THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

INNOVATION IN GOVERNMENT:

HOW TO MAKE THE PUBLIC SECTOR FASTER, SMARTER AND MORE CONNECTED

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 17, 2009

PARTICIPANTS:

Featured Panelists:

DARRELL WEST, Vice President and Director
Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

BETH SIMONE NOVECK
Deputy Chief Technology Officer for Open Government, Executive Office of the President;
Professor of Law, New York University Law School

CARMEN SIRIANNI
Professor of Sociology and Public Policy
Brandeis University

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. WEST: Good morning. I'm Darrell West. I am Vice President and Director of Governance Studies at Brookings, and I'd like to welcome to your Innovation in Government Panel. We appreciate all of you coming out this morning to hear this conversation.

For years people have been complaining about the inefficiency and wastefulness of the public sector. According to the common critique, the private sector is more innovative and more entrepreneurial than government agencies. Yet there actually have been very few tests of that proposition concerning the relative sense of technology innovation in the private versus the public sectors. We got a grant from the Kauffman Foundation that funded some research on technology innovation in the public and private sectors, so we compared the websites of leading American corporations with those of state and national government. We examined a variety of different examples of technology innovation such as the degree of online services, how much interactivity there was, was there disability access through the website, and how each site handled issues of privacy and security.

The details are in a report that's available outside of the auditorium. I know some of you picked up a copy of it. In general we found some aspects of the conventional wisdom to be correct. We found

that the private sector did tend to be better at including multimedia features on their websites, having interactive features, and being able to personalize and customize the website to your particular interests compared to government agencies. Leading companies such as Wells Fargo, Home Depot, AT&T, and Microsoft all had a number of advanced features on their websites. You could make suggestions about products or services, provide feedback on your experience, watch videos, order products and services, and customize the site to your particular needs.

But there were two areas where the public sector actually did better on average than the private sector. Those were in the areas of disability access and protecting visitor privacy. On each of these dimensions -- particularly in terms of disability access -- it's very important for everyone to have access to this digital revolution that we are living through right now, and there is software that will essentially allow visually impaired people to see the contents of the website by converting text to audio signals. So basically the contours of that site will be read to this person so they can understand what is on the site. But the sites have to be configured in particular ways with tags on images and other ways for that software to work, and in general we found public sector sites were much better than private sector sites on providing that type of disability access.

Ditto in terms of various indicators of the quality of privacy policies, in terms of safeguarding the privacy of the visitor experience to that particular website. You're much more likely to encounter cookies and other various features on corporate sites as opposed to government sites.

After we did the analysis comparing these websites, we undertook some interviews to see what were the keys to successful technology innovation, and the report outlines some of those suggestions. But one thing we found was that the private sector often does better because it actually spends more money. We got some information on the percentage of the overall government agency budget devoted to technology versus that in the private sector, and on average there is not a big differential, but on average in the private sector, about 2.5 percent of the budget was devoted to technology innovation compared to 1.88 percent for -- the information we got was actually for state government agencies. That doesn't seem like a big difference, but it's enough of a difference to allow the private sector to do many more things when they're thinking about their digital outreach.

We found for example that the top innovators on the corporate side focus on the customer, they value market research, they often are very systematic at undertaking market research on behalf of their website and talking with people, what do you like, what do you don't like,

how can we improve the site and so on. They take feedback very seriously and that allows them to then incorporate visitor feedback into what they offer.

I once was talking to a state government official and I asked him did he obtain feedback on that agency website, and he said we have no money for market research, we can't really do surveys or focus groups or really do anything very systemically. So I said how do you figure out how things are going? This person said basically we just monitor the complaint lines and when we get a lot of complaints we assume there's a problem and we fix that particular problem. I thought this was very interesting, and it showed part of the problem of public sector responsiveness, or more accurately, the lack of responsiveness in the sense that the responsiveness was reactive as opposed to proactive. In the private sector, people are more systematic at trying to anticipate what the problems are. They want to see around the corner. They want to try and figure out what their customer base wants and then configure their digital innovation to satisfy those needs.

We also found that successful innovators often tie resource allocations within the company to customer satisfaction. That can take a variety of different forms. Sometimes there's a bonus to the budget if you are in a division within that company that has very high consumer

satisfaction and so it basically creates incentives for effective performance and encourages employees to value innovation on behalf of the company as a whole.

I do want to point out that our study of government agencies was completed before President Obama took office, so before Beth gives me grief on this point, I want to note that there is nothing in our project that reflects any of the new thinking that is currently being undertaken at the federal level. There obviously has been a burst of new ideas over the last few months from the new administration on how governments can become more transparent, accountable and connected. As part of America's Recovery and Reinvestment legislation, the federal government has set up a variety of websites such as recovery.gov, data.gov and other such features that are designed to help the public and interested parties track the money trail on the stimulus package in particular. How are states and localities spending the money? Are the policy goals that were set out in the legislation being achieved, and so on?

There are also a variety of new initiatives in terms of employing social media for public outreach and public communications using tools such as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter to communicate with people. It's estimated now that about a quarter of members of Congress are now using one or more of these social media outlets.

There are a number of other outreach tools that give the public a chance to make comments and provide feedback on what should be happening in government. You can go to whitehouse.gov, for example, and offer suggestions on what you think the president should be doing, how Beth should be spending her time, and they actually do offer interesting suggestions, and various administration officials will then come back and respond to particular ideas if they see a suggestion. If they think is notable and has some offer of success they will come back and comment on that and talk about what they're doing in particular areas. So I think there is a lot of exciting stuff happening in the digital area both in the public and private sectors, but obviously there's a lot of additional work yet to be done.

With that backdrop, we are fortunate to have very distinguished experts who are at the forefront of this subject. Our first speaker is going to be Beth Simone Noveck. She is the author of *Wiki Government: How Technology Can Make Government Better, Democracy Stronger and Citizens More Powerful*. I love that subtitle. That really evokes a lot of strong images there. I want to say this is an outstanding book that was just published by Brookings Institution Press a couple of months ago. I read this book in manuscript form and I thought it was one of the most creative books I've ever read just in terms of thinking about

new ways to think about government. It combines strong analysis with detailed cast studies that really bring the subject alive. This is the paid commercial part of this introduction, if you want to buy a copy of her book, it is available for purchase in the Brookings bookstore just outside the auditorium across the hallway. It's also interesting that Beth has been an academic for much of her career. She's been a professor at the New York University Law School, but she now has an opportunity that academics can only dream of most of the time which is a chance to really put her ideas into practice. Many of you know that she recently has been named the Deputy Chief Technology Officer of the White House Office of Open Government, and in that position among other responsibilities she has the opportunity to execute the open government vision of the Obama Administration.

Our other speaker is equally accomplished. Carmen Sirianni is professor of sociology and public policy at Brandeis University. He is the author of a terrific book entitled *Investing in Democracy: Engaging Citizens in Collaborative Governance*. The book examines the opportunity for collaborative governance. It notes that agencies often treat citizens as passive clients as opposed to contributing members of the community. Carmen presents studies of three particular examples where the government successfully engaged people to solve problems,

neighborhood planning in Seattle, a youth civic engagement program in Hampton, Virginia, and civic environmentalism at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. That book also is published by Brookings Press and is available for purchase in the Brookings bookstore following this panel as well, so I recommend you get copies of both of those books.

The format that we are going to follow on this panel, I've asked each of our two speakers to make brief opening comments laying out their thoughts on how to make the public sector more innovative. Following their comments I will pose one or two questions to each of them, and then we'll open the floor to any questions or comments that you have. So our opening speaker will be Beth Noveck.

MS. NOVECK: Thank you very much. Thanks to everybody for being here, and thank you to Darrell. And I have to say you are right that it is a rare privilege for an academic to work in government and have the opportunity to implement ideas, but I would have to say they are not my ideas that I'm implementing, but ideas that are built upon the work of people like Carmen and like Darrell. I really view myself as their student having followed their work for many years and having had the privilege to read your book in manuscript as well as we were working on these in parallel, and so it's really a very rare privilege to be here with both of you and I thank you for all the hard work that you have done in really helping

and influencing and getting us to the point where we can think about how to use technology now to make democracy stronger and citizens more powerful.

Right now on the White House website at whitehouse.gov/open there is a policy dialogue taking place, what I'd like to think is an unprecedented policy dialogue that actually engages citizens in the process of crafting the administration's policy on transparency, participation and open government. We're in now a two-way dialogue, a blogging process of a three-phase process if you will that started with brainstorming and is now in the midst of discussion and dialogue on a blog, and next week on Monday moves to a drafting phase. It's really I think very heartening and exciting the level of participation. We're not talking about 100,000 comments about everything under the sun, but we're talking about really focused discussion about how do we actually bring innovation to the way that government works, innovation that's enabled by technology, but innovation that's not exclusively about technology. That's why I'm glad that we're both here together because this is really about a process of changing the way that government works and changing the way that we think about the way we make decisions.

So I think really the core here to this work and I hope how we think about innovation in government and in public sector institutions is

the need for the public sector first and foremost to do a better job of articulating what the problems are, what the agenda is, so that we are creating opportunities for people to take action and to work together in a collaborative fashion to do things ranging things from the Department of Transportation now has a design, "The Bus Stop of the Future" competition, that's running that engages people in doing exactly that, designing a bus stop or in this policy-making process of crafting recommendations on open government.

We need to proliferate more opportunities for engagement. As the President likes to say, we have to tap the knowledge and expertise of the American people. We can't solve the problems that we face today on our own, on our own as in government by itself, but we have to think about ways of working that are actually going to create these new opportunities for engagement that recognize the opportunity that technology has created for us to work together across a distance. By work together, I think work together really takes on a bit of a new definition, a definition that I would ascribe not only to ways of working, but actually fundamentally to how we should be thinking about not just government but of democracy, is one in which we're focused not only on what are the appropriate procedures for fair and reasonable deliberation for ways of talking together, but what are the strategies for coordination

that will enable the kind of collaboration and collaborative examples that you'll hear Carmen talk more about.

It means in addition to the strategies for uniform legal procedures, how do we actually think about more and different opportunities for participation and collaboration, and that includes opportunities for example for people with technical skills who may want to contribute and participate in government not by simply speaking as part of the process like writing a comment on a blog post, but who may actually want to build software that actually enables government to work better and for more people to get engaged and participate. So it's thinking about co-creation through action, not only co-creation through talk, thinking about again collaboration rather than only deliberation, and these two things go hand in hand, but I would really think about it as kind of expanding our concept of deliberation to now include what we both have come to call collaborative governance. Really what this grows out of fundamentally is a changing notion of expertise of thinking about the fact that government, and the President now says this himself on a very regular basis, that we do not have all the expertise alone in government in Washington within a single institution. Business has long ago come to recognize this, so when you take a look at something like an incentive platform where Eli Lilly, the pharmaceutical company, said it would be cheaper and more effective for

us to go out now to a network of 280,000 volunteer solvers and pose questions to them and let them help us to answer them in exchange for bounties. Or the Threadless t-shirt company if you've ever bought anything from them that crowd sources the design of T-shirts and baby clothes and other great items, but they're all made by people who submit their designs on the web. Or we take a look at what happened in this most recent political campaign where so many people got involved including by creating campaign offices that were not in fact created or sanctions by or even known about initially the folks in Chicago, but actually which sprung up of their own accord, for example, in Silicon Valley where 70,000 volunteers self-organized including developing software and mailing lists and outreach campaigns, et cetera, to run the campaign on their own from the periphery rather than from the center.

So I think we have to start by recognizing this cultural shift away from centralized notions of expertise toward more distributed notions of expertise, and we have to let that inform our process of institutional innovation. The ITIF did a study that came out earlier this spring in which it talked about innovation and global competitiveness and said that the U.S. is sixth in the world on global competitiveness, we are dead last of all the countries that they rated in terms of change, in terms of improvement, in our level of global competitiveness and innovation over the last 10

years. One of the prescriptions that they made in that study was to say that we need to actually build institutions, we need to build regulatory institutions and political institutions, that support innovation in the economy. So we need to have good policies around jobs and the economy, but we also have to innovate in the way that we work in order to open up and be more collaborative in tapping this distributed intelligence and expertise. Let me just say a little bit more about how I think we achieve this in practice and then I'll turn it over to Carmen and we can talk more about specific examples in a few minutes.

I think that we need to as we think about this kind of redesign of political institutions and how we facilitate new kinds of political structures that enable new ways of working is we have to look around at these opportunities for example that are driven in particular by data and data transparency. If we are going to engage people in doing stuff, it has to be toward given outcomes and we only know if we're achieving those outcomes, if we're to outcomes, if we have data on which to base the decisions that we make, and that depends squarely on data transparency which is why an initiative like data.gov is really so crucial. So democratizing data that allows us for example to know when we're spending billions of dollars on censors that go into people's homes to power the smart grid, those sensors have to be able to talk to one another.

If we're spending billions in health care IT, we have to make sure that the data that we're getting back from this process allows us to know if in fact the processes that we're putting in place are actually driving toward lower costs and better outcomes in whatever the region is or the place is. So it doesn't really matter what the policy is, we have to have data transparency in order to facilitate the making of the tools and the analysis of the tools. John is sitting here, and I'm depending on the Sunlight Foundation to do a lot of this analysis they're doing now particularly focused on Congress in which more people as we've providing more Executive Branch data are able to do in order to get involved in and participate in new ways in the Executive Branch policies as well.

We need to focus on redesigning process, and I think the key principle here is that we have to start to design not simply horizontally for uniform procedures across every form of engagement, but in more vertical ways that allow people to form communities of interest around particular areas of engagement. We can use the new technology that's available to us, and I'm happy to talk a little bit more about this because I think there are some interesting examples. We can use the technology to help reflect back to us what we're doing so that we can see ourselves in the screen, we can see ourselves as part of something and thereby know what is the task, what is the role that I can possibly take on. Am I actually

going to be the person handing out the leaflets or the person making the coffee or the person answering the phone? We now have tools that enable us to know which role I can take on and to self-select to participate in order to be involved in this process of co-creation and collaboration.

Finally, that we need the platforms, we need the IT, but we need the process and we need the replicable process that allows us to bring innovation into government and to connect solutions to problems. So when we know that we want to do a two-way engaged policy dialogue, it has to be easy to use a blog or it has to be easy to adopt a brainstorming platform. If you're the Department of Transportation and you now want to run the Global Congestion Challenge with the International Transportation Society and give a $50,000 purse to the person who comes up with or the organization that comes up with the solution to the global congestion problem, you have to be able to have a platform on which to run that brainstorming that's accessible to you, and if another agency wants to also engage in a similar form of innovation, they have to have those platforms, those products essentially which are a combination of those web 2.0 tools, but also again this process for new ways of working that allow us to take advantage of and engage in collaboration. So I think it's a combination of policy that focused on data transparency and the ability to adopt web 2.0 technologies, processes that

recognize the changing nature of expertise and the ability to tap the intelligence of others to work together in new ways, and then the platforms, the IT and the replicable IT that actually lets to do these things in practice. With that let me stop. I could talk about this subject for a long time and there are lots of examples we're seeing of things that are happening, things that are going to happen and things that need to happen, but I think we'll hear more about some of those really promising examples from Carmen.

MR. SIRIANNI: Thank you, Beth. First, thanks to Darrell for organizing this and the Brookings Institution generally. I did have a special thanks to Mary Quaff , the editor who really helped, and I'm sure Beth feels the same way, and the whole staff of the press was just superlative and it was great to work with them.

MS. NOVECK: Absolutely.

MR. SIRIANNI: I don't see him here, but I did want to put in a special thanks to Bill Galston, not because he had anything to do with this book, but Bill first when he was at the White House with Clinton really created an opportunity for me to really begin to learn about this because my area of expertise was very different at the time and I was transitioning, and Bill created a series of opportunities at the White House, the National Commission on Civic Renewal, Circle, and a variety of other things that

certainly allowed me to grow and allowed me to grow in a network of people some of whom I see here who have been very important in developing these ideas over the years. And a special thanks to Beth. In the fall we were talking on the phone and exchanging manuscripts and I was really struck for the first time, although I knew a little bit about the online tools, how much potential there was when you thought about these tools in a problem-solving context, and I think the beauty of the book is terms of thinking is through as collaborative democracy as it is very focused on problem solving, and you'll see in a second that this is the core of the my book "Investing in Democracy."

What I try to do in the book just quickly is provide some empirical cases, and Darrell referred to those, but particularly to develop a conceptual model of collaborative governance, drawing upon a lot of other empirical evidence, but cross-disciplinary work, work in public administration, in planning, in urban studies, in sociology, in political theory, in political science, environmental policy, that more and more over the past roughly 15 years or so has really pinpointed the value added that can come from collaboration not just across different institutional systems, but with citizens, civic groups, multi-stakeholder partnerships, et cetera, and that we really can't solve many of the problems that we face today because of their complexity unless we really begin to fill this model out.

There is no one model that's applicable in all circumstances, but there's a lot of rich thinking and practice that moves in that way quickly, and this is extremely a brief sort of overview and gets some things wrong for us. I would say that model boils down to thinking of citizens as co-producers, Beth mentioned co-creation, and problem solvers, not just advocates, claimants, watchdogs, clients, all of those things are important, but really making more central the role of citizens as problem solvers and co-producers of public good in the quality of public life.

Secondly, looking at communities as having assets of all sorts, networks, public buildings, connections or various sorts, that can be mobilized in new ways to make more robust communities but also make policy work on the ground, so to speak, in many different kinds of institutions. Third, looking at public agencies as partners in this work to enable citizens, associations, multi-stakeholder partnerships, networks, et cetera, to enable them in their public work, not to come in and say ah-ha, we have the solution. You've told us what you want, we have the solution and we'll come in and impose this on you in this way or that in this particularly technocratic fashion.

One sort of way of thinking about this is the following, I think. I was trying to figure out here we are in Washington, what's the significance of this for an Obama presidency running 4 years, maybe 8

years, and the way I think of it is this. Take faith-based community organizing, that tradition that Obama was trained as an organizer 25 years ago, take its richest components, add 25 years of learning especially in those areas where partnership building, the notion of power with relational work, has been truly enriched in a number of those networks. And then recognize that on parallel tracks in other areas of community development, in community-based environmentalism, in healthy communities and some public health work, sustainable communities, you've had real parallel learning of a fairly ambitious type going on. So we're not just stuck where President Obama was Barack Obama in the early 1980s in Chicago, we have a wealth of experience, models, practices, intellectual foundations and across a range of areas, not just fighting at the local urban level for more jobs or some public improvement by the mayor. Then say we're at a moment potentially, an historic moment I hope, where we can take that learning and that capacity building and leverage it in significant new ways in our polity and our politics generally. In a sense, in the word investing which I developed a lot in chapter one is really an argument that because of the nature of complex public problems and the challenges of really engaging citizens effectively, we need to think systemically about an investment strategy, and again an analogy is here. We have decided to invest fairly substantially in national service for

reasons that probably most of us accept, although I know there are philosophical differences, add a couple billion dollars over the next 5 years. What we really need to say in addition to that is what would the nature of the investments be, federal investments, but also leveraging state, local, foundation investments so that the kind of capacity we really need to have an engaged and effectively engaged problem-solving citizenry, a citizenry and civic groups capable of using some of the tools that Beth is referring to, what would that take? In one of the empirical cases, and I'll just give you a little taste of this at EPA, EPA was an important case for me because it was an agency that really over its whole life, almost 40 years, but especially in the 1980s forward, certain pockets and certain cross-office networks within the agency have really struggled with, how do we engage communities, and how we empower communities and provide some of the tools that they want to address some of their most pressing problems, the deterioration of ecosystems and watersheds and all kinds of things surrounding that, environmental justice, problems that generate intense conflict in many communities, and a variety of other things. They figured out this and they didn't do it perfectly, I'm creating a type here, in a number of program areas across a variety of programs with the intention of culture change. In other words, what was called in the 1990s community-based environmental protection, the CARE program

today which stands for Community Action for a Renewed Environment, and now with the emerging climate communities, grants, et cetera, is trying to figure out how do you cut across these different silos so that you can enable the resources of the federal government, and again then state and local, et cetera, to enable communities to come together to address some of these problems more creatively than they can do by just applying separate mandates, rules, command and control techniques.

Importantly, at EPA is that over the last 4 years now through the Innovation Action Council which is a high-level senior management group cutting across the regional deputy regional administrators and other deputies who are in this group, and the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology, NACEP, has initiated a discussion inside the agency and across the agency should we rethink the agency of the mission to build it much more coherently around the notion of stewardship and collaborative governance. It's not that the agency has gone there, but it's opened this conversation in a very serious way to think we should be thinking about how citizens, communities, civic networks, should be at the table as problem solvers and not just depending on us or Congress, and all those things are important. One of the important things in moving in this direction over the years that I noticed as I went through all kinds of documents and interviews is that citizens would say you have

this tool and this tool doesn't fit what we want to do. We want to design this tool with you. We want a different tool. We want to be in dialogue as Beth has opened that dialogue. So we want a different watershed planning tool, we want different volunteer monitoring tools, water-quality tools. Over time the agency has not only generated quite a rich array of tools now yet at the sophistication of some of the kinds of things that Beth's book is about, but getting there, in terms of visualization, using GIS, geographical information systems, really intelligently, to enable people to bring economic data and environmental data into a community discussion and making real decisions on tradeoffs, that they have moved this way and have really thought of developing those tools and also of fostering the network capacity building of many other groups in the various fields.

I end the book, and just briefly I'll wrap up here, with a couple of proposals. This was sort of in the works before we even knew that Obama would be elected, that anybody would listen, and certainly before any of the different offices started to get created. There were a couple of proposals, one for a White House Office of Collaborative Governance, and it's not going to look like that, but the important piece here is that if citizens are to be engaged from the bottom up in a collaborative, yes, we can, grassroots problem solving, that we need some true strategic levers, we have one here sitting on this platform in terms of

the information policy and Beth thinking much more broadly in that information policy, to really think how do all of the agencies need to invest in democracy to some extent, how do they need to build capacity for this work going forward. I said that there's a parallel with the investment in national service, but there's also a danger in thinking that national service carries too much of the water if you will of what a revitalized citizenship should be. In some sense, national service is as much an appendage if you will of a much more robust collaborative democratic strategy, a very important one, don't get me wrong, but it shouldn't carry too much water in that.

Some of the people here, I saw Caroline Lukins Meyer walk in and John Komensky is here, and I know some -- has been some of these meeting. People have been meeting with federal officials to try to figure out what the specific kinds of institutional levers might be to make the White House far more strategic on this, and I leave that for discussion. I think one of the things that I try to tease out in the book is that all federal agencies, and this is a normative argument but it's also based on I think what's possible from seeing what's happening at EPA, all federal agencies should have a civic mission. They do by default or design. By default they treat citizens in a variety of ways that are sometimes good and sometimes not so good. By design, in other words, all agencies and

clearly HHS, EPA, HUD, the ones that really work with communities much more directly and this is much more relevant should be asking themselves what is our role in building the capacity of citizens as we do all of the other mandated tasks that we are entrusted to do by Congress. In other words, we have a mission and we should be asking ourselves how do we build that role for citizens and collaborative governance and collaborative democracy into that mission, obviously align it with all of the other tools of governance, market tools, command-and-control tools, et cetera, but that we need a federal government. I do think we have the opportunity at this point, the famous book by James Scott, "Thinking Like a State" which is a very negative view of how states think about people and the people under them, thinking like a democratic or civic or collaborative state, that's the challenge that we face, the opportunity that we have at this point in time.

MR. WEST: Thank you very much. Beth, let me start with the first question for you. You've given a number of interesting examples of innovation. I especially like this design a bus stop. I suggest they have roofs on them so we don't get wet when we're standing there, and global congestion challenge, software competitions, other sorts of things. I'm just curious, as you have started to think about these types of innovations, what are the biggest obstacles that you've encountered and how are you seeking to overcome them in 25 words or less?

MS. NOVECK: In 25 words or less. I'm actually reminded that I worked on a project a few years ago called deliberativebusstop.com which you might like. I used to own the domain deliberativebusstop. I don't know if I'm still paying for it, but now I could actually finally use it, this idea of combining these two things, we were going to do civic engagement and street furniture as I liked to call it.

What are the biggest obstacles? This is one of the things we are actively in the process of discussing and trying to identify, and I have to say that we are not coming at it from a blank slate. There are a lot of people who have a lot of knowledge. I can see one of them in the back of the room. He's been a very active poster on some of our listservs at helping on our blog and our brainstorming, and helping to share what some of the obstacles are that people are facing in the field if you will in their agencies and trying to adopt innovations, and I think there are a number of them. In no particular order, only as they occur to me, number one has to do with an absence of technology and technologically trained people. I fact it is not part of most people's job description so we outsource the development of technology with people who manage the development of technology, but we don't always have tech-savvy people who are there and are empowered to and have knowledge of one of the

tools that they could possibly have at their disposal in order to engage in the kind of co-creation and collaboration that Carmen talks about.

The second think and related to this is that kind of problem solving or design thinking as kind of the mindset I think that you are really describing and has to do with coming to the problem from this perspective that you can work with others on solving it. That partly has to do with cultural issues and incentives and training around workforce and HR issues, but we are not rewarding the people who solve the problems with collaboration as opposed to owning the solution to the problem all by themselves. So it's not rewarded to ask others or to ask for help in the way that it really needs to be as a kind of HR policy if you will.

The third thing is of course there are potentially policy impediments. We just posted something on the White House website yesterday, last night, on exactly this question of really trying to get to some of these issues about whether some of the policies we have in place, policies that are in place for good reasons, I see heads shaking back there, a 1980 policy like the Paperwork Reduction Act which is intended to try to minimize the burden on citizens, for example, from filling out government forms and invite citizens to participate in the process of designing those forms by having a notice in the Federal Register and having to get permission. What that's causing what I hear from a lot of

people in agencies is I don't know if I can ask anybody a question because I might have to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act to require a 30-day notice in the Federal Register, I'm doing this, and then I have to talk to OMB, and the second OMB comes into it then everybody goes I don't want to do it. Sorry if anybody is from OMB. I work very closely and they're going to be very mad at me.

MR. WEST: You'll be getting a call.

MS. NOVECK: I assure you every day I get a call and that's totally unfair. It really is totally unfair because first of all their work and these policies are in place to do things that you mentioned earlier like protect privacy in ways that we want to do better than the private sector does. And the Paper Reduction Act just to take as this example was originally designed to reduce the burden on citizens, but it dates to 30 years ago now and didn't anticipate the place we would be in at the moment, and there are policies like that. OMB is looking at revising the cookies policy for example which is a number of years old now and technology has changed and our notion for example of what is acceptable practice, in other words, the prohibition on use of persistent cookies in government. We've come a long way, baby, in the private sector both in terms of, if you will, sort of comfort with use of some of these tracking tools as well as also there are many new mechanisms for invading people's

privacy that wouldn't be defined as a cookie, so the policy is both under- and overinclusive potentially. So I don't want to say necessarily that we have to change these laws or policies, but we may need to reinterpret them, change our guidance and look at how we understand them, but we have to get people to a place where they're comfortable adopting technological innovations that are not in fear of their general counsel as is sometimes the case. It's widely disparate. You see folks for example in EPA who have a phenomenal Innovation Office. In DOD they're pumping out innovations there and tech-based innovations one after the other that's really sort of a model of what can be done, and this is contrast to other agencies where I hear from folks who say I can't put up a blog, I can't use a wiki, I don't know how to do this, and it's really a combination, I think it's no one thing, it's a combination of policy, it's a combination of technology and access to it, it's a combination of culture and culture shift. And also I would say now it has to do with also having an easy pathway and possibility of adopting both free tools and working with the community on the creation of new tools and piloting new innovations and engaging people in civic participation in the way that you've talked about by tapping people who have technical ability and expertise that they want to contribute as well as other forms of expertise. So I think we have to be working on all of these fronts at once and we have to be modeling out

what can be done. So part of what we've done on the White House website now is also to set up something that we called the Gallery of Innovation to really celebrate and showcase some of the work that's getting so people know about it, because a lot of people if they can see that someone else is doing the kind of thing that they want to do, it makes it easier for them to do it. That's one thing, and by celebrating it we say, yes, it is okay to innovate. But the other thing that we need to do is we do need to make some of these platforms and tools as I mentioned earlier available to people and available to them cost-effectively so that they can have a quicker pathway to adopting innovations.

MR. WEST: Carmen, you talked specifically about the EPA and citizen-designed tools and watershed monitoring techniques and so on. The question I have for you in terms of collaborative governance is really the conflict resolution aspect of that. The notion of collaboration implies we're all working together toward a common good and somehow we can move forward in that way. What happens in an area like the environment where there are divisions, sometimes very sharp divisions across industries, between industries and people and so on? How do you resolve conflict through a collaboration model?

MR. SIRIANNI: Much of the collaboration really is a product of some very intense conflict. In some cases that's not the case. Groups

will come together and develop a kind of common vision or find some nice way to figure out how to vision the future and work together from the beginning. But a lot of places, the move toward greater collaboration comes because of intense conflict, often stalemate. There are a variety of paths into it, but it's often a point at which people say we've been fighting and even when we win and when we take it court and it make take 10 years to resolve, we don't even win and the environment is worse off, health in this inner-city neighborhood is worse, this watershed's indicators have declined even though we won. So more and more people have come to the table and this run across agencies. All the agencies have some experience in this.

There's more opportunity for moving forward in some areas than people ever imagined, but there's not always opportunity for moving forward. There is more opportunities, and you can take a lot of cases of environmental justice where the conflicts were so intense and organizations were collapsing because they couldn't sustain the level of conflictual engagement, and finally people came together including leaders of the environmental justice movement, one of whom is the key leader who convened the environmental justice movement in the 1991 summit and is now the head of the Office of Environmental Justice at EPA, Charles Lee , and he's only been there for about 6, 7 or 8 years, a fairly

long time, but basically came to that saying when we look on the ground what we see in these intense conflicts if people want to say let's pick a piece of this that we can make better. We can make asthma better. We can make children's health better. We can do this. We can bring in a network of local body shops and all the networks of industry people and we can actually take a piece, go to a bigger piece, go to another piece, and maybe we can't resolve all of the conflict, but we can generate a dynamic toward collaboration.

But of course there are a lot of places where you need to go into formal dispute resolution for which there is a whole apparatus, or that are not resolvable in this way that will require tougher enforcement of things that haven't been enforced or some news statutory basis. So I don't want to take the position that this is always and everywhere possible. You have to look at that mix. The fields are very different, and often there are many groups who don't want to collaborate. Your civic field is often populated by groups who us versus them is their bread and butter, and then others who are willing to move in another direction, and often then a mayor or a city council or a planning department says can we change that dynamic by the way we do business. But you're right, it's not always and everywhere workable or even appropriate by the way.

MR. WEST: Speaking of collaboration, why don't we move to collaboration with the audience. In the very back there's a question. If you can identify yourself and if you're with a particular organization.

MR. SNYDER: Jim Snyder from -- and my question is basically directed to Beth, but Darrell or Carmen you might have some comments.

My question is how far should we go with the current effort to federalize open government at a local level? Traditionally the constitutional theory in the whole gist of the federal government's open government initiatives were things like the Administrative Procedures Act and the Freedom of Information Act all adhered to openness at the federal agency level. But increasingly we're seeing a push to use the power of the federal government open up local governments, so recovery.gov, for example, where you would have local contracts with state and local government, there's a much greater push for openness. The Department of Education is not under an openness rubric, it a data-driven education policy that started under the Bush Administration with No Child Left Behind and now there is a major push to open up assessment data and other things that were traditionally sort of secretive and what not at a local level as well with national standards.

So there's lots of opportunity to use the power of the federal government. In the Department of Education they're doubling funding for the local level to open up budgets and all sorts of things again at a local level. So if you have to rely on the 14,000 school boards or the 20,000 plus town councils to open it up it will be decades. You don't have the grassroots infrastructure to do it. The federal government can do it far more efficiently and have national standards for say openness and disclosure. So why not have the federal government take some more additional steps to open up and solve this terrible problem where all the glory and the public interest groups are focused on the national level and they completely ignore what I believe is the much greater problem of openness at the local level?

MS. NOVECK: Is that a question? Yes. I think you've put it very, very well, and the opportunity here, frankly, to drive toward openness to promote interoperability in order that we can share and compare data because if we don't know what's going on at the local and state level, so much of this money trickles down with something spent from the federal level, we're giving it out from Washington, but its impact is only measurable if we know what's going on at the local level.

I should say that the process though is reciprocal. It does go in two ways. To a great extent we are getting pushed toward openness,

and many of the examples that you have looked at are also local and state level, they're regional. So I do think that there's a reciprocal process that goes in both ways, it's not just about sort of our tying highway dollars to the use of seat belts, this is the 21st century version with regard to open data and data standards. But I do think that you're absolutely right that we have to look at this as an information ecosystem and that if we don't have the ability to follow the data, we cannot understand how our dollars are performing, where our dollars are going, and we also lose a lot of the opportunities for engagement and the kind of collaboration and engagement that we're both talking about and this really has to happen across levels of government.

From a vision perspective, I think it's very much why in the President's memorandum on January 21 on transparency and open government, it very squarely has three prongs. Not just a transparency prong or a participation program which is about engagement backing government, but has a collaboration prong that specifically speaks to the idea of federal, state and local and I do think that transparency is one of those areas that we can create a viral movement to infect if you will all levels of government with data transparency. I can tell you that the State of New York for example is now launching Empire 2.0 and it's very much modeled on the notion of an open-government initiative that's coming out

of the White House and trying to replicate some of these things at the state level. At the same time we've heard from I think is was maybe someone who participated in a workshop that Caroline organized that we should be mimicking what Florida does because they had an open-government initiative before the federal government did, et cetera.

I am only belaboring the point at this point which is to say, yes, we need a movement for transparency. We need to do whatever we can to infect transparency at a federal, state and local level. The buck doesn't just stop here.

MR. WEST: There's a woman right here on the aisle with a question.

SPEAKER: -- from American University. First of all, it's really so refreshing to be sitting here and hearing these kinds of presentations. I've been around for a long time and I keep thinking it's not only the 1960s, but it's also some of the efforts that people have tried to do over the years. But I also get the feeling that we're hearing the story of the "Myth of Sisyphus," that we keep pushing the stone up the hill and it keeps rolling back. I wonder if we really thought about some of the lessons that we could learn from past experiences, whether it's a national performance review or the Community Action Program of the 1960s where we learned what we did was not totally effective and that it created some problems.

What I'd like to do is focus on the institutions that you were talking about redesigning because much of the focus on the institutions has been on the bureaucrats and viewing them as the experts in those institutions. I don't think we've really sorted out what are the institutions of democracy and some of the issues that are related to legitimacy and authority, elections and officials. I've done a lot of work on performance measurement and it is extremely difficult to get to outcomes in a collaborative government system, in a federal system. The question that you just heard about local level, it is very complicated for us to worry about some of these issues when we have a system which has formerly given authority to state and local levels. In the area of performance one of the real issues is can we even get to outcomes in collaborative settings when the real issue is process and that the processes of coming to collaboration are what makes the difference and that when we push too early to try to define outcomes we end up pushing people out because our programs and our polities have multiple goals and multiple values embedded in them.

The question I guess I have after my statement is what are we going to do about the elected officials? How are we going to deal with elected officials' roles both in the transparency movement and also in some of the collaborative efforts?

MR. SIRIANNI: You've made some great contributions in thinking about that including how social justice and other kinds of things don't get factored in.

There are a number of ways to go with that and I'm not an expert on this by any means. In the Seattle case that I looked at I thought one of the most interesting things was that in the neighborhood planning process that was created officially in 1994 as a result of an uproar in the neighborhoods in response to the new comprehensive 20-year plan which was designed for sustainability but really left out local players, there was a very contentious environment, very contentious. The previous 10 years had seen lots of conflicts with the neighborhoods. The people in planning, the mayor's office, neighborhood activists, a couple people in the Department of Neighborhoods really came together, and I think what they worked out, and this is not exactly in all the accountability measures you would want, was a system that had many levels of reciprocal accountability built in. One of the things that was really striking to me is that there were really a lot of -- controls is the wrong term -- checks on citizens, did you really include people broadly enough when you developed this plan? Was it really deliberative? Are these designs technically feasible? Did you vet these with the people in transportation? Before you put these forward as your community, your neighborhood plan,

were they really properly vetted through relationship building, sitting down in the coffee shop, going back and forth, were they really vetted?

The elector officials came in at various stages, Norm Rice who oversaw this in a variety of ways, but then every member of the council was really responsible for a cluster of neighborhoods that they visited, they checked did this stuff happen, was there a reasonable consensus in the neighborhood, did they address the overarching values of equity, social justice, sustainability? By no means was it perfect and sort of the true outcome measures were very refined, but there was an incredible degree of mutual accountability. I was really struck by how many steps and how much and to some investment in democracy there was that the city staff that were tasked with making this work, how much intensive time they spent with all these stakeholders. In a sense the norm of accountability was not just like the forms, the matrices that went up to city council and that were vetted by the 10 to 12 departments or whatever, but by the fact that people were really required to communicate honestly, amend their views when they weren't right when technical people said this is not going to work. It really became embedded in a lot of the culture, and again some people sometimes trivialize this, David Brooks wrote a brilliant yesterday in the "New York Times" on relationship building that was very funny, but there really was relationship building of an incredibly

sophisticated nature involving technical staff, planning staff, city counselors, the mayor, his subcabinet, and to me that was what was so extraordinary that they worked so hard on that. There were a lot of places for revision according to some of the things that you value deeply when you criticize some of the performance work that goes on. So it's a very partial answer.

MR. WEST: If I can just add a couple of quick comments on that. The two reasons I'm optimistic that we're actually going to overcome the "Myth of Sisyphus" is, one, we actually are institutionalizing innovation now. Beth was talking about how a variety of federal agencies now have offices on innovation, so I think that's different from 10, 20 and 30 years ago. Then the point that Carmen just mentioned which I think is absolutely crucial, it's not just a question of changing institutions, we have to change our culture and we have to change our expectations. That involves the public, elected officials, everyone. We have to get over the idea of top-down government, they're telling us what to do. It has to be a bottom-up vision of governance. In the very back there was a gentleman with a question.

SPEAKER: To the last point, Peter Corbitt at I-Strategy Labs who was one of the coordinators of the Aps for Democracy Context that was run last year in D.C. and was very successful is doing another

one which is called the Aps for Democracy Community Edition. I'm sorry I don't have a good URL, but you could Google that. One of the improvements they've made this year is a more cradle to maintain kind of lifecycle of how you would run an innovation contest. The community edition that they're doing was very interesting in that it engaged people including developers to go out into some of the neighborhoods and look at different things. But there's a really great presentation that came out of Transparency Camp about how to do more of the lifecycle around these innovation contests, and I wanted to share that.

MR. WEST: Thank you very much.

MR. MACASHI: I'm Suhar Machashi and I'm a student at Brandies University.

MR. WEST: Is this a set-up question for Carmen?

MR. MACASHI: I'd like to add three questions and you can answer whichever ones you want. First of all, it seems that a lot of models of engaging the polity are sort of like we are this discrete organization and they are the cloud and we will shoot questions out to the cloud and see what comes back. To what extent collaborative governance require an internal change in the organization, maybe like nonhierarchical structures within the government agency or foundation or whatever. Secondly, I've also see two different theories of what open citizen engagement is for. To

what extent is we want to open up the process so that the few good men, the Clay Shurkeys of the world, can go out and help us out? Or is really more of a method to poll the wider polity, and to what extent is that able to be captured by people demanding the decriminalization of marijuana for example? Lastly, say we had an organization, maybe I'm thinking of a nonprofit, but maybe it's a department in the EPA or a small group in the EPA and let's say they want to increase environmental awareness and run ads and make websites and so on. Their method of engaging the public is to have a sign-up form where people say, yes, I want to volunteer, here are my skills and then when they want to do something they email the people who have the requisite skills and say can you help us. Is there a better way to engage the citizenry than that? How would you go about in a democratic network collaborative way? Thank you.

MS. NOVECK: Clearly your student. You train them well.

MR. SIRIANNI: He didn't ask to come. He just told me he was coming.

MS. NOVECK: Those are wonderful, wonderful questions and observations. I don't know if I can answer any of them. I'll try to answer all of them.

Just a few riffs on what you're talking about. To your first point of shooting off a question into the cloud as you put it, posting a what

do you think and hoping to get answers back, obviously the question is itself the answer in that it is not enough to simply throw up something on a website. I'm all in favor of putting things on Facebook and Twittering them, but it essentially is that form of one-way communication unless there is a feedback loop, unless there is a serious formulation of a question and a problem, it becomes very difficult for people to take action to know what the potential tasks are that they can take on, what the role is that they can assume coming back to an earlier point, and that's where I think that it's very difficult and it is a culture shift to get into that mode of actually articulating the challenge or articulating the problem. We are making, and I say we and not just government but others, first steps with these kinds of contests and challenges where an X Prize has been very instructive in terms of helping to formulate problems around which people can then take action and then respond. But it's only the beginning because our institutional structures are frankly not set up this way, and I don't again just mean government. I also want to mention all of the civil society and dot-org organizations that have been set up around on certain assumptions about the way government works and therefore the way they have engaged their members is by developing mailing lists and seeking contributions so that those organizations can as middlemen file comments

and rulemakings or send lobbyists to the Hill but at not acting as a platform to coordinate the expertise and action of their members.

To the last point also, I think it is not only about us asking, us, the central institutions, but creating platforms that enable people to take action of their own accord. I often refer to the example of Net Day which ran over a period that began in 1996 I think in California and has spread across the country, this idea of getting professionals out to wire their own communities and their own schools. The Carrot Mob example in San Francisco where, I've forgotten who was the impresario of the Carrot Mob, but you can look up the website online, that engaged people in collective action to identify the local stores that were the most environmental and directed the opposite of a boycott to direct all their buying power toward the store that was committed to engaging in environmental change, a sort of every wins situation.

So I get back to the idea of being in the position of articulating the problem not only so that it's a work with us on solving it but articulate the challenges and the problems so that people can go out and solve them for themselves and work on them for themselves on a level, on a state level, but also on a federal level. So we need a lot of these processes and that does require also the kind of institutional internal changes that crate opportunities for people to work cross-disciplinary, to

work in terms that allow for better and more effective articulation of a challenge and then responses when people are bringing them back, but we need a much more fluid institutional ecosystem in the way that we articulate challenges, respond to them and create opportunities I think for collective action and that has to be a change on the part of all of our very centralized and hierarchical institutions and the way that they operate.

MR. WEST: Right here.

MS. ARIES: I'm Emily Aries with Blue State Digital. I had a question about accessibility which is something that all three of you touched upon and potential roadblocks to accessibility in this model of collaborative government. How do you see us overcoming the most basic roadblock which is broadband penetration in this country which ranks fifteenth in the world behind Norway, Sweden and a bunch of other countries in terms of allowing the most basic hardware to get to the people in rural parts of our country or in underserved parts of our country who can't even begin to participate in government? And on top of that a more difficult but let's say roadblock would be this idea that everyone has equal amounts of free time. If you're a single parent holding down two jobs raising children, how much time, despite whatever expertise you might have, do you think you might have to really add your voice to this collaboration? In light of these two roadblocks, and I'm sure there are

others, how can we be sure that this collaborative government model will be a representative model and what challenges in terms of representativeness do you see rising with collaborative government?

MR. WEST: I can address the broadband part of that. As part of the stimulus package, Beth knows this, we're devoting at least $2 billion to extend high-speed broadband to underserved areas, both rural areas as well as urban areas. I think we have kind of a once-in-a-generation opportunity to do some good things. We're kind of like where we were on 1957 when we devised the federal interstate highway system and the impact that had on transportation, although I hope all of that parallel does not come true because we actually made some bad decisions in 1957 and I hope we can do a better job on broadband. But the FCC has a deadline of February 2010 to devise a new broadband strategy. There is a lot of discussion among interested people on that, but I think we will be making good progress on that over the next one to two years.

MR. SIRIANNI: Just quickly, the broader issue, you mentioned time, but of course it's all kinds of things that create participation biases at all levels. It could be homeowners participate more than rents in neighborhood planning, new immigrants participate much less than people who have been here. There are some techniques for

making some progress of sort of really innovate outreach, but a lot of these other inequalities will not fall by the wayside just because we create some collaborative model without an awful lot of continual work. And in the end it's bound to be very imperfect until we have a far more egalitarian society perhaps, but there are ways of creating stakeholder and other forums where those who can't show up are at least linked through personal conversations and networks to others so that they in some sense have some representation via the networks of information and trust building around them, I can't go but I trust you my neighbor who is really concerned about this and you won't just act for your own self-interest, you will want to protect the space so that my interests and as a single working mother, that there is a lot of that that happens so we need to find ways of strengthening that without having a too overly ambitious or utopian sense of what it will take to be truly equal. I think that's so far off in the sense of eliminating all of those. But they're very important to call attention to because if anybody tries to legitimize something that really systematically excludes people, you obviously need people banging and saying where are they, you need some strategy for that.

MS. NOVECK: I'll just say briefly that if we don't proliferate the opportunities to participate, we will face the roadblock that you're talking about, but if create lots of ways to engage including ways that

involve different forms of time engagement and again that speak to different kinds of expertise and talent and knowledge, different people can engage in different ways. So I'm less worried about the problem of representation and in fact more worried about the problem of diversity of participation. Most of my book talks about a case study called the -- patent example which I didn't mention today at all, but I'll just say that that particular example of creating an opportunity for scientists to engage in the process of reviewing patent applications, you or I if looking at one of those patent applications, we could sit there for 3 weeks and we wouldn't know the answer to a question and we don't have the time to give to it, but for the person who knows, in 10 minutes they look at it and say I know the answer and I have something to contribute. Incentive? My favorite example is they gave a million dollar bounty to a guy who solved a problem in 4 hours because he knew, he just looked at it and it spoke to something that spoke to his expertise or his particular intelligence, it was worth a lot, but if we proliferate more opportunities for engagement in fact we can have much more granular, smaller forms of engagement than just the kind of old ways of I have to be committed to one institution or one organization as a kind of my major hobby, I can have my hobby and I can still spend 10 minutes doing something or an hour or more depending on my choice if we create diversity of participation.

MR. WEST: I like that hourly rate of pay. That's pretty good.

MR. WAN: I'm Ali Wan and I'm a Junior Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment. One of the questions I had actually touches upon a point that you raised in terms of problems of collaboration, and the problem that you mentioned was conflict. I wanted to address another problem with collaboration which is that parties are not in conflict with another, but they don't know about one another, and I think that one of the problems with the internet is that because it's facilitated such an explosion in the number of voices and the number of actors who are involved and the number of people who wanted to get involved, when you have some many people you actually have kind of the opposite problem that we had in the past when we didn't have the internet that there wasn't enough collaboration or that there weren't enough resources. I think now there are so many people involved, there are so many resources being committed. So what happens when you have people who are overlapping in what they want to do but they don't know about each other and redundancy and overlapping, and also does that dilute effectiveness? Let's say you have one group of 100 people who have the same unified vision who are working together versus 100 individual who don't know about each other working toward the same end and they dilute each other's effectiveness? How do we eliminate redundancy and overlapping in collaboration?

MS. NOVECK: I think you're right that if we shift from a question of resource allocation to a question of coordination that really becomes the central question, and therefore as we talk about institutional innovation, there's a normative question here and there are practical questions about what is the role of government as a coordinator of these processes. I do think that again the more that we can use tools to show who is doing what and the more than we can also help to play a role, not of coordinating but also of curating, of showcasing what's going on so that people can find each other and say instead of doing my own thing over here I'm going to add myself to this group over there. This is what you have like a source forage, for example, for software is a clearinghouse where can people can see that there are all these different software projects going on and I can add myself to this one or that one or I don't like the way this is going so I'm going to fork off from here and I'm going to create my own. A lot of those things die. The majority of projects for example on a source forage never come to fruition, and you see a lot of that also in the collaborative action space and the collective action space with people trying things and they're not working. I don't know that that's a bad thing that we have people engaging and it doesn't lead ultimately to the outcome because they decide to fuse with another group or they go back to doing whatever they were doing before, but I do think that the

opportunity to involve in coordination, curating and showcase, but again also to the issue of platforms, we need to be providing the platforms to help people to find each other and engage, and that's something that we have not done a very good of particularly where we have participation practices that are very focused on one-to-one, send us your comment, send us your answer, as opposed to helping to traffic cop and get people together working together on developing solutions to problems. But we are just at the beginning of figuring out the answer to some of I think these coordination issues. That's a good comment.

MR. WEST: We have just for one last question. Gary Mitchell?

MR. MITCHELL: Thanks. Gary Mitchell from the "Mitchell Report." This is a quick and I think tangential question, but it's triggered by Darrell's observation a little earlier about the institutionalization of innovation. I have two questions. One is are there any congressional heroes in all of this? How is the Congress doing on this in this realm, number one? Number two, there has been some interesting stuff written lately about the way in which political factions react differently to issues like this as opposed to the war in Iraq or the fiscal stimulus package, but sort of operational kinds of issues like this. My question is, A, is there much interest on this up on the Hill? And if so who are the leaders?

Secondly, have you encountered any sort of political differences of perspective on this leap forward?

MR. WEST: In general, Congress is lagging the Executive Branch and this has been true for a number of years. We have been tracking technology innovation for a decade now. Congress is always below many of the major executive agencies. But the real laggard is the judiciary. They're terrible. Every year we have rated federal agencies, almost invariably the bottom 10 slots are various courts, courts of appeals and so on.

I don't know about heroes in Congress. I know Joe Lieberman has spent a lot of time. He was very active in the original E-Government Act of 2002 which had some good features in terms of innovation, but it was seriously underfunded so many of the things they wanted to do never got implemented. I don't know if you have other things you'd like to add to that.

MS. NOVECK: I guess I'll just add that when we ran the first phase of the open government policymaking process, you may have heard that the number one idea that was proposed in the brainstorming in terms of votes, voting wasn't the be and end all of the process, we didn't only listen to the top voted ideas, and this was a process that was run by the National Academy of Public Administration, the top rated idea was

from John Boehner and in fact was not about Executive Branch transparency which is what we are focused on, the Hill is unfortunately above my pay grade, but it was about congressional transparency. So I think to the early point about creating a sort of infectious movement toward transparency and engagement, I think you're seeing a lot of that reciprocal rhetoric sort of feeding off of each other with moves toward an excitement around transparency across the branches of government. The public printer who of course serves all three branches of government sent a public letter to the President maybe 2 months ago now declaring the public printer's support for openness and transparency and getting behind and talking about how the public printer could play a role in actually opening up and creating greater access to information in government documents which is an issue that we're in conversation with with the public printer and that Congress will also have to be talking about with the public printer and I know that there are hearings going on and discussions amongst congressional staff around making more congressional documents available. So I think that the mood is in the air, if you will, and it's a good time and one of the wonderful things in terms of heroes and not nonheroes, the wonderful thing about working an issue like transparency and civic engagement is I don't encounter anybody who is opposed to these things and everybody is excited now and trying to learn more of

what they can do whatever branch of government they come from I think now. So I hope that we can only do more to encourage each other and have a race to the top.

MR. WEST: With that benediction I want to thank Beth Noveck and Carmen Sirianni for their contributions, and thank you very much.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia
Commission No. 351998
Expires: November 30, 2012