted by mail to the Deputy General Counsel, CEQ, 722 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C. 20503 or via electronic mail at info_quality@ceq.eop.gov. In choosing the means of transmission, persons should be aware that normal mail delivery to the Executive Office of the President has been slowed considerably due to security concerns. The request for correction should be as specific as possible regarding the information that is the subject of the concern and the reason(s) for the concern. Affected persons shall clearly indicate that the communication is a "Request for Correction" under Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 2001. Persons should specify the information that is being contested, the aspect of the information that needs to be corrected, explain how they are affected by the information, how the information identified does not comply with the CEQ and/or OMB information quality guidelines, and what corrective action is sought. Persons should provide all supporting information necessary for CEQ to correct the information. CEQ's response will be proportional to the nature of the request. CEQ will generally not substantively respond to a request that is duplicative of an earlier request..

3. CEQ will respond to any request within 60 days of receipt of the request in accordance with paragraph C.1 and may at that time provide an initial response that additional time is necessary to consider the request, to consult with the source of the information or other agencies, or to obtain additional information from the requestor or the public. If CEQ finds that additional time is necessary, CEQ shall seek a mutually agreed-upon extension of time and, if agreement is not obtained, shall include in its initial response a deadline for a final CEQ response based upon the factors that require additional time.
4. CEQ's final response will set forth whether CEQ agrees or disagrees with the concern expressed and, if it believes the concern has validity, how CEQ will correct the information or otherwise address the concern. Subject to applicable law, rules and regulations, CEQ may take corrective measures through any appropriate and effective means, including personal contacts via letter or telephone, form letters, press releases, or postings on the CEQ website to correct a widely disseminated error or address a frequently raised request. Corrective measures, where appropriate, should be designed to provide reasonable notice to affected persons of such correction. In all cases, corrective measures will be disseminated by the same means originally used for the information deemed to be in need of correction.
5. If CEQ responds that the information meets the requirements of the applicable guidelines and no correction is needed, the affected person may request reconsideration of the response from the CEQ General Counsel within 60 days of receipt of the response. Such a request for reconsideration shall clearly indicate that the communication is a "Request for Reconsideration" under Section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 2001 and set forth, as specifically as possible, the reasons for the affected person's disagreement with CEQ's response. The request for reconsideration should be mailed to the CEQ General Counsel, 722 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, DC 20503 or e-mailed to info_quality@ceq.eop.gov. CEQ will respond to any such request for reconsideration within 60 days of the request.
6. When a person wishes to challenge information that is disseminated in the course of rulemaking or another administrative process that provides for public input, challenges to information should be brought forward within the context of public participation under the existing administrative framework. In cases where the agency disseminates a study, analysis, or other information prior to the final agency action or information product, requests for correction will be considered prior to the final agency action or information product in those cases where the agency has determined that an earlier response would not unduly delay issuance of the agency

action or information product and the complainant has shown a reasonable likelihood of suffering actual harm from the agency's dissemination if the agency does not resolve the complaint prior to the final agency action or information product.

7. These guidelines are intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal Government

C. DEFINITIONS

1. "Affected" persons are those who use, or may benefit from or be harmed by, the disseminated information.
2. "Dissemination" means agency initiated or sponsored distribution of information to the public, whether in written, electronic, or audiovisual form. Dissemination does not include distribution of information or materials that are:
 - a. intended for government employees or agency contractors, consultants or volunteers;
 - b. intended for U.S. government agencies or the President, Vice President, or their immediate staffs;
 - c. produced in response to requests for agency records under the Freedom of Information Act, the Privacy Act, the Federal Advisory Committee Act or similar law, or requests from Congress or other government officials;
 - d. correspondence or other communication limited to individuals or to other persons within the meaning of "person" as forth in paragraph 7, below, unless the responsible CEQ employee clearly knows prior to communicating the information that the intended recipient intends to disseminate the information;
 - e. archival records;
 - f. responses to subpoenas or other compulsory document productions;
 - g. documents prepared for adjudicative proceedings.
3. "Influential" when used in the phrase "influential information" refers to disseminated information that CEQ determines will have a clear and substantial impact on important public policies or important private sector decisions.
4. "Information," for purposes of these guidelines, means any communication or representation of facts or data, in any medium or form, including textual, numerical, graphic, cartographic, narrative, or audiovisual forms. This definition does not include:

- a. opinions, where the presentation makes clear that the statements are subjective opinions or interpretations, rather than facts; however, any underlying information disseminated by CEQ upon which the opinion is based may be subject to these guidelines;
 - b. information originated by, and attributed to, non-CEQ sources, when CEQ indicates that the information is being provided as a service rather than being sponsored by CEQ or being relied on in the course of a decisionmaking process. Examples include: non-U.S. Government information reported and duly attributed in materials prepared and disseminated by CEQ; hyperlinks on CEQ's website to information that others disseminate; and reports of advisory committees published on CEQ's website;
 - c. statements related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of CEQ and other materials produced for CEQ employees, contractors, agents, volunteers or alumni;
 - d. descriptions of the agency, its responsibilities and its organizational components;
 - e. statements of Administration policy; however, any underlying information disseminated by CEQ upon which a statement is based may be subject to these guidelines;
 - f. testimony or comments of CEQ officials before Congress, courts, administrative bodies, or the media unless such testimony contains new, substantive information not previously disseminated;
 - g. investigatory material compiled pursuant to U.S. law or for law enforcement purposes in the United States; or
 - h. information that is prepared for the purpose of a conflict resolution proceeding, including litigation, whether before a U.S. or foreign court, or in an alternative dispute resolution procedure.
5. "Integrity" refers to the security of information – protection of the information from unauthorized access or revision, to prevent the information from being compromised through corruption or falsification.
 6. "Objectivity" is a measure of whether disseminated information is accurate, reliable, and unbiased and whether that information is presented in an accurate, clear, complete, and unbiased manner.
 7. "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or legal representative, an organized group of individuals, a regional, national, State, territorial, tribal, or local government or branch thereof, or a political subdivision of a State, territory, tribal, or local government or a branch of a political subdivision, or an international organization;

8. “Quality” encompasses “utility”, “objectivity”, and “integrity”. Thus, the government-wide guidelines and CEQ’s guidelines may refer to these four statutory terms, collectively, as “quality”.
9. “Utility” refers to the usefulness of the information to its intended users, including the public.