



NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

900 7th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20001-3888

TEL (202) 347-3190 FAX (202) 393-0993
INTERNET: www.napawash.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Beth Noveck, Deputy Chief Technology Officer for Open Government
Office of Science and Technology Policy, The White House

DATE: June 1, 2009

FROM: Lena Trudeau, Vice President
The National Academy of Public Administration

SUBJECT: Summary Analysis of the Open Government Brainstorm

On January 21, 2009, his first full day in office, the President issued a Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government, in which he called for recommendations that make the Federal government more transparent, participatory, and collaborative. In response to that Memorandum, the Chief Technology Officer, together with the Office of Management and Budget and the General Services Administration, recommended that on May 21st, the White House invite the public to contribute its expertise to crafting final recommendations on open government.

Traditionally, proposed policy is crafted by government representatives—who though knowledgeable, do not always have access to the best possible expertise and information—and subsequently posted to invite public comment. The challenge lies in the fact that this process is designed to engender incremental rather than transformational change. Creating a transparent, participatory and collaborative government, however, is a foundational shift, and success requires that we are able to access the best and most creative ideas for accomplishing this goal, wherever they reside.

The vision for this exercise, therefore, is to invert the policymaking process by enabling informed public dialogue to inform policymaking at the front end. The collaborative three-phase process employed opens up tremendous possibilities for real-time innovation. People are invited to:

1. Brainstorm—share ideas on how to make government more open, participatory and collaborative, discuss and vote on the ideas of others;
2. Discuss—dig deeper on the ideas and challenges identified during the Brainstorm phase; and
3. Draft—collaboratively craft constructive recommendations for an Open Government Directive.

The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy has asked the National Academy of Public Administration to host the first phase of this civic engagement exercise—an online brainstorm named the OpenGov Dialogue—analyze the results and provide a synthesis of key themes. This document provides a summary of the ideas received during Phase I, from May 21st, when the site went live, through May 28, 2009, and details specific topics that best lend themselves to further discussion in Phase II. To perform this analysis, the National Academy assembled an Advisory Panel consisting of three Fellows with directly relevant subject matter expertise.¹

¹ See Appendix for more complete biographical sketches.

- **John Kamensky**, *Senior Fellow, IBM Center for the Business of Government*
- **Anne Laurent**, *Content Editor, Federal Thought Leadership Program, CGI*
- **Sallyanne Payton**, *William W. Cook Professor of Law, University of Michigan Law School*

Kamensky and Laurent also serve on the Advisory Panel to the National Academy’s Collaboration Project, an independent forum of leaders committed to harnessing collaboration and innovation in government. Payton served on the Panel that oversaw the National Dialogue on Health IT and Privacy, an innovative web-based dialogue that engaged the public in key issues around healthcare, information technology, and personal privacy. Collectively, the Advisory Panel brings to bear unmatched subject matter expertise on the unique challenges and issues facing government, as well as cutting-edge techniques for using technology for citizen engagement and deliberation.

In assessing the feedback received through the brainstorming session, the Advisory Panel considered three overarching questions:

- What were the general observations of the week-long discussion?
- What were the most important themes to emerge across the ideas? Where did ideas “cluster” or nodes form?
- Which ideas submitted to the brainstorming present potentially actionable next steps that should be considered for further discussion in Phase II and were viewed favorably by the participant community? Note: the vote totals received were a contributing factor but not the only means for determining the potential value of any specific idea.

The first two questions considered by the Fellows are addressed in this memorandum. The third question will be answered in a separate observations document, to be delivered separately. The analysis presented in this memorandum is also informed, where possible, by the content of posts made to the Federal MAX Community. In some cases, the analysis will refer directly to input received through the MAX Community.

PHASE I: BRAINSTORM—CONTENT ANALYSIS

Our analysis is grouped into four categories:

- Transparency;
- Citizen Participation;
- Collaboration; and
- Capacity Building, Legal and Policy Challenges.

I. TRANSPARENCY

General Observations

- In the Transparency category, several “campaigns” were waged around certain postings to drive up votes, driven in particular by open government advocacy groups (e.g., Open the Government, Sunlight Foundation, Strengthen Our Nation’s Democracy).
- Specific actionable ideas included: appointing a senior representative in each agency to lead transparency initiatives; adopting common data standards; creating a one-stop portal for all budget data; and webcasting all open meetings.

- An important cross-cutting question that emerged was about the purpose of transparency: Is it to create trust, increase accountability, or both? Answering this will be important in defining the needs of the “sender” (government) vs. the “receiver” (the public).

Themes

Make Data More Accessible

The general theme of how to make government data more accessible to the public is foundational to the notion of transparency. Specific ideas that emerged in this thematic area include:

- Create structured data that is easily consumable. e.g. require XML, pursue CRADA-like agreements, define principles for open-source data.
- Bring government services online and make them reusable by the private sector; if citizens own the services they should be able to build on top of them. This requires a SOA approach The VA Loan Guaranty Service is also a good example.
- Ensure a CCO Creative Common copyright waiver for products created with data.gov contributions. There should be a way to allow non-government Open Source Transparency Projects to work for free for the government (right now, they cannot contribute).
- Post all FOIA request responses on the web so everyone, not just the requester, has access.
- Digitize all government research reports and make them available free via NTIS.
- Convert Depository Libraries around the country into Regional Data Centers.
- Make NARA the off-site electronic backup data center for all agency e-record systems.
- Build the cost of records retention management into agency IT purchases.

Make Government More Open

Access to data is a necessary but not sufficient condition for transparency. Government must also ensure that the public understands the process by which policy is created, services are delivered and decisions are made. Specific ideas that emerged in this thematic area focused largely on performance measurement and accountability:

- Create a “MyGov.gov” customized RSS feed/alert system that reaches across all federal agencies; create a “Citizens Portal”.
- Appoint a transparency ombudsman in each agency, with governmentwide leadership:
 - Require annual agency report cards on their transparency;
 - Develop measures to track progress/extent of transparency and openness being achieved by each agency; and
 - This person should not be in IT, but rather have FOIA, Privacy, Plain Language, and Info Quality Act experience.
- Impose penalties on agencies not following FOIA, or creating excessive delays. One suggestion was to look at India’s approach, where government officials become personally liable and must pay fines if they do not act in a timely fashion.
- Agencies state there are legal issues and policies in place that prohibit them from posting their organization charts. Changing this might help increase transparency.

- Government should communicate a governmentwide strategy for using social media tools to create a more effective and transparent government; agency CTOs should develop their own social media/Web 2.0 communication plans.

Potential Topics for Phase II Discussion:

- What should be the Administration’s policy in regard to transparency? e.g. Start with the presumption that agencies will disclose, not withhold, information.
- What specific actions should be taken to make government data more accessible?
- What specific actions should be taken to make government more open?
- Who should be the leaders for the transparency initiative in the White House and in the agencies? e.g., A transparency and participation ombudsman.
- What enforcement mechanisms or incentives should accompany the transparency initiative? e.g., Individual fines if officials withhold or delay release of information.
- How should progress be measured? e.g., Performance measures, certification standards.
- What resources should be provided? e.g., Dollars, training, etc.
- Are there specific practices or initiatives that should be the initial focus of this effort? e.g., Expanding the functionality of data.gov, creating a one-stop budget website, webcasting open agency meetings, etc.

II. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

General Observations

- Participants who posted ideas in this category were mainly those who knew about the brainstorm in advance and thus, were prepared to respond on very short notice with well-developed materials, and members of the advocacy organizations and networks that operate in the open government policy arena.
- Across the Brainstorm, three overall “nodes” of participants were discernable: Grassroots/Local Civic Participation/Deliberative Democracy; Online Democracy; and Technology. In the MAX forum there were a great many concrete suggestions for improving agency ability to accommodate greater public participation. In general, the ideas clustered around (a) improving agency capacity to use collaborative technology and social media; (b) creating favorable government-wide policies to support participation; and (c) reconsidering some of the legal rules that hamper the use of collaborative and social media technologies. The MAX group was, not surprisingly, focused on augmenting the capacities and competencies of government through use of the technology. Because their clienteles vary by agency and function, the discussion of issues and opportunities was far-ranging.
- Grassroots/Local Civic Participation/Deliberative Democracy
 - This was the largest and most well-prepared group in the Brainstorm: they were early to the table and augmented their ranks as the dialogue proceeded.
 - Comments centered on how to bring together representative groups of citizens to deliberate together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and learning on matters of

- common concern in which, it is hoped, common purpose might bridge the divides that usually make collective action difficult.
- A number of these participants expressed skepticism about the use of voting as a primary means of eliciting opinion in civic participation exercises, viewing it as tending to divide, polarize and create winners and losers. They were much more interested in how to reduce conflict by framing issues in terms of objectives that might be shared, and in helping to foster community feeling.
 - These contributors focused on achieving diversity and effective universal access to process, seeking to claim the legitimacy that flows from the perception of fairness and respect for individual and minority views.
 - These contributors suggested methods of educating the public and equipping ordinary citizens to handle issues of public importance. Several of these groups had had experience in conducting local civic participation exercises. Some were well-known facilitators, e.g., AmericaSpeaks. Some were local government officials (e.g., from King County, WA), and a few were international (from the Netherlands and Canada). Much of this work had a strong theoretical basis in social science.
- Most of the ideas presented by the Deliberative Democracy group do not lend themselves to immediate action; they are, rather, general principles. One set of such principles that met with general approbation was submitted by Sandy Heierbacher, Director of the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation. The proposed Core Principles for Public Engagement are:
 1. *Careful Planning and Preparation*—Through adequate and inclusive planning, ensure that the design, organization, and convening of the process serve both a clearly defined purpose and the needs of the participants.
 2. *Inclusion and Demographic Diversity*—Equitably incorporate diverse people, voices, ideas, and information to lay the groundwork for quality outcomes and democratic legitimacy.
 3. *Collaboration and Shared Purpose*—Support and encourage participants, government and community institutions, and others to work together to advance the common good.
 4. *Openness and Learning*—Help all involved listen to each other, explore new ideas unconstrained by predetermined outcomes, learn and apply information in ways that generate new options, and rigorously evaluate public engagement activities for effectiveness.
 5. *Transparency and Trust*—Be clear and open about the process, and provide a public record of the organizers, sponsors, outcomes, and range of views and ideas expressed.
 6. *Impact and Action*—Ensure each participatory effort has real potential to make a difference, and that participants are aware of that potential.
 7. *Sustained Engagement and Participatory Culture*—Promote a culture of participation with programs and institutions that support ongoing quality public engagement.
 - Online Democracy
 - These were contributors who were interested in exploring the possibilities of substituting electronic voting methods for processes of policy formulation presently used by the legislative and executive branches of government, or augmenting those processes with electronic plebiscites. Although technologies that might enable online surveys of participant opinion are under active development, there were no proposals in the Dialogue for making participation in these surveys sufficiently representative to qualify the results as expressions of the opinions of the whole public. Consideration of adopting

these methods should be reserved until they can be combined with some of the insights and methods of the civic participation/deliberative democracy group. The use of these methods will also have to be harmonized with constitutional requirements and administrative law.

- There were several proposals for using “crowdshaping” for making administrative decisions. Some of the contributors to the MAX forum agree on the usefulness of enlisting the “wisdom of crowds” for eliciting expertise on particular subjects.
- Technology
 - The Brainstorm produced some ideas that might be actionable in the short term. These are:
 - *Web design issues*: Use well-designed *feedback systems* instead of central control to improve web design; Use good collaboration practices in web and other technology design; Make government websites mobile platform-ready.
 - *Data handling issues*: Form a working group on interoperability to adopt Semantic Web 3.0; Use web and technical standards for handling data; Make all agency regulations, guidance, etc., easily searchable down to the internal database level.
 - *Procedural reforms*: Review certification and accreditation IT processes to prevent the blocking of innovation; Create standards for agency webforms through which they communicate with the public.

Additional actionable suggestions from the Brainstorm

Regulatory/rulemaking:

- Make the public comment period 30 days per 750 pages for all documents subject to public review (e.g., Environmental Impact Statements).
- Make the NEPA EIS process “open book.”
- When the public is invited to comment on an agency proposed action, allow the public access to the same logic and data on which the policy itself is based.

Benefits/services administration

- Speed up processing of Social Security disability benefits so disabled people do not lose their homes while waiting to be approved.
- Make the immigration visa process transparent so applicants can track the status of their application.

Administration of Citizen Participation

- In designing all administrative interventions, the potential for collaboration should drive the choice of process, tool, and approach.
- OMB should publish its specification of goals and objectives, and its evaluation criteria, for notice and comment.

From the MAX group: actionable suggestions

- Rather than designing government-specific software, use non-governmental methods already familiar to the public to facilitate public participation, e.g., Wikipedia, Ning. Technology for Interactive Media (Web 2.0) needs to be part of the Federal Standard Network Configuration.
- Engage in targeted crowdsourcing
- Allow government employees to engage in social networking.
- Emulate DoDTechipedia to communicate with supplier communities to level playing field between small and large enterprises
- Address Legal Issues arising out of the applicability of cross-cutting legal requirements to participation and collaboration efforts:
 - Privacy Act
 - Records Management
 - Paperwork Reduction Act
 - Sec.508 of the Rehabilitation Act

A final suggestion

- Note: As the Administrative Conference of the United States has been reauthorized and funded, and is presently being stood up, the legal issues that have arisen in this Dialogue might appropriately be referred to it and to NAPA for a jointly-sponsored collaborative dialogue that would include both management and legal perspectives and that would involve all the interested publics and stakeholders. The question is how to harmonize emerging Open Government policy and practice with constitutional requirements, administrative law, particular statutes, and substantive policy.

Potential Topics for Phase II Discussion:

- How may policy development and rulemaking be made more participatory?
- What specific actions should government take to ensure that access to participation is universal?
- Are there specific practices or initiatives that should be the initial focus of this effort? e.g., improving Regulations.gov.
- Should government adopt a set of principles for participatory governance, and if so, what should these principles be?

III. COLLABORATION

General Observations

- In this category, feedback suggests strongly that participants lacked information or context upon which to construct suggestions. As a result, the most well-informed ideas did not, by and large, present new or innovative perspectives. Many of the top vote-getters were concrete, easily grasped concepts that have little direct relevance to collaboration, for example: Make voting day the same day nationwide and a national holiday; Get rid of private prisons; Rejuvenate public transportation; Community jobs for the unemployed.

- Across the Brainstorm and the MAX Community, two overall themes were discernable: Incentives and Invitation.

Issues for further clarification:

- What do we mean by collaboration? How is collaboration different from participation? A clear definition with examples would help participants better understand what is intended here, and how individuals, nonprofits, community groups, etc. can best engage.
- This is a federal initiative, however, many opportunities for collaboration exist at all levels of government. How can we best engage those with deep experience in and ideas for local government, citizen, and/or NGO collaboration?
- What can we do to give participants more context and clear targets against which to frame their thinking and comments? e.g., Canvass federal agencies for their top 3 to 5 examples of collaboration. Summarize the leading examples, and then frame a participatory dialogue around how best to leverage or improve these starting points. Or, put out a menu of policies and proposals already under consideration and seek input on those.
- Is the Web the best vehicle for inviting public participation in policy-making? If other means are important (and arguably they are to enable all who want to have input) how can this be accomplished? At what level of policy-making can public participation be invited in a way that truly makes a difference?

Themes

Create Incentives for Collaboration

- Change federal budgeting and funding of programs to encourage interagency partnering.
- Create a Local Open Government Commission to develop open government principles, best practices and a seal of approval to encourage state and local governments to become more inclusive.
- Include transparency, participation and collaboration criteria and metrics on performance measurement and scorecard systems. The President's Management Council should oversee the implementation of the directive. All agencies should provide regular public reports on their progress towards implementation.
- Turn federal incentive structure on its ear to create collaborative policies, adopt collaborative processes and utilize collaborative technologies. Collaboration, itself, may need almost as much rewarding as agencies' and programs' individual goals and objectives. (MAX 16.1.1).
- Make community relations—whether with citizens, suppliers, or other groups—a horizontal component of everyone's role rather than a vertical function within public affairs. Collaboration between program managers and their constituents can catalyze innovation.

Invite Collaboration

- Invite nonprofits and community groups to collaborate via a website sorted by goal and objective—a survey of one Chicago neighborhood found 400 community groups, 75% of which were willing to do more in the community, even beyond their stated purpose, but no one had asked.

- For target areas (e.g., disconnected youth, livable communities, regional planning, etc.), each agency with relevant funding programs should be required to join others with relevant funding to streamline regulations, support unified public participation frameworks, and promote progress toward a shared set of outcomes.
- Require Federal Executive Boards to submit a plan within 180 days for how they will advance the goals of the Open Government Directive through collaborative regional projects.
- Invest in community organizers.
- Share information among programs with similar goals and provide enough information for them to decide if there are opportunities for them to work together.

From the MAX group

- A recurring theme in the MAX Community was the desire for a governmentwide, Web-based collaborative space on the model of the Intelligence agencies' Intelink. Those with access to this community were uniformly enthusiastic about it, especially about the extent to which training is provided those who qualify for its use. The enthusiasm of this discussion intimates there is real potential in this idea. (Max 6.2)
- MAX surfaced other useful touchpoints, such as:
 - The need for a potential “collaborator” level of authentication for participation in government networks.
 - The need for a data classification scheme that can be applied agency-wide (no more FOUO and SBU but one new category).
 - The need to reform FISMA, specifically, the guidance on identity and creating accounts.

Potential Topics for Phase II Discussion:

- How can government agencies foster more collaboration:
 - Within agencies?
 - Among agencies?
 - Between levels of government?
 - With non-governmental organizations and the public?
- What are appropriate performance measures for collaboration? How should agency performance against collaboration goals be incented and measured?
- Are there specific practices or initiatives that should be the initial focus of this effort? e.g., Provide governmentwide access to existing collaborative communities.
- How can government best support collaboration efforts from a technology perspective? e.g. Provide access to a suite of collaboration tools/platforms, revise existing policies to enable broader collaboration.

IV. CAPACITY BUILDING, LEGAL AND POLICY CHALLENGES

General Observations:

- Similar to other civic engagement efforts by the White House, the Brainstorm saw many comments from those in favor of legalizing Marijuana and/or “ending the war on drugs”.

- Other comments that may be loosely categorized as “legal and policy”, but were clearly off-topic as it relates to this Brainstorm, pertained to issues such as the use of torture/waterboarding, ending the electoral college, and reforming the banking industry.
- Specific recommendations were also made about improving the communications around the Open Government Brainstorm: To get the full benefit of citizens' experiences, wisdom and ingenuity, Open Government Dialogue should be repeated—next time with plenty of public notice and a generous response time—at least as much as provided under standard rulemaking.

Themes

Legal and Policy

- Redefine FOIA rules to include documents produced by contractors for the government (uncertain about the current policy on this).
- Directives and legislation providing protection for whistleblowers who disclose waste, fraud, or abuse within an agency, and punitive processes for managers who retaliate against those whistleblowers in their performance reviews should be established. The president should also work with Congress to enact comprehensive federal whistleblower reform that extends meaningful protections to law enforcement and intelligence agency whistleblowers.
- Revise the U.S. Code and Administrative Procedure Act to empower agencies to make greater use of collaborative governance, including dialogue, deliberation, and deliberative democracy, and also to collaborate with all levels of governance (federal, state, regional, and local), private, and nonprofit sectors.

Hiring and Recruitment

- Several comments pertaining to USA Jobs and the need to: 1) be able to track paperwork once submitted; and 2) find a way to cull out real job opportunities versus positions that have to be posted despite already having an internal candidate in mind.
- Several comments pertaining to leveraging people in the State Department for foreign language needs within government.

Performance Appraisals

- Implement 360 degree performance appraisals.
- Create a new set of core competencies for executives based on the new skills needed for transparent, participatory and collaborative government.
- Create a recognition program to promote openness and transparency in government.

Training and Development

- Create simple knowledge sharing/collaboration tools for government employees
- Promote web 2.0 literacy in government

Communications

- Open Government initiatives must include efforts to educate the public about the use of collaborative technologies. When large segments of the population don't participate in an effort, the results may not reflect the views of the population.
- The language used is also seen to be very important. One commenter wrote: Rhetoric of "public work" will be much more powerful and resonant than language about "transparency, participation, and collaboration." The OPE has promised to "allow ordinary Americans to offer their stories and ideas regarding issues that concern them and share their views on important topics such as health care, energy and education." But skepticism was expressed around the notion that people are motivated to discuss issues—or are adequately informed about issues—if their only opportunity is to "offer stories" and "share views." Work is motivating and educational. It can draw a broad cross-section of Americans, whereas only specialists usually want to provide opinions and ideas.

Strategic Planning

- Every agency should plan and budget for integrating public participation and collaborative processes into their programmatic work. Link program/agency budgets to open government objectives.
- Use the President's Management Council as the key oversight body for the transparency initiative.
- Appropriately resource FOIA and e-gov programs so they can implement the transparency/openness recommendations.

Other

- Tie grant money to open government standards.
- Build on the success of existing federal information exchanges to improve data sharing. e.g. EPA's CDX (Central data exchange)

Potential Topics for Phase II Discussion:

- How can current FOIA rules be strengthened and improved to ensure access to information and promote transparency in government?
- What specific actions can be taken to encourage and protect "Whistle-blowers" who disclose waste, fraud and abuse?
- How should we best deal with existing regulatory and policy frameworks to empower agencies to make greater use of collaborative governance tools and to collaborate with all levels of government (federal, state, regional, and local), private, and nonprofit sectors). e.g. Revise the U.S. Code and Administrative Procedure Act? Re-fund ACUS (the Administrative Conference of the United States, a government advisory body that deals with regulatory issues) to help sort things out?

TRAFFIC AND PARTICIPATION

Information about traffic to and participation in the brainstorming site provides critical context for the observations above.

The platform, along with Google Analytics software allowed two general types of information to be captured: traffic metrics and participation metrics. Traffic metrics generally measure the amount of overall activity on the site, including the total number of unique visitors, page views, time spent on the site, and geographic origin of visits. Participation metrics measure active involvement in the Dialogue, including the total number of registered users, posted ideas and comments, votes, and tags. Participation metrics also include facts about site moderation, including the extent to which inappropriate content was removed from the site in accordance with the stated moderation policy.

Traffic Metrics

During the course of the seven days the National Academy actively monitored the site, May 21st through May 28th, the site produced the following traffic:

- 30,222 visits from 20,830 unique visitors.
- Each visitor spent an average of five minutes and 31 seconds on the site.
- Forty percent of the visits came directly to the site's web address, <http://opengov.ideascale.com> while 17% linked to the site through whitehouse.gov.
- There were 113,648 page views, with the average visitor looking at between 3 and 4 pages.
- There were at least ten visits from every U.S. state and territory, as well as visits from 123 foreign countries and territories. (Germany was second to the United States with 1,023 visits followed by Canada with 603).

Site Participation

While traffic metrics are important in quantifying the reach of the Open Government Dialogue, metrics relating specifically to participation help convey the extent to which visitors were compelled to take part in the Dialogue.

Over the course of a week, the Brainstorm generated:

- 4,000 registered users (about nineteen percent of unique visitors).
- 1,129 unique ideas, which prompted 2,176 comments and 46,469 votes.

The site's nineteen percent "conversion rate"—the rate of unique visitors that ultimately created a user account so they could participate in the Brainstorm—shows that nearly one in five visitors wanted to engage in this conversation. The site also reached a ratio of total votes (both in favor and opposition) to ideas of over 41:1, implying that users used the voting mechanism as a way to provide feedback on ideas.



APPENDIX:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS

John Kamensky—Senior Fellow, IBM Center for the Business of Government. Associate Partner, IBM Global Business Services; Former Deputy Director, National Partnership for Reinventing Government; former special assistant to Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget; Assistant Director, U.S. Government Accountability Office; Staff, Texas Constitutional Convention; Staff, Texas House of Representatives.

Anne Laurent—Content Editor, Federal Thought Leadership Program, CGI. Former consultant, Special Projects, Atlantic Media; Blog Founder, *The Agile Mind: Explorations in Virtual Government* <<http://theagilemind.blogspot.com>>. Former positions with *Government Executive* magazine: Executive Editor; Deputy Editor; Program Manager, Government Performance Project; Senior Correspondent. Former positions with *Federal Times* newspaper: Senior Editor; Associate Editor; Pentagon Correspondent; Congressional Correspondent; columnist.

Sallyanne Payton—William W. Cook Professor of Law, University of Michigan School of Law, Professor of Art and Design, University of Michigan, Chief Counsel, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. Staff Assistant to the President of the United States, Domestic Council, The White House. Attorney, Covington & Burling. Chair, Administrative Law Section, Association of American Law Schools. Public Member and Senior Fellow, Administrative Conference of the United States. Consultant, President's Commission on National Health Care Reform.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The National Academy of Public Administration is a non-profit, independent coalition of top public management and organizational leaders who tackle the nation's most critical and complex challenges. With a network of more than 600 distinguished Fellows and an experienced professional staff, the Academy is uniquely qualified and trusted across government to provide objective advice and practical solutions based on systematic research and expert analysis. Established in 1967 and chartered by Congress, the National Academy continues to make a positive impact by helping federal, state and local governments respond effectively to current circumstances and changing conditions.

For over a year, the National Academy has hosted the Collaboration Project, an independent forum of leaders who share a commitment to the adoption and use of collaborative technologies to solve complex problems of management. Started in 2008, the Collaboration Project drives the integration of Web 2.0 tools into government management by building a community of practice, producing and sharing knowledge and research, and aiding agencies and departments in assessing and implementing collaborative tools.