

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
ENTERPRISE LEADERSHIP:
THE ESSENTIAL FRAMEWORK FOR TODAY'S GOVERNMENT LEADERS

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, August 14, 2013

PARTICIPANTS:

Welcome:

JACKSON A. NICKERSON
Nonresident Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Keynote Speakers:

ADMIRAL THAD ALLEN
Senior Vice President, Booz Allen Hamilton
Senior Vice President and Former Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard

RONALD SANDERS
Vice President and Fellow
Booz Allen Hamilton

Moderator:

ELAINE KAMARCK
Director, Management and Leadership Initiative
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

STEPHEN SHIH
Deputy Associate Director
Office of Personnel Management

LAURA CRAIG
Senior Analyst,
US Government Accountability Office

DR. JAMES TRINKA
Executive Director
Leading EDGE

DR. SUSAN KELLY
Director
Department of Defense Office of Veterans Transition

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. NICKERSON: Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. NICKERSON: Okay, that was all right. Let's try that again. Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. NICKERSON: All right, thank you so much for being here. My name is Jackson Nickerson and I'm the Associate Dean and Director of Brookings Executive Education. I welcome you to today's conversation on tackling wicked government problems, a practical for enterprise leaders.

Our conversation today is based on a just released book by Brookings Press. I have a little copy here. Some of you have one, also for sale afterwards in the bookstore. It's under the same title. It's co-edited by Ron Sanders, to my left, and myself. The book has a connection to history that I think you might find interesting so I thought I'd share it with you.

Four and a half years ago, the Brookings Institution partnered with the Olin Business School at Washington University in St. Louis to manage Brookings Executive Education. The idea then as it is now was to combine cutting edge leadership thinking from one of the world's top business schools with the policy and government expertise of one of the world's leading think tank, if not the world's leading think tank, to create a new model for leadership development.

My hope is that you are as pleased with the innovative results as I am. Now, you might wonder why the Brookings Institution would collaborate with the

Washington University in St. Louis. Well, a look back into the history might explain the choice.

Both institutions had a common benefactor, Robert S. Brookings. He was President of the Board of Trustees at Washington University for 27 years. And in 1916 he and other reformers founded the Institute of Government Research which was the first institution to bring science to the study of government. And it was the forerunner of the Brookings Institution.

Now, less well known is the fact that at about the same time, in fact the same year, he approved the founding of the Business School at Washington University to bring science to the study of leadership. Now with a common benefactor founding both institutions during the same era it somehow seems fitting that they came together to support and advance Brookings Executive Education.

Robert S. Brookings was a forward-thinking advocate for effective and efficient government and leadership. He had a deep interest in educating government leaders in the art of handling problems. So when an opportunity presented itself to study and write about how to help public servants engage in the art of tackling wicked problems, I leapt at the chance.

The book and today's conversation are based on a conference held almost a year and a half ago cosponsored by Booz Allen Hamilton through the leadership of Ron Sanders and by the Olin Business School through Brookings Executive Education. The idea of the conference was straightforward. How can we understand how the nature of leadership in the Federal government is changing? And how can we use leading thinking about networks to develop leaders to handle these challenges?

Out of the conference came an understanding that the challenges, let's call them problems, facing government have shifted. Increasingly these problems that the Federal government faces are wicked which to me means that they're complex with many moving parts, they're ill structured, meaning we haven't seen them exactly before and that typically they span multiple agencies, multiple departments, even NGOs and even other governments.

The question then is how can federal leaders with narrowly defined authorities tackle these wicked problems? Perhaps more importantly is how can we increase the supply of federal leaders who can tackle these problems? We discovered that presently the Federal government does not systematically develop individuals who have the capabilities to lead across the enterprise.

Now this book draws upon practitioners and professors to clearly formulate the challenge of developing enterprise leaders as well as offers feasible and we think implementable solutions to greatly increase the supply of enterprise leaders. But today you'll have the opportunity to engage with enterprise leaders and frontline practitioners. My hope is that they will share their stories, not only about the challenges of wicked problems that they faced but also how enterprise leaders can successfully tackle them.

Also they will discuss what the Federal government can do to systematically develop enterprise leaders. Now, to begin the conversation I'd like to introduce you to Ron Sanders who'll I hand the podium over to. Ron is the Vice President or a Vice President with Booz Allen Hamilton and its first Fellow. He joined the firm after a 37 year distinguished career in federal service.

He's served the intelligence communities or as the intelligence community's Chief Human Capital Officer. He was in the Office of Personnel and Management as the Associate Director of Policy. He is with the Internal Revenue Service as a Chief Human Resource Officer and he was the DOD's Director of Civilian Personnel. I think he's seen of these wicked problems and understands a little bit about the challenges of developing enterprise leaders.

Please join me in welcoming Ron Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Thanks, Jackson. Good morning everybody. I'm going to stand down in front and pace a bit. I like to present a moving target. That's one of my strategies for tackling wicked problems. I'm going to be joined in a second by my colleague Thad Allen and as you heard we're both formers. Thad needs no introduction.

We both spent a lot of time in government. Almost a century between us, that really makes us seem old, tackling this notion of wicked problems that Jackson has set up. So what I'm going to do for a few minutes is set the stage both for what we're talking about in the book and for the morning's event.

So the morning's event first, you're going to hear from Thad and I, talk about in a little bit more depth this notion of enterprise leadership. As I said we've lived it and we've tried to capture it in the book because it is in fact what we believe to be the new normal for federal leaders. We'll talk about that in a second.

After we do that, for a little bit I'm going to introduce Elaine Kamarck. Many of you know Elaine. She made her name with the Vice President Gore reinventing government about a decade and a half ago. And she's back at Brookings directing something called a leadership and management initiative and I'm sure she'll talk about

that. And she'll moderate a panel of real live enterprise leaders and we have four interesting perspectives to share with you this morning on the panel.

First, we have Steve Shih, who's Deputy Associate Director of OPM and among other things what Steve does is run the entire federal SES. So he's in charge of policy. Yes, if you want to talk about rank awards, Steve's the guy. No, just kidding. This is about enterprise leadership this morning and Steve has been a champion of that. And he really is in the pilot seat when it comes to moving the SES forward.

Secondly, we have Laura Craig. Laura will be joining us here in a second. Laura comes to us from the Government Accountability Office where she spent the last couple of years of her life studying the challenges of interagency collaboration and as a dimension of that, how to prepare leaders to do that essentially on point with the book. And she'll share the results of those reviews and audits and reports with us, again as a way of charting a path forward.

We'll hear from Dr. Jim Trinka who is, as I said, himself an enterprise leader. So, too, is Steve. Steve's got an unusual pattern for SES'ers. He's actually moved between agencies as have I, as has Jim and I'll talk in a minute about Susan Kelly here. That's a very small minority of the SES corps unfortunately. Jim Trinka worked for me at IRS, FBI, FAA and now he's at VA. He actually runs one of the first programs to develop the SES corps as an interagency government wide resource, sort of back to the future. And Jim will talk about some of the challenges of running that program and some of its content because it's relevant today's subject.

And then last but not least an enterprise leader from the front lines, Dr. Susan Kelly who comes to us from DOD where among other things she is currently the

Department's Representative on the White House Task Force on Veteran's employment. One of those classic interagency task forces that we're going to talk about, lots of activity and hopefully in this case some results and she's going to share her experiences there and doing other interagency things. But there has been a recent development that I know Susan's going to talk about with task force and some of you will recognize how difficult it will have been to reach the milestone she's going to talk about.

So that will be the morning and then Jackson will conclude. There'll be plenty of time for questions and interaction. So does that sound about right? All right. Speak now or forever hold your peace because we're ready.

All right, so we talked about the new normal. Jackson's already set the stage a bit. This notion of wicked problems as we have defined them have a couple of common denominators that I want to underscore.

First, they are all inter in nature, interagency, international, inter-sectoral, intergovernmental, put the word inter and fill in the blank. What we've discovered is that all of the big challenges facing our government and frankly all of the big challenges facing our nation are inter in nature. No more can you fit them into nice neat bureaucratic stovepipes. Homeland Security does this, HHS does that, HUD does this. Here's a problem, fit it in the box and it's solved.

The problems we face in this vertically structured government cut a horizontal swathe across that government. The partnership for public service and Booz Allen just released a report emphasizing that and talking about a number of strategies to rebuild the federal enterprise. That's what we're talking about, an enterprise approach to government and in this case to leadership. We'll talk a little bit in a little bit about what

enterprise means both from a structural standpoint as well as a leadership standpoint.

But that common denominator it's crosscutting and boundary spanning. And underneath that some of you have experienced this firsthand, I know Susan and Steve have. No one is in charge or maybe everybody is in charge. Everybody reports to a different agency head or cabinet secretary. There's no common chain of command. Okay, as a practical matter we all report to the President but you know that you can't go running to the President every time two agencies can't agree. 'Cause that's all the President would end up doing.

So you've got all of the chains of commands, vertical stovepipes all trying to collaborate toward some common inter fill in the blank end. It requires a new set of leadership competencies and it's frankly a set of competencies, again Thad and I will talk about that, that most of us weren't prepared for. I'll speak for myself and my early interagency experiences in defense, Army, Navy, Air Force and our fourth branch the Marine Corps. And Susan and I were kidding ourselves.

I used to adopt the habit of wearing purple every time I had one of those sessions because in DOD purple means joint. It means inter-service but it's been three decades in the making and still a work in progress.

But we are typically developed as leaders with an implicitly inward bias. We run an organization. There's a boss, there's subordinates, there are peers and we have to get along with them but as I said ultimately there's a chain of command. You can run to your boss to be arbiter.

There's an external environment. All our leadership development programs talk about that. And we learn as leaders to be aware of that external

environment and to navigate it but under those models there's a "we" and a "they." And in enterprise there's no we and a they. There's an us.

And we have to learn to do things like lead without formal authority where almost everything we do as leaders implicitly or explicitly goes back to our job. So we're going to talk about those leadership competencies as we go through the morning. But those are the kinds of competencies that Jackson and I and the contributors in the book talk about.

How do we prepare the government for the new normal? For the notion of enterprise and this challenge of enterprise leadership?

So with that, Thad talk about help wanted.

ADMIRAL ALLEN: Good morning. What we're looking for are leaders that understand, can operate in and manage complexity; a complexity that goes well beyond the authorities, the jurisdictions, the appropriations, the regulations, the policies and even the culture of the organizations that they're working in.

Because when you're looking at these very complex problems, it is well beyond the purview of any particular agency to solve by themselves. It puts a premium on a collaboration, networking, cooperation as the only way to succeed moving forward. And Ron is right. The President can adjudicate every disagreement or overlap of jurisdiction.

I was talking with the President during the Deepwater Horizon Oil spill and he wryly, then he stated later on in a press conference that he never realized that when a salmon is in fresh water it was owned by Interior. When it got to salt water it was owned by Commerce. I'm not sure the salmon knew. But you try and direct their

behavior.

So when we talk about enterprise leadership we're really talking about is managing very complex programs that have to be coproduced and I steal that term from Don Kettl, who's a professor of public policy up at the University of Maryland. And that includes the private sector as well. And we need to learn how to understand the inner workings and how we do this together to accomplish the ends we're trying to do in public service.

So let me just take one quick example in chaos and I'm going to talk about Katrina first. I'll talk about the oil spill later. Trying to understand what's going on in chaos and trying to figure out what the problem really is is important and you've got to kind of unchain your thinking. For the first week following the landfall Hurricane Katrina, we thought we were dealing with a hurricane. There was an emergency disaster declaration. State and local governments were in charge. All powers not granted the federal government reserved to the states.

I was sent down by President Bush a week after the storm came ashore after the Superdome and the Convention Center meltdowns. As I flew in the city on the 6th of September I looked over and I said, my God, we got the problem wrong. If you don't get the problem statement right you're not going to get the solution right.

We weren't dealing with a hurricane anymore. After the hurricane passed and the city was flooded, we were dealing with what was the equivalent of a weapon of mass effect used on a city without criminality, the result in a loss of continuity of government. Now that's a big long sentence. What they didn't need was a bunch of resources flowing into the city. They needed to reconstitute the elements of civil society

that would allow local leaders to carry out their authorities and their jurisdictional responsibilities. Which working with General Russ Honoré and I, we put together an organization that was able to do that. But the key there was trying to understand the problem, look through the chaos and the complexity and then focus on what you really need to do to solve that.

In the oil spill the overlapping jurisdictions were extraordinary. I just mentioned wildlife. You couldn't deal with food safety without talking to FDA and NOAA. You couldn't deal with environmental monitoring without talking about NOAA and EPA. Then you had the state and local governments that were involved as well.

The only way that we were able to navigate that milieu, I actually established an inter-agencies solutions group. That's what I called it. And I put everybody in the room and I shoved pizzas under the door and I said, unless you want your principles in a situation room talking to the President, let's solve this. And it got to be such a compelling forum to deal with those issues that people started showing up and it actually became a community of interest.

And to give you a good example, we were dealing with exposure to volatile organic compounds by workers in and around the oil rig and onshore that we thought the standards for personal protective equipment needed to be lowered so we'd get personal protective equipment out sooner at a lower threshold. I wasn't the OSHA administrator so I went to the Secretary of Labor. We signed an MOU that said OSHA and the National Incident Commander would work together and I merely issued an order. I had no legal authority. But they obeyed it. Dealing with complexity.

Ron?

MR. SANDERS: And that's one of the "competencies", I'll put that in quotes, that enterprise leaders need to learn. That there is white space, there are seams and there are gaps. What Thad did was not illegal but there wasn't a book that said when you confront this situation, here are the three things you do.

ADMIRAL ALLEN: And Ron I might add, addressing the second bullet, we've got a tremendous effort going on inside this country right now to implement the President's executive order on cyber security and infrastructure protection. In the absence of legislation that would actually empower people to do things under law because we haven't got that legislation yet. So you have NIST that's trying to develop a national set of voluntary frameworks that industry could abide by in dealing with cyber-attacks in their specific sectors and then exchange that information with the government, working with Homeland Security; extraordinarily complex.

MR. SANDERS: So as we go through these examples, let me paint a contrast for you and I'll use the word relative and I'll underscore that word. Because in a crisis like a Katrina or Deepwater Horizon, as difficult as it is to achieve unity of effort amongst all of those agencies, and you need leaders who like Thad can speak the language of many of those bureaucracies and then bring them together, there is still the crisis.

That's a mobilizing event. It gets people focused. There are people hurting, in some cases dying. But what we're talking about transcends the crisis. There are also enduring endemic challenges like the ones we talk about here. Thad just talked about cyber security. If there ever was an interagency, intergovernmental, cross-sectoral, international challenge it's that.

And frankly, one of the reasons we don't have legislation is because all the stakeholders, A) don't even define the problem the same way much less B) figure -- have a common solution to it. So how do we protect our nation's critical infrastructure, the networks and systems that we now take for granted? And NIST, for example, is sort of David and Goliaths.

NIST is in charge of this. DHS is their compatriot in the effort but NIST is a relatively small agency trying to herd a bunch of 7, 8 and 900 pound gorillas like DHS and DOD and the US Chamber of Commerce and other things.

Susan will talk about the third bullet. The classic interagency taskforce, who here has been on an interagency taskforce? They are models of efficiency and effectiveness, correct? That's how the government gets things done.

In fact, that is sort of a common MO and we have to figure out and Susan Kelly will give us some examples later of an interagency taskforce that's actually begun to get things done. I know that's a contradiction in terms but we'll talk about that.

Thad, other examples of this new help wanted, the new kind of leader that we're looking for?

ADMIRAL ALLEN: Well, Ron and I have actually worked with the Kennedy School of Government and the School of Public Health up at Harvard. I'm going to cross models here just a little bit on a concept called mettle leadership. And mettle leadership involves how do you deal simultaneously with leading up from career to political leaders? How do you still inspire the people that are working for you? How do you cut across all those boundaries? And how do you understand that event or the problem that I talked about earlier when I flew into Katrina?

But at the center of all of that is the leader themselves and trying to understand who you are as a person, your emotional intelligence or your capacity for empathy. Because not everybody's going to agree but they need to be heard and they need to understand that you're listening and you're trying to understand where they're coming from. That puts an extraordinary demand on the personal skills we're developing and we don't always think about that in classical leadership programs. Most specifically the one I would tell you about is emotional intelligence.

MR. SANDERS: Before we move on, let me just touch on this very last bullet because it's fresh on my mind. I spend the day yesterday with the Federal Interagency Healthcare Roundtable. 24 agencies all involving some facet of our nation's healthcare system, VA, DOD cause DOD runs one of the largest healthcare systems, OPM was there because of FEHB, obviously HHS and NIH and the Public Health Service. 24 agencies and here's their big, hairy, audacious goal: to move the nation from healthcare, that is a focus on diagnosing and treating symptoms to health. Prevention through healthy lifestyle and other choices which we know will save trillions of dollars in healthcare costs. But it's not part of our psychic makeup.

And I have to tell you, with all due respect to my colleagues yesterday, and I stood up and told them this yesterday as well, they are great at admiring the problem. But think about the challenge of literally changing our nation's culture and trying to mobilize 24 agencies, small, medium and large and a dozen different Cabinet departments, all mobilizing them all towards that end. There again, every agency defined the problem differently and then in that regard defines the solution within that same lens.

And there are a couple of us and I will single out John Woodson, Dr. Jon

Woodson who is the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs who gets this and who's had me come a couple of times and talk to this group about enterprise leadership. And we're actually now beginning to develop strategies to develop leaders on the theory that when you have the leaders in place who understand this you may actually make some progress.

So some quick definitions and then we'll move on. You may have already gotten the drift of this. Again, I apologize for the I-Chart, it's a little dim. And that's a little small but if you're interested in copies of the slides we'll make sure that we can get them out to you.

Enterprise and enterprise leadership, let me define enterprise and then I'll let Thad define enterprise leadership. And again, it ought to be straightforward by now. An enterprise as we're defining it is the situation when it takes two or more agencies or levels of government or you name it, stakeholders, but our focus here is on federal leaders because of their role in this enterprise, when two or more of those organizations have to collaborate and integrate and coordinate to get things done that they can't do by themselves.

Sounds pretty easy, right? Easy to grasp and it is as I suggested the new normal. But one of the threshold hurdles to this enterprise perspective is the notion that we can't do it alone. Because many agencies again define the problem in the context of their programs and their own legal jurisdictions and their own authorities and don't worry about everything outside those boundaries, even though if you look at things like the government accountability office's annual list of duplicative programs there are 47 agencies involved in food safety, for example. Think about that enterprise as a

leadership challenge.

So, Thad, definitions?

ADMIRAL ALLEN: Well, in my mind based on the major crises I've had to deal with in my life, also trying to make some substantial changes in organizations that I've led, at the core of everything is what I call unity of effort, okay? Now, I'm going to compare and contrast that unity of command which is a Title 10 DOD notion that extends all the way to the President. When you go to boot camp or officer candidate school or whatever, first thing you have to remember is your chain of command all the way to the President and that is legal authority. In fact, failure to follow the chain of command actually subjects you to criminal sanctions potentially.

When you move outside of Title 10 or you're acting under a law enforcement authority the best you're going to achieve is unity of effort. It doesn't allow you to compel people to cooperate unless they want to and to do that you have to create a set of shared values and a focus on the problem that transcends everything else.

And while there's a lot of things that go on out there, whether it's the social media, the press, the political environment, all that other kind of stuff, you really have to kind of focus on the problem you're dealing with and make that the number one goal. I used to tell people that were coming into Coast Guard Headquarters that had never been there before especially coming in as senior officers, I said, you have to learn how to be effective in a political environment without being political. By that I mean partisan frankly.

And so, what you got to do is you got to focus on what it is you're going to do, deal with the other things but you've got to have a North Star. And the North Star

is unity of effort related to the task at hand. If you can get everybody subscribed to that based on a set of shared values and the trust that comes with that, you're going to be successful.

MR. SANDERS: So that's enterprise leadership in a nutshell. But there are some competencies involved and again, I apologize for the I-chart but if you can make it out we've got two org charts. The classic organizational chart of a bureaucracy, lines and boxes, chain of command, connected by social networks. And that's one of the essential competencies that Thad and I will talk about.

But Thad, what are the four things that we think enterprise leaders need to learn how to do to be successful?

ADMIRAL ALLEN: Well, the first bullet up there is systems thinking. Actually we kind of stole that from a guy named Peter Senge, who wrote a book called The Fifth Discipline, works up at MIT. It's this notion of being able to step back and look at the broader network of issues that are going of the interacting forces and trying to consider it almost if you were able to pull yourself out of the environment and look down on it.

It takes the ability, again I said earlier, to kind of unpack all the baggage you've got, focus on the issue and then in a very, very straightforward way try and understand the systems, the dynamics, understand there'll be latency and things that you can't predict but to the best of your ability to model that. It takes a development over a lifetime to start approaching your profession as a craft where you try to become a master of that craft in thinking about these problems and how you deal with them.

MR. SANDERS: You know, in the intelligence community we call that

connecting the dots. When we teach this have you ever seen those optical illusions, the colored dots that make no sense and if you look at it in a certain way all of a sudden a 3D picture emerges?

I have to tell you it took me a long time to figure out how to sort of step back, get up on the balcony and see the patterns. And you know that's a little trick and frankly some people can't do it. But when it happens it's remarkable. This aha, there's that three-dimensional picture embedded in all of that color. But think about that as a leadership competency with the dots being agencies and organizations and stakeholders and problems, to be able to see those patterns and connect the dots.

ADMIRAL ALLEN: And if you don't have an institutionalized way to do this, if there's not a taskforce that's been charted by the President, sometimes you have to create it. One of the big epiphanies that I had during the oil spill response and it came as a result of personal conversation I had with the President was that we should have taken control of the air space over the Gulf the first day. We didn't think it was an air event but we had near midair collisions.

Until the 12th of June I was coming back with the President on Air Force One after he had been in Pensacola and he was going to address the nation that night. And I looked at him and I said, Mr. President, I'm going to go talk to the Chairman of the Joint Staff. Similar to what we did in Haiti to facilitate the landings in relief down there, we need to take control of the air space.

We did improve safety, improved effectiveness, efficiency. We had to create an entity that didn't exist before but there was a predecessor idea and that's what we did in Port-au-Prince to control the landing slots that we had there. So what we did

was we put everything in Tyndall Air Force Base in northern Florida where we actually do the defense of North America Command Center. And I went in there a couple of weeks later and we had Air Force officers, Coast Guard officers, we had people from the Fish and Wildlife Service. We had computer experts in wheelchairs with ponytails.

The only reason I bring it up, Ron was talking about purple.

MR. SANDERS: My ponytail is that my --

ADMIRAL ALLEN: Being joint. Yes. What we created was plaid.

MR. SANDERS: No that's good. We were trying to figure out what you call interagency outside of DOD. It's plaid. So I'll start wearing plaid. Look this is something we can't overstate. Jackson alluded to this too. This is almost a net centric way of looking at leadership because many of the times the dots you're connecting are people.

And to be able to connect across agency lines to build those networks and then the leverage then for leadership purposes, that's the fancy diagram we've drawn here, it is both art and science. But it is an essential leadership characteristic -- and think about that for a minute. Think about who you could call in another agency, pick up the phone and say, I need you to do something for me, and they will. Those things don't happen with cold calls.

There's also an interesting phenomenon that Jackson and I have been exploring called transitive trust. I know Susan. Susan trusts me. I need Steve to do something. Susan knows Steve, Steve knows Susan. Susan knows Ron, Ron knows Susan. Susan trusts Ron. Steve doesn't know Ron from Adam. I ask Susan can you get Steve to help me. And there's enough trust between the three of us that Steve helps

me even though he doesn't know me.

Think about how powerful that is though, not just in a disaster situation but in trying to deal with some of the enduring problems. Talk about collaboration.

ADMIRAL ALLEN: You have to be able to get in a room with people that may not have your background, your professional expertise or the life experience that you've had and find a way to work together. The term that I used when I was talking with my staff, I kind of mixed metaphors, I call it cognitive diversity.

If you agree on a problem and everybody says, yeah, that's a problem, we want to solve it. Then the more varied opinions, backgrounds and experiences you can bring to bear on that solution increases the robustness and the fidelity of what you're trying to do. When everybody understands that then there's room for everybody at the table and you can be empathetic in listening to people and how you want to try and solve the problem.

But this notion of listening, trusting, building a set of values is very important. And then finally, if you're a leader sometimes you're going to have step right up and say, I'm in charge. It's my responsibility; I'm going to have to assert some authority until somebody says I can't. I need to push this forward. I was talking to two people that are leading an interagency taskforce right now in a very, very complicated problem. And they were wondering whether or not they ought to be more forceful in what they're doing. And I was trying to actually tell them you need to be more forceful.

So at one point to make my point, I said, you know what? You just got to declare yourself the Blues Brothers. You're on a mission from God. You're going to save the orphanage and the nuns, get the mindset and go forward.

MR. SANDERS: So bureaucratic multiculturalism, to be able to speak several bureaucratic languages, Pat Tamburrino in the book, Pat works for the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and Susan's a colleague of his, talks about the first early meetings of the White House Taskforce on Veteran's employment where they didn't even speak the same bureaucratic language.

I have to tell you when I came to the intelligence community, there was all of this controversy about TSP. I'd come from OPM. TSP was thrift savings plan, what's the big deal? Terrorist surveillance program, that's the big deal.

So he didn't know that. Let me segue into a quick discussion about how you begin to develop enterprise leaders with a focus on this notion of enterprise acuity. That's a couple of \$20 words that basically mean you understand the histories, the cultures, the traditions, the mindsets of the agencies you're dealing with. Sort of this bureaucratic multiculturalism but on steroids because frankly that's not something you can read out of a book. And it requires all of the competencies that we've talked about.

Building those networks of relationships, connecting the dots in a systematic systemic way but understanding all of the actors in the enterprise, what motivates them, what makes them tick, how can you unify their efforts? We have tried to develop enterprise leaders in a couple of fairly well documented now instances.

But as I indicated at the outset that's not the focus of most agency leadership development programs. Jackson and I spent a lot of time in the book talking about how you can sort of elevate those programs so that you can begin to help executives and executive candidates become aware, at least, of the enterprise and begin to demonstrate some of the competencies we've talked about.

We've made a couple of references to joint duty in the military borne out of something called Goldwater-Nichols. Today in the military and we have some in the audience, you can't be a flight officer unless you served in a joint operation, a joint command, another part of the Department; again, to build relationships, to understand the actors, to acquire that enterprise acuity, not just awareness but acuity.

The intelligence community did this and I wrote a chapter in the book about this. I can't tell you how painful and difficult it was even in the post 9/11 era of getting 17 intelligence agencies that report to six different Cabinet secretaries all to say, beyond the principle of our leader should think enterprise, everybody agrees to that. The mechanics of it are much more problematic because frankly agencies think that executives are their property as opposed to a corporate resource. And I know Steve will touch on this in the panel. This is sort of back to the future for the SES because that the original vision, right? A corporate resource. It's certainly not the case today but we'll argue that in the new normal they need to be.

Let me just say one word about, again, you can't read this very well but the National Defense Authorization Act of FY13. Senator Lieberman, before he retired in his capacity as Chair of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee tried to institute this notion of enterprise particularly in the national security community. Essentially trying to codify something called the national security professional development program, something President Bush issued as an executive order in post-Katrina.

Only reason I single that out because for all of his efforts, the only result in legislation was to do a report on this which I found disappointing. But I want to single

out a young man named Gordon Lederman who was the person on his staff that drove this. Gordon unfortunately passed away a few months ago. We've dedicated the book to him and I just wanted to make sure that you all that he's one of those young people who thought enterprise and labored long and hard, even during his illness, to try to make something happen legislatively. And I know he was disappointed that it fell short but I think I hope he, if he's watching, looks at this as a glass half full because a report can start big things. Goldwater-Nichols started as a report a couple of years before it became law but there have been attempts to begin to do this.

Some agencies have. DOD actually has a course that tries to develop enterprise awareness; in this case it's the defense enterprise. They even their own sixth executive core qualification around leading the defense enterprise and I won't Steve Shih up, but I have long been an advocate of that sixth ECQ for all SES'ers because until it becomes something like that it's going to be hard to refocus agency leadership development programs to not just focus on agencies but to focus on the enterprise.

But this is ultimately a leadership development pipeline problem and I hope we'll touch on that as we go through the morning. So, Thad, any closing remarks to put this all in perspective from the front lines?

ADMIRAL ALLEN: I'd like to start with two concepts and I'm going to kind of play them out for you in a scenario if I could. Great leaders are great learners. If you want to be a great leader, be a lifelong learner because you got to be insatiably curious and firing those synapses off because you don't know when you're going to get in a situation where you have to do it in a compressed timeframe with incomplete information and try and absorb what's going on and get that systems view.

The second thing is my favorite definition of leadership is the ability to reconcile opportunity and competency. You can be the best leader in the world, if you're never given an opportunity it's a loss for you, it's a loss for the community, it's a loss for society. On the other hand, you need to recognize when there's a window to act and you need to be prepared to act.

I was called by Secretary Chertoff at 11:00 in the morning on Labor Day and he said, would you go down and become the Deputy Principle Federal Official in New Orleans and assist Mike Brown? Again, following the Convention Center and the Superdome. I had some misgivings because I wasn't sure all the windows hadn't closed to be able to do anything about it. But my wife reminded me that I preach to everybody that my favorite definition of leadership is the ability to reconcile opportunity and competency and she kind of said, man up. So ultimate kitchen pass.

If she would have known it was going to be six months she probably would have rethought it but when I flew into New Orleans that morning I knew we had to something. And I already told you the problem statement. We did that by unifying all the efforts, dividing the city into sectors, touching every house. Remember the spray-painted symbols and everything and we did that by providing logistics, security, admin, communications support for local officers to do their job. In other words we breached the gap for the loss of continuity of government. Had we done that a week earlier I'm not sure we have the problem in the Superdome or the Convention Center because that's what the city really needed.

So here's the postscript. That Friday on the 9th of September I get a call from Secretary Chertoff. He says, get up to Baton Rouge, I want to talk to you. We had

established what's called a joint field office under the Stafford Act in Baton Rouge. It was an old Dillard's warehouse and store complex in Baton Rouge. There were 5,000 people in this place trying to run the entire response for all the agencies and everything else.

So I get up there and they've got an office forum and they got brown paper over all the windows so you can't see what's in there. I'm going oh my God, performance counseling. So I walk in, he says, shut the door. He goes, here's the deal. We're going to have a news conference in 30 minutes and you're going to relieve Mike Brown in the entire response of the Gulf. So in case you're wondering what my tasking was, how I found out about it and the details associated with it: that was it.

Called Mike Brown in. Said, Mike, there's going to be a news conference in 30 minutes. Dad's relieving you to go back and be the director of FEMA. And he said I'm not going to go out there and get vilified by the Press. If they come at me I'm coming at them and Secretary Chertoff said, you're going to keep your mouth shut and I'll do all the talking. And I'm looking for a table to dive under, okay?

So we had what was arguably the most uncomfortable press conference I've ever been involved in. If you don't believe me go Google Allen, Chertoff and Brown and see what comes up in the pictures.

Brown storms off, Mike Chertoff leaves, my aide looks at me and she goes, so what are you going to do now? Legitimate question. So thinking back to opportunity and competency and what you need to do, I remembered a conversation I had walking out of the building that morning. I walked up to this lady and I said how are you doing? She was a FEMA employee and she goes, working 20 hours a day. I'm helping people. I feel really good about it.

But I go back to my hotel room at night and I can't turn on the television because I see my agency and my leader is being vilified. And it's killing me because these people are working really hard here. I went, got some serious issues here. So I looked at my aide and said I want to have an all hands meeting. And she reminded me there were 5,000 people and this was kind of a conglomerate warehouse/store complex. And I said get as many people as you can in one room. I want to talk to them.

So about 30 minutes later I walked into what used to be the bottom floor of a Dillard's store and there were about 2,500 people and they were hanging off the rafters. So I got up on a desk with a loud hailer and I said, listen I have to go back to New Orleans. They all know what had happened already. And I got to make sure we keep doing what we're doing down there because it's working. I'll be back in 24 hours. Here's who you call whatever.

Then I looked at them all and I said I'm giving you an order. All right, I have no moral authority to give an order but there's an old saying, you don't have sovereignty unless you can exert it. I said, you're to treat everybody that you come in contact with that's been impacted by the storm as if they were a member of your own family, your mother, your father, your brother, your sister. I said, I'm telling you this for two reasons.

Number one, if you make a mistake you're going to err on the side of doing too much and at this point in this response I'm okay with that. Number two, if somebody's got a problem with what you did, their problem's not with you. Their problem's with me. I told you. They need to deal with me.

At that point, people started openly weeping in the room and there was a

collective sigh that changed the barometric pressure in the building. Nobody in very simple terms had told these folks what the real issue was, that one goal without partisanship or anything else you can focus on to the exclusion of everything else that unifies everybody under a set of principles and values from which you can build trust. But more importantly nobody ever told these people that somebody had their back.

This comes up time and time again in public service. Every time there's an issue, the funding's reduced becomes a referendum on public service. Wrong question, wrong assertion. The question is how do you apply the resources of passion and commitment to the best ends? Now, you're probably asking and I get this question all the time, okay, I know you're a four star. You work for the President. You can tell people what to do, everybody says, yes, I'll do it. I'm a GS14 or GS15. And my answer is, wrong.

You always have the opportunity to reconcile opportunity and competency. You always have the opportunity to make clear unambiguous statements to your people about what the goal is, the values associated with that and you can always tell your people that you have their back.

MR. SANDERS: So if there's the essence of enterprise leadership, it is to unify folks around some huge, big, hairy public policy goal. Whether it's a disaster or some other national challenge and while that's difficult, frankly that's where enterprise leaders get their leverage. You just heard an example of that. Orders don't do it. It's getting people mobilized around that larger vision that requires all of them to work together. That's the essence of enterprise leadership.

So with that, Elaine, I'm going to ask you to come up with our panel and

as you're transitioning, I took the liberty of introducing at the outset. But if you'd all come on up and as we segue this is a list of the folks in the book and they're both practitioners and academics. I got to say this, on behalf of Thad and Mike McConnell, former Director of National Intelligence, we all work for Booz Allen and I have to thank Booz Allen for giving us the opportunity and letting us do stuff like this 'cause it's not billable. It's just for the public good. And there are lots of others that contributed too but I wanted to say that publicly.

So with that, Elaine, over to you. Thanks, everybody.

MS. KAMARCK: While we're getting settled let me just say this is a wonderful book with some pretty incredible stories in it and a pretty incredible wrap up at the end about enterprise leadership. So this is a real addition to the field of leadership in the public sector and I think thank you very much to Ron and to Jackson. Where's Jackson? Jackson, here? Oh, okay, for doing this. I suspect Brookings will get lots and lots of use out of it in the coming years as will of course the government.

Let me -- I know you introduced the panel before. So let me just start right in because what I want to focus on in the panel is sort of what the next step. I mean, can this in fact really happen, all right? Can we make enterprise leadership and the sort of set of concepts it encompasses, can we make it a reality?

And to do that I'm going to start with Steve Shih, okay, because frankly you're in the agency. You've got the assignment, so to speak and I want to ask you two things. Is it possible to develop this and secondly are interagency assignments realistic in this day and age when senior executive service members are so busy and so overworked. Is this realistic?

MR. SHIH: Thank you for the question. Good morning, everyone. It absolutely is not only realistic but absolutely critical in order to be able to face the current wicked challenges of today and the foreseeable future.

I was at DHS and had the honor of working with Admiral Thad Allen. And in a span of about six months between 2009 and 2010 we had a series of consecutive back-to-back crises that not only impressed upon us the fact that not a single agency or organization has the control and the authority to be able to tackle all these wicked problems of today, but no single organization has the resources in a budget constrained environment as of today.

So in November of 2009 we had the Fort Hood shooting. The following month, December 2009 I'm in my basement playing with my kids on Christmas Day, got a call from the Secretary's Office at DHS and it was the attempted underwear bomber bombing incident in Detroit Michigan. The following month as we're dealing with all of the terrorist activities and the screening that went into that underwear bombing incident, we had the Haiti earthquake. That was January 2010.

A couple of months later in April 2010, we had the attempted bombing in Times Square followed by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. And I remember sitting in a conference call in January of 2010 hearing Admiral Allen identify to the Secretary of Homeland Security that there was a need for an enterprise response. He identified the fact that we needed to be able to control the air space over Haiti in a coordinated manner and he began laying out the seeds of a coordinated, collaborated response.

And it really resonated with me that there was a perfect example where not only did one Department not have the control and the authority over all of the

coordinated response that was necessary, but we didn't have the resources either. So to answer your question, it absolutely is critical in order to address these challenges.

Is it possible to foster these types of interagency rotations and sort of collaboration? I absolutely think it is. Dr. Sanders set up the answer really by talking about the fact that the Senior Executive Service was created in 1978 as a corporate cadre of executives who are responsible for providing strategic leadership, selected, developed, appointed, managed and retained because of their ability to provide executive leadership and to be deployed throughout the entire federal government. So the SES is a perfect place to start.

It is going to require support and commitment from leadership, top down. But I also very much appreciate what Admiral Allen mentioned about opportunity to provide influence. And we have opportunities as leaders no matter how large or small our span of control is to influence others in terms of fostering an enterprise approach.

MS. KAMARCK: Well, let me just play devil's advocate for a minute. So on the question of interagency rotations, you know, I mean obviously all of our models is Goldwater-Nichols but that was for a common end which was war fighting. So let me just say: would you put some limitations on it? Would you take SES biochemists from FDA and rotate them through Army personnel? Or would you bound this in some way?

MR. SHIH: So I think your question gets to the point that there is some value in terms of respecting agency's discretion and control over their human resources including executives. Quite frankly, there are reasons that agencies would want to retain control and not necessarily share their human resources.

They spend quite a bit of time and investment in selecting and recruiting

the right types of individuals and also focusing on achieving the right fit for a leadership culture within their agencies. These are factors in addition to the fact that there's a need for continuity that transcends sort of projects, taskforces, initiatives, even administrations that suggests there's a value attached with having executive resources that stay put and provide the long term institutional knowledge and the continuity, knowledge transference within an organization.

I think the key here ultimately, though, is if as organizations in the federal government we focus on developing executives to be able to have these enterprise leadership competencies, then there's a range of opportunities along a spectrum in terms of how much we actually deploy them throughout the enterprise. You can take an approach where following the DOD and the IC approach, there's a value attached to ensuring that individuals, maybe pre-SES or even post-SES appointment, have this type of rotational experience and diversity of experience and cognitive thought.

And then there's a range on the spectrum in terms of the partnership for public service for example in their current enterprise mobility report suggests that you could you have a cadre that's staffed with executives who are specifically focused on enterprise leadership and are more mobile. And then you could have another core that would stay in place to provide the long term continuity.

MS. KAMARCK: Great. I'm going to skip around a little bit because I think we're going to keep coming back to the same topic of how do we make this happen. But Susan, you actually did this with the Veteran's Administration and DOD. Thinking about what you did, right, what would you tell Steve about what OPM should be doing to try and make this system wide?

DR. KELLY: I think that while you're developing that SES cadre that we need to, at the same time, be thinking of pulling those folks who are going to follow in our footsteps with us. So that while you have a set of senior leaders who are rolling up their sleeves and getting dirty with the problem at hand and showing all of the skills that you are talking with because it was very exciting to hear the two of you talking about the skills but also some of the attributes, the personal attributes, that senior leaders were showing. And I can give specific examples of how that is happening day in and day out on this taskforce and how it happened from the beginning.

But while you have those senior leaders who are driving this change, you also need to be bringing those junior folks with you who are perhaps subject matter experts. But you also have to be pulling them along deliberately and exposing them to the nuts and bolts of this interagency work. Sometimes the not pretty side of it but to build up their awareness as well as their resilience.

It takes some real resilience to work on an interagency initiative. So I would look at the pulling young people along with you so that we're not always just focused at this high level or at those 14s and 15s. Pulling them along.

MS. KAMARCK: The other thing you said that made me curious is you said subject matter experts.

DR. KELLY: Yes.

MS. KAMARCK: So with the 21st century federal government is a very expert heavy government. It is not as it was in the 1950s, a government mostly of clerks who were filing things and keeping track of things. And a lot of those experts are in the SES and yet they're there really because of a scientific expertise, a technical expertise, et

cetera.

Does it make sense to have experts lumped with managers? I mean is it time to think about the SES differently?

DR. KELLY: I would say absolutely. I don't think we have the luxury of saying either or. I think it has to be a combination. And it takes a certain level of intelligence, a certain level of drive and risk-taking, the ability to put yourself out there. But we don't have, I don't think we have the luxuries, particularly in our budget situation to say you can only do this, you can only do that.

And I also think that as you practice these skills at a certain level, those skills you begin to hone, you begin to generalize them at higher and higher levels when you become a more strategic focused outlook. But I think that's one of the competencies that has to be looked at, the ability to balance a strategic view but also to look at what can really work in practice and at execution level and in the field.

So that is a compensate that you really have to hone but also be willing to say I don't know if this will work and pull other folks together. It's a certainly level of humility to acknowledge you don't know what you don't know.

MS. KAMARCK: Laura, you've studied these interagency collaborations and leaderships, trying to put this into practice more broadly throughout the federal government, what do you think the biggest problem is?

MS. CRAIG: You know I've been thinking about it a lot as I've heard everyone speaking this morning and this little thing keeps going through my head. You know how in the real estate you know location, location, location and I'm thinking for interagency collaboration and programming really it's incentives, incentives, incentives.

And I think what our work has really shown is that it's not necessarily the -- I think some of the incentive structures are very obvious.

I mean, I think the idea that you can put together an interagency rotation program but there's no incentive to participate, I think that's been well documented with Goldwater-Nichols and that sort of thing. But I think it's more complex than that because there are really multiple players involved that you have to think about their incentive. So you don't just have the participants. You have the agency that's receiving the interagency rotatee or whatever you want to call it.

And although at the very top level of leadership another agency might say, oh, yes, we really want to support this program. There's the frontline managers that might be stuck in their mind supervising someone. There are all sorts of perverse incentives I think is really, I think we need to be very strategic in how we think of those.

There are incentives for the managers who are letting go their best people to get out there and the perverse incentives for them not to. So I think it's very complicated and I think how you design it and perhaps even bringing people together to be collaborative in the design that are representing all of the different interests and thinking about how you can make it a win-win, I think that's critical. And I don't know that in the human capital area we've always been set up to do that. So I think that's sort of an issue.

DR. KELLY: I'd like to add another perspective to that. I don't think that rotational assignments are always the best answer and I think we have so many opportunities right now to address the problems in a much larger way and to recognize that even today we need an interagency action towards solving those problems.

We don't necessarily have to rotate. We just need to engage all of the agencies together to solve these larger issues. It helps to have a crisis with Katrina and with the oil spill et cetera but we have some very huge problems out there now that require interagency tackling. It doesn't require rotational assignments. It requires us to change the way we think about the problems and all come together. And try to go forward with some joint results, larger picture results. Rotational assignments are one way.

MS. CRAIG: Let me just add to that. I absolutely agree. I don't think they're the only answer. I think it's a tool, again, the idea that you can get multiple benefits out of it; it's a tool for professional development. I think the idea being to inculcate some of those competencies that Ron has been talking about and others have been talking about.

You're right, it's a high investment strategy and so I think it has to be used carefully and I think there are other ways to not only get the sort of things done that you're talking about but to develop that enterprise perspective that's so important. But from our work I think it's interesting, you really do see some surprising things.

I think it's obvious that you send somebody over to another agency. They learn; they sort of get a foundational understanding of other agencies, of other resources that they can draw on when they go home. They learn a lot of things. They get the other perspective but the thing that really struck me interviewing many, many, many people is that what they learned the most was what it was like to look back. Being outside and looking in at their own agency and getting a sense of wow this is how others perceive my agency and if I want to negotiate, if I want to be a leader that can cut across

these organizational boundaries I have a better sense of what's important to others and how we're perceived. And I think that's a very powerful thing.

But I really do agree. It is a high investment, a big investment and it's not the only way to do it.

MS. KAMARCK: Jim, you run something called Leading EDGE geared towards government wide leadership for the SES and I guess 14 agencies. Tell us what you do in that program, why it was created in the first place and how it links to the discussion we've been having this morning.

DR. TRINKA: Oh, I'd be happy to because I'm sitting here and really wanting to say something here. And you like to, you said you want to be a little bit take the other side of the issue and of course I'm equally as provocative. I'd be equally as provocative I guess to say that I think if you start at the executive level for interagency assignments that's way too late and it's not going to help.

The one thing, the lesson that the DOD has learned is that yes you have to have to have a joint assignment to become a general but when does that happen? That happens in early to mid-career. And the benefit that people gain from that is networking. And I think that is the biggest thing that the Leading EDGE program tries to foster across government is to have people know about what each other does.

Because as you said, we just don't know. I mean, I'll give an example. I know there's all these crises example but I know they would all say, you know, if we can do it -- I've heard Thad Allen say this too. If we can do this in a crisis why can't we do this every day? If there's smoke coming out of a smokestack where you say well that might be dirty, that's probably EPA's business right? And then you think about it and say well,

it's coming out of a power plant. Well, that's probably Department of Energy. Well, it's on federal land. Well, that's probably Department of Interior.

It might be a commercial enterprise. Well, that's Commerce. I mean you could go on and on. There's a hospital there, there's HHS. I don't know, there's public housing is HUD. So you could go on and on and on here and people do not realize that there's so many other people's mission is to help out in this day to day issue.

And so, what we try to do is get people together to find out those kind of things. And I think that's more than anything else what we attempt to do through our program is people to build their networks. And because I think we've failed at building those networks early on in people's careers. And that's what the DOD's program through the Goldwater-Nichols Act has actually done is build people's networks.

So when I was in the military I knew a lot of people in all the services just because I went to different schools and all that kind of thing. And it helped out. I called on them. And people are willing to cooperate and collaborate to solve a problem on any forum they just don't know. And I think that's the biggest thing is just the knowledge of that whole thing.

MS. KAMARCK: Well and a little earlier Thad Allen talked about the importance of giving permission. Permission is really very important. When some of these messes happen, right? Where do they end up? They end up at the White House and having worked there for five years I can tell you the White House has very little capacity. I mean the problem with saying let the White House do it or the problem with all these silly czars that every president seems to think are going to solve the problems is there's no capacity in the White House.

Or to put it another way, they have no planes, no trains, no automobiles, no trucks, no guns, no nothing. So usually what happens if you wait for the coordination problem to go to the White House you're probably by that time in a big, big problem. And in fact, part of I think particularly what you were talking about, Susan and James, is kind of getting ahead of big, big problems. I mean by establishing an interagency leadership culture.

Other comments? And then I think we'll take some questions from the floor. Anybody want to add anything?

MR. SHIH: I just want to add real quick and sort of leaping onto your point about incentives. I want to get a little bit away from the notion that agencies and executives operate in silos because they're either selfish or don't understand the value of coordination.

I think one of the keys ultimately is that we have very, very limited resources in every single agency. And executives and organizations are motivated to achieve certain performance goals that are focused on their specific organizations. And so, one of the keys in this book tackling wicked problems and one of the things that the partnership talks about in its report is sort of reframing that focus to your point.

It's an organizational incentive in addition to an individual incentive. And one of the things that enterprise leadership really fosters is a more strategic way of thinking.

Dr. Jackson Nickerson talks about a star model of leadership and one of the first things is stop and then you think, then you act. And oftentimes to your point, Elaine, we have a lot of leaders who are very much subject matter experts. We know the

what and the how and that's what we're trained to do and that's what we focus on.

So when there is an issue, whether it's a crisis or whether it's a more endemic issue, we leap into it and we start solving it. What we really need to do is we need to stop for a second and think about it strategically. What is the best way to achieve the desired outcome and why we're doing it?

And when we stop and think then we'll realize that we can really accomplish those outcomes through an enterprise approach rather through a tactical response.

MS. KAMARCK: I remember when Ron came to talk to one of my classes at Harvard a couple of years ago and he was in the middle of the Intel rotation. And I had just spent the summer in England, guest of the British Government, moving round from MI-5 to their Defense University et cetera, talking about these Intel issues. And the simple difference was they all knew each other.

It was a small government. They all knew each other. So I'd go from one place to the other and they'd say, oh, yeah, yeah, you just met with so-and-so. And so-and-so and I went to school together. Or so-and-so and I did this together and so there's a real problem with bigness frankly that I think other organizations other than federal government cope with. But the federal government, let's face it, is very large and you can't -- this is a really hard thing to do.

Do we have some questions out there? Anybody? Yes, right here.

MR. JECKEL: Thanks, Larry Jeckel. I think one of the most important things that we said today revolved around trust and I think that what we don't see a lot in government is trust between these inter-agencies. So this whole notion of, I think it was

Ron who was saying, this networking is very important. How do we get over that? I heard a lot about the technical expertise, how you have to look at a situation to understand where the leadership comes in. But to me leadership is all about personal relationships. And if you don't have that, if ego interferes, then you don't have it.

I mean you're not going to solve anything. So how do we promote more of that?

DR. KELLY: I'll take a shot at that just from the experience on the taskforce. You are exactly right that trust is at the core of all of it and that's built based upon relationships. And I can tell you looking back, hindsight, we had a compelling force. We didn't have a crisis in reference to Veteran's Employment but we had a compelling force.

And the agencies that came together shared a concern for veterans who are going to be returning. Not only because of good will but also as you looked at it more strategically, of the economic impacts on our communities, of the long term outcomes when veterans are not reintegrated back into the communities, so if you looked at a larger perspective you were able to hear then more of those voices who were at the table who were small voices. But when you look at it in a larger, the other voices became included.

But as you moved through that let's recognize that every agency has an agenda. They have their own mission. If you could articulate what was that common value, that common mission that all of the agencies at the table had sometimes when that trust was even injured a little bit because we're all human. We're all human and there are egos involved and we also make mistakes. And sometimes we just step on people's toes

without even knowing. Again, you don't know what you don't know.

If you recalled or if somebody had the courage in the day in and day out work of reminding us all what was the core mission here, what was our value and we can all latch on to that value. We could get through some of those missteps that we made and build trust over and over again. But to build that trust you have got to be sometimes eyeball to eyeball. You have to spend time with people and I think as our gentleman said, you have to hear what people have to say.

And one of the biggest lessons learned is that when you hear what other people from other agencies do day in and day out it will blow your mind. You will become even more proud.

MS. KAMARCK: Did you want to add to that?

DR. TRINKA: Yes, I did. In the chapter that I wrote, I talk about some of the barriers to collaboration. And one of the barriers that I wrote a little bit about was this whole thing I called the transaction versus relationship based collaboration. And I think it speaks to this whole trust issue because I think in this country we look at collaborating with one another based on a transaction that can come out of this.

So I will collaborate with you because it gives me something and vice versa. And whereas in many other cultures other than here, apparently in England as well as you've realized that it's based on relationships, certainly Middle East and many others. Where the relationship is established first and there is trust built and then collaboration follows from that naturally. And I think the more that we can get to that type of a situation with the type of networking that happens earlier on in people's careers, perhaps it's a generational thing.

Perhaps another generation that's used to that kind of networking may have less of a problem with this. We'll wait and see but I think that's one of the issues and it certainly is a barrier to collaboration but certainly not a brick wall. It's certainly easy to overcome.

MR. SHIH: Can I add to that also real quick?

MS. KAMARCK: Sure and then we've got a question.

MR. SHIH: In addition to trust which Jim talked about sort of the value of Leading EDGE which is bringing together executives to really understand mission but also to be able to develop those personal networks and relationships, to foster that trust. I think the key here is it's shared ownership and it's need.

Okay, so, we're going to work in multiple organizations and initiatives where we're not necessarily going to trust others. We're not always going to -- it's not always good to trust necessarily everyone. People come to initiatives with their own agendas.

Not to suggest that it's a malicious intent but it's a different focus and so, oftentimes what we really need to do is to be able to figure out how to work with people whether we trust them or not. If Jim and I are in the same boat and we're in a storm and our charge is to save that boat, I'm going to figure out pretty quickly that I can get that boat to shore more quickly and more efficiently and safely by having Jim row with me rather than me trying to throw Jim overboard.

So then I'm going to work with Jim so that we can jointly that boat. Then once we get to safety I can throw overboard.

MS. KAMARCK: Let's see. We have a question down here.

MR. FINK: Good morning, Jonathan Fink, OCC. I was wondering about the word turf which hasn't been used yet this morning. And in my area of work and I think this would be true of many people, it's not only that agencies have different missions but they are suspicious of each other or nervous of motives. And I'm wondering what you've seen work in terms of breaking down those kinds of issues.

MS. KAMARCK: Do you want to give it a try?

MS. CRAIG: Sure. Well, I don't want to sound like a broken record but I think it goes back to incentives. And I think what you need to do and I think this sort of builds on the conversation about organizing people around a common outcome. If you can align the incentives for individuals to understand what they're doing in their individual mission and their individual resources, how that fits into the whole, I think that really works.

And it sounds a little bit pie in the sky but there are very specific practical things that you can do to make that happen. And I think it's sort of a combination of a carrot and a stick. You reward people for behaving in a way that benefits the big picture, the enterprise and also maybe my pet one is that you take away things that might punish for doing so. Because I think historically that's been in place and you might be talking about experiencing that.

MS. KAMARCK: Yes, Ron?

DR. SANDERS: I'll just piggyback on what Laura said. One of the interesting things that we did in the intelligence community, Mike McConnell, when he was DNI and we did this literally with about two hours of discussion. He instituted personal performance agreements with all the agency heads but not with respect to their

individual missions because they worked for a cabinet secretary. That was fairly straightforward. Their goals and objectives were shared.

And you can imagine the initial reaction which was I'm not responsible for that. You can't hold me accountable if I don't have all of the authority. Well, the problem is you share it. And after the initial misgivings, I had the chance to brief that all of these agency heads and I can tell you how warmly it was received. There's a lot of heat in the room but it's been institutionalized and the focus again is on the shared goals.

And to Susan's point, once they realize that they can't do that alone and they've actually had to put it in writing to start, it became a very powerful incentive for them to work together.

MR. SHIH: And I think you've also made the case for why enterprise leadership is so important. Because yes those things do occur, it is a barrier to collaboration across government but yet it takes that kind of a leader that Ron talks about to be able to set the standards and expectations in order to try to say we're not going to go through this big, huge reorganization that will take multiple years and ultimately probably not achieve its objectives. But we're actually just going to work together in the structure we have and figure out a way to do this and I think that that's a much better solution.

MS. KAMARCK: Jackson, you wanted to add to this conversation?

MR. NICKERSON: Yes. I'm getting all excited over here. At Brookings Exec Ed one of the things that we've learned, first of all there are many ways to overcome these turf battles. But one way to overcome it and you heard Thad and other people echo the sentiment is that if you collectively formulate the problem together then it

becomes your problem. And that then turns into the set of goals and values.

Where, instead, if you're jumping toward a solution because you have an agenda, that's where a lot of the turf battles and the conflicts occur. And so I would put a plug in for the notion of processes. There are a variety of processes. We teach some of them in our programs but processes where you come together with a clean slate and collectively figure out what is the issue we're trying to solve. And when that happens then it becomes everyone's ownership.

And that's different from the way most people come to meetings. Often we come to meetings and within a few moments the solution is already on the table and that leads to the fight. So I'm just throwing this additional mechanism which I thought I heard through a lot of the comments but I thought I'd amplify.

MS. KAMARCK: Great. And Jim, you said something that really resonated with me which is reorganization. I mean, every President naively comes in and asks for a reorganization authority. He doesn't get it. He puts a reorganization plan on the table, it doesn't happen. There's lots and lots of reasons for that and a lot of us have come to the conclusion that yeah, in spite of the stories about how many agencies run -- have rules about Sam and et cetera, that what really matters is getting the government to work horizontally. Because the reorganization in a mature and complex government just gets to be a little bit more trouble than it's ultimately worth. And nobody's ever sort of shown me a compelling case for this with one exception which is the merger of basically INS and Customs at the border.

Which I think, and again, that was quite painful for everyone involved but I think that that was one of those few areas where they came up independently for

historic reasons but basically it never really did make any sense to have two different agencies and two different cabinet departments operating at the border. Did you want to add something, Susan?

MS. CRAIG: I did.

MS. KAMARCK: Oh, Laura, I'm sorry.

MS. CRAIG: No, it's okay. You know I wanted to add that really resonated with me, too. And I think you know my background was originally in State and local government where you actually can reorganize a little bit more easily. It's still horribly painful and difficult but what I've seen from my experience is that even when you can reorganize you just create new seams. So that need for enterprise leadership is never going to go away.

MS. KAMARCK: That's a really good point. You replace an old set of seams with a new set of seams. So and five years down the road you still find yourself with a need for enterprise leadership. Great. Let's see, we've got room for two more questions and we've got two questioners back there and right here. And we might be able to get one more. Yes.

MS. FELDBLUM: I'm going to stand because I'm short. I'm Chai Feldblum from Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I want to thank you very much. This is fantastic. I do also agree with the point of incentive, incentive, incentive. So my question to all of you is about performance plans for SES'ers because I feel at least at the EOC that we really worked on getting a completely different type of strategic plan, try to change a culture. And I have found that in two years the performance plans have still not been able to be changed to in fact, and I think Jackson had this fantastically,

you can't hold me responsible if I don't have full authority.

Well, but if what needs to happen is you working with someone else in order to achieve the goal, then yes I would like to hold you responsible. It's just I'd like to hold you and the other person also responsible. But obviously OPM is a key piece here but really from all of you, actually one last thing. I noticed recently that in the regulations it says that SES'ers are supposed to provide input into the development of the performance and I'm wondering if that happens well in any agency. Because that, to me, seems essential.

MR. SHIH: Let me take a quick stab at this. Ms. Feldblum, thank you for the question, first of all, and your leadership at EEOC. I spent 12 years at EEOC so it's good to see you tackle the wicked challenges including budget that the EEOC is facing.

I want to very quickly just put in a plug for an effort that I led a couple of years ago. And it was actually an enterprise leadership effort itself as a microcosm in basically leading an interagency effort to design a new SES performance appraisal system. And so, we had representatives of over 30 different federal agencies, Offices of Inspector Generals, small agencies, medium size agencies, large departments come together and design within 10 weeks, a new SES performance appraisal system applicable to all federal agencies and to be implemented across the entire federal government.

I'm proud to report that by the end of October of this year we will have over 90 percent of federal departments and agencies that will be using this new SES performance appraisal system. So the effort is a perfect example of the fact that enterprise leadership and coordination can and will work.

But the new performance appraisal system is founded upon the five ECQs, leading change, leading people, results oriented, business acumen and building coalitions. And it provides a foundation for all agencies to be able to embed the organizational and individual performance expectations and requirements focused specifically on enterprise leadership.

Now, my good friend, Dr. Sanders, Ron Sanders, who Susan tells me I should trust has been trying to get me to focus after leading this incredible effort that now over 80 different federal agencies and departments are using to tweak that and to add a sixth ECQ; which will be a monumental enterprise leadership activity in and of itself.

But whether it's a sixth ECQ focusing on enterprise leadership or using the current building coalitions which neatly captures this whole concept of enterprise leadership, the foundation and the tools are there. Now it's up to the agencies to really prioritize and to use this new tool to focus on enterprise leadership.

MS. KAMARCK: Okay. I think we've got the last question back there.
Yes?

SPEAKER: Yes, the quick question I guess I had and it kind of follows up with the idea of trust, I'm aging myself but there was one time and now maybe in some schools it's being taught again, good citizenship. And I guess what I'm talking about is basically character, ethics and good citizenship. To me those are qualities that are good leaders and certainly enterprise leadership, which I think is a fascinating idea of working with one another.

And I just wanted to get the panels thoughts on those qualities because obviously we've seen on the private side and in some instances in government, where

poor ethics, poor character and obviously poor citizenship led to a lot of crises that we have. And I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on that particular three or four points.

MS. KAMARCK: Anybody want to take that on? Jim?

DR. TRINKA: Yes, okay. It's one of the objectives of the program that I run, too, is to instill that. I think that the vast, vast, vast majority of government workers have very, very high ethics of course and ought to be applauded for that quite frankly. And I think that goes a long way in order to do that. And in my program we actually focus on that because that's what it takes to kind of build that next generation of leaders as well that's going to come into the agency as younger employees. And they'll go into an organization that they think they have a difference in.

I think there was a -- I think the Merit System Protection Board does a survey every couple of years and on one of their recent surveys it says they asked all the federal employees, one of the questions they asked is why do you do your job? And I'm saying they're motivated to do their job because they think their job is important. 98 percent, you know that kind of a thing. And I go wow, that's a great thing.

I know that there's the folks in the audience that say well, we'll try to figure out what those two percent are doing and we'll correct that. I said, hey, we got the 98 percent. Let's figure out ways to further that.

So, yes, you can focus on those point oh-oh-oh-oh-one percent of folks that do make mistakes and the typical response from Congress and quite frankly, senior leadership, is let's punish all for the sins of the few. And I think if you just focus more on the positive here it may have more of an impact.

MS. KAMARCK: Great. Anybody want to add anything?

DR. KELLY: I always give people the benefit of the doubt and I think people come at something with probably the best of intentions. Certainly with my interagency work I come away with a tremendous amount of respect for all my colleagues and the issues that they deal with day in and day out.

But I think we're all in this and this is generalizable statement that we think we make a difference. but one of the things that we're not doing as leaders is saying because we brought this interagency team together these are the results that they had as a team that they could not have had a single agency. We are not doing that.

And I think when the younger folks, when the middle folks, I can say that at my age, that when they see that there are results and that they can make a difference by working together because they see the results when other people have worked together, they'll want to be part of that. They'll want to. They will gravitate towards working together and we don't have to be so concerned about reorganization. We don't have to be so concerned about we can document it in performance plans, absolutely, shared outcomes, but it will become -- it will be more embraced because they see results. And they can see the results that are happening right now across the federal government. We just don't know about it.

And I think that's a gap that we all share. To highlight the successes that are happening right now by inter-agencies working together and looking at problems more strategically. We've identified a few here in this group but I think there are a lot more and we need to highlight those, build the incentives to go towards that.

MS. KAMARCK: Laura, you get the last word on this.

MS. CRAIG: That's exciting and I don't want to end on a dark note but I would be remiss, government accountability office, if I didn't mention this. And I'm not going to go through all of my caveats. I really do believe that the vast majority of people are in government not for the money. I know I'm not here for the money but because they really want to change the world. I know that sounds a little idealistic but I think that's why most of us are here. And I totally agree. I think if you can really get people to have a vision around the outcomes that makes a huge difference.

But in the few times that that doesn't work because people have lost their way or whatever, that performance agreement, the incentives, that's also an accountability tool. If you clearly define what people are responsible for accomplishing, I think there's less room for people to veer off the path.

MS. KAMARCK: Well said. Listen, thank you to our panel. And now I want to call back the authors here. Professor Jackson Nickerson, Ron, you're not coming up?

DR. SANDERS: I'm going to let Jackson have --

MS. KAMARCK: Okay, Jackson, you get the last word.

MR. NICKERSON: Will you join me in thanking Elaine for her service today? I'd like to get you out of here in just a few minutes. First of all, I want to lend my voice of appreciation for all of you being here, our speakers and the people who contributed to the book. I'm sure you know it takes quite a while to not only write the chapters but we had great support from Booz Allen Hamilton tracking down all the authors when it was hard to get them sometimes to get things delivered on a deadline.

So my appreciation and thanks go out to them. In case you're interested,

the book you could have bought beforehand, before you came here. It's available in the bookstore. It's also on amazon.com which tends to have a lower price. So if you want to download and read it, I want to give that plug for the book. I don't think we're going to make the New York Times bestseller list but if we get close that would be pretty exciting.

A few other general announcements, Ron Sanders and I will be leading a new program called Building Networks and Partnership Enterprise Leadership. And you probably found an announcement on your seat. And it's going to be based on some of the things we've learned through the book. I hope you find that useful and we'll consider it.

I also want to mention that this book is part of a series. One of my goals here at Brookings Executive Education is to help to bring new innovations and leadership to government. And so, this is the second book in the series but we anticipate additional books. Often there's the flavor of the month or something has been recast that has existed before and what we're trying to do is identify those innovations and leadership that will make a difference particular for the government.

So I ask you to remember the book series and at least consider it when new books come out. With that, I'd like to close today. Thank you so much for being here. We appreciate your time and we hope that you got some value out of it. Have a great day. Be safe.

* * * * *

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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190