



Frontiers of Innovation
Celebrating 20 Years of Innovation in Government

ABSTRACTS:
PRESENTATIONS AND PANELS

Charter Agencies, State of Iowa: 2005 Innovations in American Government Award Winner

The Honorable Thomas J. Vilsack, Former Governor of Iowa

(This award occurred as a result of Governor Vilsack's leadership)

Can bureaucratic culture change? Can concrete outcomes prevail over administrative rules in the everyday work of governmental agencies? Can better results be achieved for citizens at a lower cost for government? These are the challenges that all governmental agencies face. Since 2003, the Department of Management of the State of Iowa has been experimenting with the Charter Agency Program, a unique model aimed at improving government. The main goal is for government agencies to enhance their efficiency in exchange for flexibility and authority.

Six governmental agencies (the Departments of Corrections, Human Services, Natural Resources, and Revenue; the Alcoholic Beverage Division of the Department of Commerce; and the Iowa Veterans Home) have volunteered to become “Charter Agencies.” In exchange for their commitment to produce measurable benefits and to help save money—either by reducing expenditure or by increasing revenues—these agencies have received greater authority and flexibility. For example, the director of a Charter Agency can “stand in the shoes” of the directors at the Department of Administrative Services, which allocates general services, personnel, and information technology to the state agencies.

Charter Agencies are also exempt from statutory across-the-board budget cuts and can retain proceeds from asset sales and 80 percent of the revenues they generate, as well as half of their year-end general fund balances. They are exempt from several bureaucratic procedures such as full-time-equivalent employee caps and approval of the Executive Council for out-of-state travel, conference attendance, and professional membership. They also have access to a \$3 million Charter Agency grant fund to foster innovation. Since their creation, and thanks to their high degree of flexibility, Charter Agencies have already produced a myriad of concrete results that have improved the life of the citizens of Iowa. Among some of the most notable results are: improved rates of income tax returns filed electronically; reduced rate of failure of probationers; increased work opportunities for prisoners; and increased number of veterans served at the Iowa Veterans Home. Charter Agencies have successfully reached their target of producing \$15 million in expenditure savings or additional revenues.

The Charter Agency Program is one element of “Reinvention Partnership,” a larger effort undertaken by the Iowa state government. The program is innovative compared to

previous initiatives in two major ways. First, the Charter Agencies' expanded authority is the result of a grant by the legislature and, second, these agencies commit to delivering improved results in exchange for increased authority and flexibility. The Charter Agency model is broadly replicable across all levels of government and the Department of Management of Iowa has received many inquiries about the model.

Contact Information for Charter Agencies at the Iowa State Government:
Ms. Teresa Hay McMahon, Teresa.mcmahon@iowa.gov

The Honorable Thomas J. Vilsack served as the Governor of Iowa from 1998 to 2006, and was the first Democrat elected to the position in 32 years. As Governor, Mr. Vilsack focused on improving education, particularly in early childhood; expanding health care to the uninsured; making the state a national leader in renewable energy; and creating a nationally recognized, efficient, and accountable state government. During two terms as Governor, Mr. Vilsack established relationships among all levels of local, state, and federal government, and worked closely with Iowa-based and national companies involved in Iowa commerce. Mr. Vilsack kept his commitment to serve only two terms as Governor, and ran as a candidate for the US Presidency until announcing his withdrawal from the race in February 2007. In addition to his distinguished public service career, including service as an Iowa State Senator and Mayor of Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, Mr. Vilsack is a highly regarded litigator. He has more than 25 years of trial experience handling complex litigation and class actions with statewide and national implications. Mr. Vilsack is a Distinguished Fellow at Iowa State University Biosafety Institute, and he is currently of counsel in the Dorsey Trial group. His practice focuses on strategic counseling and advising clients in the fields of energy conservation, renewable energy, and agribusiness development.

Innovations in Governance: Ethics and Accountability in the Public Sector

Setting the Context

Professor Kenneth Winston, Harvard Kennedy School
kenneth_winston@harvard.edu

It is often said that public office is a public trust. Yet we know that corruption is a pervasive problem in many countries, and sometimes so deeply entrenched that it defines the whole character of public life. That makes the safeguarding of public values often a precarious undertaking, and one that requires constant vigilance.

This panel is about forms of vigilance, the never-ending work of enabling the promise of good governance to be realized. Preserving public values is like tending a garden: it requires constant attention—planting, cultivating, nurturing, weeding, and so on. The challenge is to bring natural forces under control and have them serve human ends. Hence, the importance of studying promising innovations. Why did things go wrong in the past? What has worked for others? Can we find models to replicate and transport to other places? Finding answers to these questions is crucial to enhancing the moral competence of public leaders.

The most common understanding of corruption is that it is the misuse of public power for personal gain. Typically, this involves violation of the duties of public office. The personal gain may be private (e.g., self-enrichment) or professional (e.g., trading official acts for campaign contributions). Violation of official duties can also occur for allegedly altruistic reasons, as when a police officer lies in court in order to convict a “bad guy.”

A somewhat broader understanding is that corruption is the misuse of public power at public expense. This is broader because it recognizes the variety of ways in which groups, not just individuals, can undermine public values. These groups include any collective body with a strong influence on public decision making, which acts to favor its own interests over the common good. Corporations, voluntary associations, as well as government agencies may take on such behavior.

Among the promising innovations that have captured attention in recent years are various forms of transparency. “Transparency” has become something of a buzzword and a cliché, so we need to be careful. We should not assume we necessarily understand what it

means in specific contexts or what its connection is to accountability and the promotion of public value.

Mechanisms of transparency facilitate the public release or disclosure of information, usually with the aim of improving the quality of decision making. But, whether the availability of information in a specific case makes a practical difference depends, in part, on whether it reaches the right parties and whether those parties are able to mobilize to act on the information obtained. The U.S. Congress has various disclosure requirements, and as a result, much information is available. That doesn't mean the information reaches parties that are able to take effective action against the misuse of power.

Transparency works by exposure, and can shame individuals into good behavior. But, what is the basis of this shame? What value or ideal is at stake? Here there are two common arguments about corruption that we should consider: it is an impediment to economic growth, and it is an impediment to democracy. It would be comforting if we knew that either of these propositions was uniformly true. Unfortunately, neither claim is entirely persuasive. Some countries have impressive rates of economic growth even with widespread corruption, and some democratic countries are no less corrupt than some autocracies (just as some autocracies are much less corrupt than some democracies).

Perhaps a third idea, independent of the other two, should be considered: corruption undermines the aspiration to create an orderly, fair, and decent society. This has to do with the quality of relationships among citizens, rather than more direct economic or political goals.

Transparency is also of interest because it illustrates the maxim that institutions can be better than people. Or, perhaps we should say: when people operate within certain institutions, their better nature is nurtured. Institutions vary in the degree to which they rely on personal integrity and a sense of professionalism. When exposure is the mechanism, for example, integrity is less important. What is crucial is facilitating ways of monitoring other people's conduct. Thus, creating a system of checks—and sometimes balances—involves not transforming human beings but redesigning the environment within which they operate. The idea is that, since corruption typically depends on secrecy, if people are in a position to review each other's work, it is more likely people will promote public values. And, that is what we are trying to achieve.

The three panelists address this set of issues in different ways and at different levels of specificity.

Stephanie Hirsch is director of SomerStat, for Somerville, Massachusetts. SomerStat is a system of accountability that aims to make city government more responsive to people's concerns, by maintaining high standards of service while controlling costs. I should note that SomerStat is based on CitiStat, an Ash Institute award winner in 2004. CitiStat, in turn, was

based on CompStat, also an award winner, in 1996. It is of interest not just in itself but also because of this replication.

Aruna Roy is one of the cofounders of MKSS in India, which translates roughly as “Organization for the Empowerment of Workers and Peasants.” In the work of MKSS, transparency and accountability are components of more ambitious efforts at democratic development and the empowerment of rural people. Combating corruption is an integral component of constructing an alternative model of grassroots democracy. With MKSS, the release of information is often followed by confrontation, because of the divergence between official accounts and the local population’s knowledge. This is not just a matter of collective verification but of asserting political power. Sometimes, indeed, confrontation is necessary to get the information in the first place. For example, documents will not be released unless there is a sit-in protest. Thus, MKSS’ efforts at achieving transparency and accountability often involve an escalation of tactics.

Frederick Sumaye is a former prime minister of Tanzania, and will talk about a different kind of escalation. When institutional reform isn’t effective by itself in addressing the problem of corruption, perhaps because corruption is too deeply entrenched, then more drastic actions may be necessary. Fred Sumaye’s story is an example of such drastic action, involving dismissal of a democratically elected, but corrupt, city council. Although only a one-time event, there were many requests at the time for replication in other cities and towns in Tanzania. And, in this context, we could think about the current situation in Bangladesh, where two democratically elected but deeply corrupt political parties were displaced, at least for a time, by a technocratic government backed by the military.

Kenneth Winston is a Lecturer in Ethics at the Harvard Kennedy School, teaching practical and professional ethics. He created the Kennedy School's course on ethics for Mid-Career students, which has been offered since 1986. In recent years, he has helped to build the school's capacity in comparative and international ethics, developing new cases and teaching in overseas venues, especially in Asia. As of January 1, 2008, he is Faculty Chair of the Kennedy School's Singapore Program. Dr. Winston has written extensively on case teaching, professional ethics, and legal theory. He holds degrees in Philosophy from Harvard College and Columbia University. He has been a Fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies, a senior research fellow of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and a John Dewey Senior Fellow.

Ethics and Accountability in the Public Sector

The Next Step for Stat Programs: Using Real-Time Data for Municipal Management

Stephanie Hirsch
shirsch@somervillema.gov

Somerville, Massachusetts, has built on the successful “Stat” management model and is pioneering a method of city management that relies on real-time data to manage all aspects of operations. Each initiative, SomerStat program, 311 call center, resident notification system, resident feedback forums, and the activity-based budget allow the city to use data to rationalize operations, and to help improve service delivery and to implement innovation in even the tightest of fiscal times. Somerville has borrowed from the best innovators in the municipal and private sectors to implement a model of municipal management that uses real-time data analysis for virtually all policy and operational decisions.

SomerStat is based on Baltimore’s (Maryland) successful and much-replicated CitiStat model. SomerStat holds weekly, biweekly, and monthly Stat meetings with 15 City departments. Like Baltimore, SomerStat launched a 311 call center. However, SomerStat also borrows from private sector models of real-time data management. By drawing from best practices in both sectors, and by taking advantage of the flexibility that the city’s relatively small population (77,000) allows, Somerville has been able to intensify its reliance on data for decision making.

Somerville uses data in the following, integrated ways:

Real-Time Data Mining: Since the inception of SomerStat, the Mayor's Office has mandated that all data used in the city be centrally accessible in the SomerStat Office. These include more than 50 data sources, including enterprise-wide systems, stand-alone tracking systems, and mainframe legacy systems. The SomerStat staff use these data to drill down and to investigate specific operational and policy issues, and to link data across departments.

311 Center: The 24-hour 311 call center captures all resident questions and work requests by phone or online. These are fed into daily staff meetings, and weekly or monthly SomerStat meetings.

Resident Notification System: 311 has allowed residents to easily contact the City and real-time data monitoring allows the City to know very quickly if something has gone wrong somewhere in Somerville. The City has also implemented a phone and e-mail notification system that, within minutes, communicates back to residents when something happens that affects them.

Resident Feedback Forums or “ResiStat” Groups: SomerStat runs bimonthly meetings for 18 neighborhood and special sub-populations groups, including non-native English speakers, young adults, and parents. At the meetings, groups share SomerStat data and solicit problem-solving ideas.

Activity-Based Budget: Somerville is in its third year of managing the budget on an activity basis. Budgeted and actual City spending get allocated to functional areas of departments and then to outputs and performance metrics of those functional areas. This exercise allows the City to look at the net cost implication of all decisions and to share this with the public.

Because of the increasing automation of transactions in all sectors, stores of administrative data, if regularly studied, provide insight into any organization's operations. Relatively few businesses or governmental entities, though, use all of the data available to make decisions. By consolidating data into a central data warehouse, developing systems to solicit additional data, and analyzing and discussing data continuously with all stakeholders, Somerville has pioneered the use of real-time data for daily decision making.

Stephanie Hirsch came to Somerville, Massachusetts, from the Boston Police Department (BPD), where she supported command staff with analysis of operations and crime data. Prior to work at the BPD, Ms. Hirsch worked with the University of Chicago and the City of New York to use administrative data to develop performance-based contracts and monitoring tools for child welfare providers. Hirsch has a master's in Business Administration from Harvard Business School, and a bachelor's degree from Swarthmore College.

Ethics and Accountability in the Public Sector

The Role of Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS)

Aruna Roy
arunaroy@gmail.com

What was the problem?

The Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS) is a peasant and workers non-party people's organization, which empowers people to access their democratic and civil rights. It is based in Rajsamand District, Rajasthan, in northwestern India. The MKSS also works on a number of laborer and farmer issues, and addresses problems arising from the lack of access to basic services and the poor delivery of government programs at the village level. This lack of

access to schooling, wages, livelihood, work, medicine, and a host of other facilities affect—for people living on the margins—the basic right to life itself.

What was the innovation?

The people asked to see records maintained in the offices relating to expenditure of their village council on payment of wages, infrastructure, and services. When denied these rights, the MKSS accessed some records and disclosed the details to a concerned group of villagers in December, 1994. When the information was revealed, chaos broke out, as people were appalled at the fabrication of facts and demanded accountability. This gave birth to a process of public audit where records were read out in front of thousands of villagers, who testified about the veracity of these documents. This process, called a “Public Hearing,” later evolved into a systemic tool officially called a “Social Audit,” now a part of the formal monitoring system. This process established the facts, and a prima-facie case was presented to government for further action.

Simultaneously, resistance from officials to parting with records led to a well articulated demand for comprehensive legislation toward transparency and accountability. This demand became a nationwide campaign—the National Campaign for People’s Right to Information—to legislate a Right to Information Act, proscribing transparency and accountability as a democratic right under Article 19-1-A of the Indian Constitution. This demand, raised in 1994, was met, and resulted in the Indian Parliament passing the Right to Information Act in May 2005.

What were the obstacles?

The beginnings of this movement have grown into a broad based campaign with multiple challenges. Because of limited time, we will concentrate only on the social audit process and its challenges. Some of them were:

- a) Recognizing and legitimizing the process of public audit.
- b) Institutionalizing the informal platform of public hearings into the formal structure of the public social audit.
- c) Creating conditions necessary for the people on the margins to speak out without fear.
- d) Ensuring participation by all sectors of society.
- e) Establishing standards, procedures, and necessary action in the formal structure.
- f) And, extending the process to other areas.

What were the results?

This was a process, which organically sought to evolve systems and methods to ensure transparency and accountability, through people’s participation and public vigilance. The

other aim was to address entrenched corrupt practices and break the nexus between the bureaucracy, the elected representatives, and vested interests in society. Two major breakthroughs have been the enactment of the Right to Information Act (2005) and the social audit as a statutory requirement under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (2005). The implementation of both acts is now a continuing challenge, where the use of social audit continues to play a major role in monitoring the implementation of the acts.

Aruna Roy is a social and political activist. She was born in Chennai in 1946, and worked in the Indian Administrative Service from 1968 to 1975. She resigned in order to devote her time to social work and social reform. She joined the Social Work and Research Center in Tilonia, Rajasthan, where she worked until 1983. Her husband Sanjit 'Bunker' Roy had set up this organization. In 1987, Ms. Roy moved to Devdungri, Rajsamand District, Rajasthan, and worked with Shanker Singh, Nikhil Dey, and many others to form the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan, a grassroots peoples' organization devoted to participatory democratic struggle. Aruna Roy is also one of the founders of the movement for the Right to Information (RTI) in India, which has been credited with getting Right to Information laws passed in several States, including the Rajasthan Right to Information Act passed in the year 2000. The RTI movement and campaign also played a crucial role in the passage of strong national legislation for the Right to Information in the year 2005.

Ethics and Accountability in the Public Sector

Drastic Measures to Eliminate Corruption

Frederick Sumaye, Former Prime Minister of Tanzania
fredsumaye@yahoo.com

What was the problem?

Dar es Salaam had a city council that was not performing, not collecting revenues, and riddled with corruption. City Councilors routinely fought over what would bring in money. All the while, no one was collecting garbage, the roads were a mess, and the whole city was stinking with filth. Even though citizens wanted change, corruption prevented the fair turnover of officials via elections. Finally, since Dar es Salaam is a large economic and transportation inlet, tourists and business people who arrived in the airport or through the harbor had a very negative impression of the city.

What was the innovation?

After seeing that all other avenues had completely failed, Prime Minister Fred Sumaye gave the Council an ultimatum to change or else the federal government would dissolve the City Council. The City Council failed to comply, and things continued to deteriorate. Prime Minister Sumaye went to the President and explained the situation. In agreement, the President told Sumaye to write a cabinet paper expressing the general consensus that the government would take stern measures. The paper deliberately did not specify timetables in order to avoid administrative challenges. During the 2006–2007 budget speech, the Prime Minister announced dissolution of the City Council, and in its place, established a City Commission under an Executive Chairman. The Executive Chairman, who was appointed by government, had a mandate to run the affairs of the city to rectify the problems, end the corruption, and bring order to city responsibilities. The very moment that the Commission was announced, it came into being.

What were the obstacles?

- a) Although the government followed all the rules of procedure as laid down by the law, some people argued that the City Council was a democratically elected body, and the Prime Minister should not be able to dissolve it.
- b) There was also resistance from the ruling party, Prime Minister Sumaye's own party, because a majority of the city's representatives to the party were former members of the City Council, and there was a worry that the party's strong support would be diminished. In fact, the President actually requested Sumaye not to continue because of pressures received from party regional leaders. However, Sumaye told him that they could not turn back. He added that he would resign if this measure did not work.
- c) There was resistance from some members of Parliament: former City Councilors, and naturally, people who benefited from corruption.
- d) There was lack of continuity from earlier to subsequent administrators, as the Commission was given two years to clean up the city before power would be handed back to the elected body.

What were the results?

Before the City Council was dissolved, it was collecting between 800–900 million shillings per year. After these measures, the Commission collected more than 8 billion shillings, a ten-fold increase. Roads were built and the city was cleaned. It had transformed so much that the Executive Chairman and the city received a cleaner-city award from the UN-Habitat. Finally, schools were built, hospitals repaired, and the general public was pleased with the change. Even tourists noticed the difference.

Frederick Sumaye was the Prime Minister of Tanzania from 1995 to 2005, making him the longest serving leader in the East African nation's history. He obtained a Diploma in Agricultural Engineering from Egerton College in Kenya and went on to head the rural energy department at Centre for Agricultural Mechanisation and Rural Technology (CARMATEC) in Arusha, Tanzania. From 1987–1995, he served as the Minister for Agriculture of Tanzania. The former Prime Minister received his master's degree from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University in 2007.

BRAC: Building Resources Across Communities

The Coproduction of Governance: Civil Society, the Government, and the Private Sector

Fazle Hasan Abed
fatema.ak@brac.net

Mr. Abed will reflect on his own experiences and his own learning over the past 36 years with regard to setting up and running BRAC. His main thesis will be that in a country like Bangladesh, it is possible to make a significant positive change in the lives of the poor and other marginalized people, including women. In fact, “it is possible to bring hope back!” He will recollect how he decided to move to the uncharted territory of “development” and to leave his secure career in a multinational oil company.

BRAC started as a small relief and rehabilitation effort in a remote rural district of Bangladesh after the liberation of the country. Early on, it became clear that relief was not the way to make a sustainable improvement in poor people’s lives, and BRAC started experimenting with “development.” Different projects on health, education, and economic development were piloted. Some were successful while others were not.

Mr. Abed will explore a major question that BRAC faced with regard to successful programs and agencies: how should they be dealt with? The traditional wisdom was that the government would replicate them, but given the situation prevailing at that time, it was not going to happen.

Mr. Abed will discuss the example of an early successful program. The year 1979 was named the “International Year of the Child,” and BRAC knew from its work that high infant mortality and fertility were major problems facing the country. BRAC also knew that people would not lower the number of children born to their families until they were sure that their children would survive to complete a desired family size. Diarrhea was one of the most prevalent causes of childhood death. BRAC decided to make the importance of oral rehydration known to the mothers. With a successful pilot, BRAC started teaching mothers about this in every household throughout the country. This was the first time that BRAC took one of its programs nationwide. This gave BRAC the experience of how to organize and plan for upscaling programs. After this, BRAC undertook nationwide programs in many areas, including health, education, and microfinance.

Mr. Abed will demonstrate that BRAC’s strategy is to first test the effectiveness of an idea through pilots, then to examine their efficiency before scaling up. BRAC is now the

largest NGO in the South, but it has not remained restricted to working within Bangladesh alone. Its programs are now found in diverse settings such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Tanzania, and Southern Sudan.

One of BRAC's distinguishing features is its belief, and consequent investment in capacity development. To this end, BRAC has set up a university. It has graduate schools in public health, development studies, and governance studies. BRAC University works with many universities in the North, including Harvard, to improve its curriculum in terms of both the science and art. BRAC also works very closely with national governments to improve governance of the public sector. In fact, BRAC works with the government in implementing many of its programs. These include a focused effort on immunization, and the two serious problems of tuberculosis and malaria. BRAC believes in synergy, and thus works in partnership with other stakeholders, including the government, the private sector, and donors. BRAC trains government bureaucrats and doctors through short certificate courses and long-term master's programs. Dr. Gowher Rizvi helped BRAC design a master's degree program for the government civil servants. Finally, Mr. Abed will conclude by highlighting another of BRAC's key distinguishing features—the fact that it finances its development programs. Of the (USD)\$430 million annual budget in 2007, BRAC generated 70% of it from its own enterprises within the country.

Fazle Hasan Abed was born in Bangladesh in 1936. Abed was educated in Dhaka and Glasgow Universities and qualified as a Chartered Accountant in London. The 1971 Liberation War of Bangladesh had a profound effect on Abed, then in his thirties and holding a senior Corporate Executive position at Shell Oil. The war dramatically changed the direction of his life: he left his job and went to London to devote himself to Bangladesh's War of Independence. There, Abed helped initiate the "Help Bangladesh" campaign, organizing funds to raise awareness about Bangladesh. After the war, Abed returned to the newly independent Bangladesh to find the economy of his country in ruins. Millions of refugees, who had sought shelter in India during the war, started trekking back into the country. The tremendous need for humanitarian relief called for urgent efforts. Abed decided to take action by setting up BRAC (formerly, the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee), dedicated to the rehabilitation of returning refugees in a remote area in northeastern Bangladesh. This work led him and BRAC to deal with the long-term task of improving living conditions of the rural poor. He focused his organization's efforts on helping the poor develop their capacity to manage and control their own destiny. Thus, BRAC's primary objectives emerged as alleviation of poverty and empowerment of the poor. In the span of only three decades, BRAC grew to become the largest non-governmental development organization in the world, in terms of its scale and the diversity of its interventions. Abed has been recognized with a number of awards, including the Ramon

Magsaysay Prize, the UNICEF Maurice Pate Award, the Olof Palme Prize, Schwab Foundation's Social Entrepreneurship Award, UNDP's Mahbub-ul-Haq Award, the Henry R. Kravis Prize in Leadership, and the first Clinton Global Citizenship Award. He is also a founding member of Ashoka's Global Academy for Social Entrepreneurship, and has received several honorary degrees, including Doctor of Humane Letters from Yale University.

Innovations in Participation: Citizen Engagement in Deliberative Democracy

Setting the Context

Professor Archon Fung, Harvard Kennedy School
archon_fung@harvard.edu

Since the 19th century, the dominant model of a just and effective state has been that of a representative government populated by professional politicians and civil servants. This is an ideal of government that is *by the people* in the sense that representatives must stand for popular election, and *for the people*, when as public servants, they devise and implement laws and policies that advance the public interest. However, it is not yet government *of the people* in the sense that in this image, the political role of most individuals, most of the time, is relegated to the occasional and minimal role of voting for representatives.

Several trends, however, have conspired to cause public sector and civil society innovators to rethink this division between government and citizens, and to find ways to thicken the engagement of citizens in reflecting upon public problems and policies, in making collective decisions, and in carrying out various kinds of public action.

The first of these trends is the growing social gap between citizens on one hand, and politicians, political parties, and government, on the other. Without speculating on the causes of this gap, its manifestations include declining citizen trust in government agencies, declining party membership in many countries, low rates of voting turnout in many countries, and the sense of powerlessness and alienation of citizens with respect to their “democratic” governments. A second trend is the evident incapacity of government, relying only upon its own resources and authority, to accomplish many public objectives such as elementary education, public safety, environmental stewardship, and economic development. Third, a large number of new initiatives, a few of them very well known, such as the Participatory Budgeting program of the Workers Party in Porto Alegre, Brazil. But, many more obscure initiatives have demonstrated the possibility and power of citizen engagement, participation, and even deliberation.

The potential of innovations that increase the quantity and depth of citizen participation hold out enormous promise to enhance and harness what some have called the “wisdom of the crowds.” When citizens engage in deliberation with one another, and with public officials, about thorny social problems and public priorities, they transform ill-

informed and sometimes contradictory gut reactions into better informed judgements (in the language of Daniel Yankelovich). In situations where the law and policy making process have been captured by some set of powerful interests, perhaps politicians themselves, organized citizens can demand accountability and justice. Where state capacities are insufficient to serve the public interest, the energies, resources, and ingenuity of citizens can augment and amplify.

However, efforts to enhance and deepen citizen participation face many perils. Nonprofessional, part-time citizens may be unable to grasp the complexities of many social problems. When government opens avenues of engagement, those who utilize these opportunities may be a select and unrepresentative group; those who are educated, highly interested, assertive, and members of dominant groups may be more inclined to participate than the least advantaged. When participation is associated with profitable stakes, citizens may assert their own narrow interests rather than taking broader and more other-regarding perspectives. Professional politicians and public managers frequently resist sharing power and authority in citizen participation initiatives.

This panel explores three particularly ambitious, and by many measures, successful innovations that engage citizens in the business of government. In one initiative, the US city of Minneapolis, Minnesota, devolved control of \$400 million over 20 years to neighborhood associations throughout the city. An initiative in Durban, South Africa, engaged informal sector vendors and workers in the redesign, revitalization, and management of a central city transit district. Finally, an effort from the United Kingdom sought to enlarge the opportunities for empowered citizen participation across a variety of government departments and community institutions.

Archon Fung is Professor of Public Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School. His research examines the impacts of civic participation, public deliberation, and transparency upon public and private governance. His book, *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*, examines two participatory-democratic reform efforts in low-income Chicago, Illinois, neighborhoods. Current projects also examine initiatives in ecosystem management, toxics reduction, endangered species protection, local governance, and international labor standards. Dr. Fung's recent books and edited collections include *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*; *Can We Put an End to Sweatshops?*; *Working Capital: The Power of Labor's Pensions*; and, *Beyond Backyard Environmentalism*. His articles on regulation, rights, and participation appear in *Political Theory*; *Journal of Political Philosophy*; *Politics and Society*; *Governance*; *Environmental Management*; *American Behavioral Scientist*; and, the *Boston Review*. Dr. Fung received two bachelor's degrees in Science and a doctorate from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Citizen Engagement in Deliberative Democracy
Incorporating the Informal Sector into Urban Planning

Richard Dobson
dobsonrt@telkomsa.net

What was the problem?

The context was a blighted South African inner city district, Warwick Junction, Durban. Apartheid and its legacy had left the area and commuting citizens without a quality and responsive urban environment. Urban management had not been prioritized, resulting in an underserved and decaying municipal infrastructure. Warwick Junction was at the heart of the metropolitan rail, taxi, and bus transport systems, with more than 450,000 commuters, and was an ideal location for informal street vendors whose businesses thrived on the high numbers of pedestrians.

What was the innovation?

The innovation, the Warwick Junction Urban Renewal Project, could best be described as “the communalization of the project” that used four process approaches.

1. **Collective learning:** the Project was based on the premise that the informal economy is an economic asset. Its goal was to create an urban infrastructure that supported this economy. In reality, neither the beneficiary community nor the project team had experience in this activity. As a result, all parties became very dependent on one another for research and design. This approach was a complete turnaround from the apartheid logic.
2. **Consultation:** the Project transcended culture, gender, language, and urban illiteracy to create a viable strategy for consultation that matured into a connectedness that secured the transfer of information and understanding to all partners.
3. **A Developmental Attitude:** it became apparent to local government that it had to respond in a new way to muster the full extent of resources—human and material—necessary for the project. The core project team included local government officials, supplemented with dedicated project leadership. This “task force” located itself in the district so it was accessible to colleagues and the community. The local government showed its support for the Project by using its public spaces, and providing sidewalk infrastructure, to accommodate the informal street vendors. The beneficiary community responded to the recognition of its preferences with participation and assimilation of the urbanized future.

4. Participative Implementation: since Warwick Junction is a working market and public transport node, the community had to be sympathetic to disruptions caused by infrastructure upgrading and implementation. As a result, parties had to agree on implementation phases.

What were the obstacles?

The Junction had suffered from years of neglect and stoic attempts by the street vendors to establish themselves. In addition, congestion, and a lack of urban literacy limited the community's ability to assimilate what they were experiencing. Equally, the project team had no appropriate national (or international) precedent to inform its intervention. They were unable to find models for informal street vending at this scale in an inner city location.

What were the results?

The project was successfully implemented. It is growing and providing new forms of entrepreneurship and income generating activities. The project has facilitated livelihoods for approximately 5,000 inner city vendors and their service providers, and the expectation of meaningful community participation has been entrenched. Work has begun to redress the cultural, social, and economic exclusion and an exciting inner city district and a unique urban experience has emerged. There is currently the promise of tourism; potential that could release its own phase of second generation energy. Finally, the Project is being replicated in other South African cities.

Richard Dobson qualified as an architect from the University of Kwa Zulu Natal in 1978. He immediately established his own private practice, working almost exclusively in the then Black townships surrounding Durban, South Africa. In 1981, he joined a long-established Kwa Zulu Natal firm, and the resultant four-person partnership continued for 15 years. During this time, the practice undertook a wide range of commissions, but was noted for its residential, commercial, and historic restoration work for which it received various local and national awards. Mr. Dobson's particular interest in low-energy construction included a patent and a national design award for a residential walling system utilizing stabilized earth. This went into limited commercial production. In 1996, upon the dissolution of the partnership, he joined the eThekweni Municipality in Durban as a contract consultant and commenced implementing the capital infrastructure within the Warwick Junction Urban Renewal Project. This involvement progressively resulted in his leadership of the project from 2001, and eventually its successor—the Inner City Thekweni Regeneration and Urban Management Program—whose mandate specifically emphasizes the needs and opportunities of the inner city. In December 2006, Mr. Dobson resigned from the program and the municipality in order to return to private practice to found an NGO called Asiye Etafuleni.

Asiye Etafuleni means “bring it to the table” in Zulu, but figuratively, it means “let us negotiate.” The organization offers technical support to the informal economy, and will focus on street vendors and endemic urban poverty. He has also commenced with collaborating on a book documenting the 10 years of development in the Warwick Junction Urban Renewal Project.

Citizen Engagement in Deliberative Democracy

Revitalizing Urban Cities through Resident Empowerment: The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP)

Robert D. Miller
rmiller@nrp.org

What was the problem?

In the mid-1980s, the city of Minneapolis was experiencing many of the problems that had threatened the stability of cities throughout the United States: flight of the middle class, deterioration of the housing stock, lack of investment in residential neighborhoods, declining numbers of local businesses, loss of living wage jobs, reduced investment in public infrastructure, increasing levels of crime and poverty, and the growing dissatisfaction of residents. In 1987, with signs of neighborhood decline in Minneapolis becoming increasingly apparent, a Task Force was formed, which found that physical revitalization of Minneapolis neighborhoods was badly needed and would cost over \$3 billion. In May 1989, an Implementation Committee proposed a revitalization program that would “protect” fundamentally sound neighborhoods, “revitalize” those showing signs of decline, and “redirect” those with extensive problems.

What was the innovation?

In 1990, the Minnesota legislature passed legislation that gave the state’s largest cities the authority to establish neighborhood revitalization programs, and allowed Minneapolis to use up to \$20 million of its Tax Increment Financing proceeds, annually thru 2009, to fund improvements to neighborhoods. These programs would be based on plans developed by neighborhood residents.

The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) was established to make the residential neighborhoods of the city better places to live, work, learn, and play. NRP shifts the traditional improvement paradigm from a reliance on professional planners and government bureaucrats to one that focuses on engaging and empowering residents. It

acknowledges that people with the greatest proximity to an issue, problem, or opportunity, and an interest in accomplishing change are the ones who may be most motivated and able to make real change happen. Neighborhood-based priority setting, planning, and implementation are the core of the program. In NRP, residents and other neighborhood stakeholders create Neighborhood Action Plans (NAPs) that describe the neighborhood they want in the future, and the goals, objectives, and specific strategies that will help them accomplish their vision. NRP completes the empowerment process by providing funding to each neighborhood to help them implement their approved NAP.

What were the obstacles?

The obstacles were many and formidable. These obstacles included: training residents to conduct inclusive planning processes; developing standards for recognition and operation of neighborhood organizations; mentoring neighborhood leaders; developing relationships between neighborhoods, and between neighborhoods and their local governments; sporadic and inconsistent cooperation from city departments; improving the understanding of residents about government and its various processes; creating a template for neighborhood action plans; ensuring financial accountability and developing processes for transferring funds; creating contracts; and, the host of minor and major roadblocks associated with creating a program while it is being implemented. One of the most significant, but initially unexpected, obstacles was a major reduction in the revenue stream that occurred when the program reached its 10th anniversary (the halfway point of its expected life).

4. What were the results?

The results were much more significant than originally expected. The program generated the participation of every neighborhood in the city, an increase in the number of neighborhood groups from an initial 42 to 72. Neighborhood groups were recognized as part of the civic infrastructure. Investment of over \$280 million of public NRP funds leveraged over \$1 billion of additional public and private investment in everything from home improvements, to construction of affordable housing, to services for young people and seniors. More than 1,000 residents became involved in the boards of neighborhood groups. Residents learned new skills. Multijurisdictional public improvements were coordinated. The program created a general sense of identity and connection to place for residents.

Robert D. Miller has been Director of the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) since 1992. Before joining the NRP, he was director of the Community and Resource Exchange Program and had served for 14 years as a Planning Supervisor and Senior Management Analyst for Hennepin County. Before serving with Hennepin County, Mr. Miller had been a Personnel Manager and Special Assistant with the Veterans

Administration. He was a member of the Urban Consortium Energy Task Force for 12 years and has served on state, county and city task forces, and special committees and study commissions in a wide variety of topical areas. He was also the owner of a successful restaurant in Minneapolis. In addition to these activities, Mr. Miller served on the Board of Directors and was elected president of a community association in Virginia, helped found a neighborhood association in Minneapolis, chaired a Parent-Teacher Association, and has recruited and mentored an uncounted number of people for community service.

Citizen Engagement in Deliberative Democracy
Together We Can Tackle the Power Gap

Henry Tam, Ph.D.
henry.tam@communities.gsi.gov.uk

What was the problem?

Despite record investment in public services from 1997 to 2001, and the achievement of priority targets, the British government found that most people believed they had little power over state decisions which affected their daily lives. Even though there were clear improvements on headline measures such as reduction in crime figures, more provisions for childcare, increased number of hospital treatments, and more unemployed helped to find jobs, there was growing doubt as to whether the government was acting on what citizens were truly concerned about. Consequently, the public was all too often unconvinced that their needs were being met. From 2001 to 2003, the proportion of people who felt they could influence decisions affecting their concerns fell from 43% to 38%. It reflected the broader trend of a rising number of people saying that they did not vote, or participate in public affairs, because ultimately they had no real power over government institutions.

What was the innovation?

In 2003, the Secretary of State for Home Affairs asked for a new government unit to be set up to tackle the problem of the power gap between state and citizens in England. As the head of this unit, I devised the “Together We Can” campaign—a culture change program which brought local and central state bodies across the country together to work with community sector partners in order to demonstrate how citizens could be empowered to work with government to set and achieve common goals. Never before had a national government taken a strategic approach to encourage its officials and the wider public to collaborate in decision making in all domestic public policies. The campaign had three key components:

1. Skills for Active Citizenship: supporting the development of people's motivation, skills, and confidence to speak up for their communities and say what improvements are needed. The Take Part Network to promote citizenship learning and the Together We Can online resource are examples.
2. Strengthening Communities: increasing the capacity of community groups to bring together citizens to deliberate and articulate shared concerns. Guide Neighbourhoods, Community Justice Centres, and New Deal for Communities are examples.
3. Partnership with Public Bodies: steering and advising public bodies to work effectively in partnership with local people in assessing needs, considering options for action, determining priorities, and sharing information on results. Examples of such cross-government initiatives include the Together We Can Action Plan, Civic Pioneer local authorities, Neighbourhood Policing, and the Healthy Communities Collaborative.

What were the obstacles?

There were broadly four obstacles we had to overcome:

1. The political commitment from our own Ministers was not fully shared by other senior politicians or their officials, many of whom regarded the empowerment of citizens as a marginal issue and did not seriously address it in their policy development. We tackled this by supplying our own Ministers with case studies of improvements to bring their Cabinet colleagues on their side, and presenting key decision makers with evidence on how trust and satisfaction with their services go up as a result of empowerment initiatives.
2. There was virtually no coordination across central and local government, or within either, leading to many missed opportunities for shared learning and collaboration. We tackled this by establishing a national forum for public officials to learn, plan, and support empowerment initiatives.
3. Many confused our work with promoting volunteerism, and diverted attention and resources away from the focus of power redistribution. We tackled this by openly and relentlessly pointing out the distinct focus on power in our work, and insisting on measuring success without reference to volunteering.
4. The public, itself, was skeptical. Moreover, superficial consultation exercises often contributed to discrediting the process of civic engagement. We tackled this by setting higher standards, promoting good practice, and ensuring effective feedback to citizens is built into empowerment work.

What were the results?

We had planned to build up the foundational phase of the culture change program by 2006 so that we could push for the incremental adoption of empowerment practices over the next

three years before 2009. The impact of “Together We Can” itself, along with favorable political changes, have considerably accelerated the process of delivering results from our work. These are notable in the following areas:

- By 2006, the Prime Minister and all the Secretaries of State with domestic policy responsibilities had signed up to champion the progress made nationally, and commit to further reforms.
- In 2006, the Local Government White Paper, “Strong & Prosperous Communities,” was published and contributed significantly to strengthen empowerment, particularly with a new statutory Duty to Involve.
- In 2007, a program to accelerate the adoption of empowering practices such as participatory budgeting, community assets management, and devolved decision making, commenced.
- By 2007, the decline in the proportion of citizens who feel they can influence decisions affecting their areas had been stopped.
- In 2008, the Government adopted a formal Public Service Agreement target to empower more people to have influence over public decisions.
- Later in 2008, we will see a cross-government White Paper on community empowerment to set out further reforms.

Dr. Henry Tam is the Deputy Director in charge of Community Empowerment Delivery at the Department for Communities & Local Government, Great Britain. He was previously Head of Civil Renewal at the Home Office where he devised the cross-government Together We Can action plan. He was responsible for setting up the Home Office’s Standards Unit for Correctional Services, covering prisons, probation, and youth justice. From 2000–2002 he was the Home Office’s Director for Community Safety & Regeneration in the East of England, responsible for developing a unified approach in implementing Government policies on neighborhood renewal and community safety in the region. Prior to joining the Home Office, Dr. Tam was the Deputy Chief Executive at St. Edmundsbury Borough Council where his duties included corporate management and community development. He directed the Borough’s successful bid for Beacon Council status. His work on democratic engagement with young people won a Best Practice Award from the Prime Minister in 1999. Dr. Tam studied Philosophy, Politics & Economics at the University of Oxford and has a doctorate in Social Philosophy from the University of Hong Kong. He is Visiting Professor at the Faculty of Lifelong Learning, Birkbeck, London University; and, a Fellow of the Globus Institute for Globalization and Sustainable Development, University of Tilburg, the Netherlands.

Institutional Innovations in Global Health: New Approaches to Neglected Diseases

Setting the Context

Professor William C. Clark, Harvard Kennedy School
william_clark@harvard.edu

Our current research and development system has worked successfully to generate innovation and treatments for diseases that affect large numbers of people in industrialized countries, such as heart disease, stroke, diabetes or cancer. Public and private actors in basic and applied research cooperate to generate scientific breakthroughs leading to new treatment candidates that can eventually be turned into drugs for a large variety of illnesses. Patients have access to these interventions through the health systems in their respective countries.

However, the system has failed to generate the necessary level of innovation in the treatment of diseases that either affect primarily the poor in developing countries, such as malaria and tuberculosis (commonly referred to as “neglected diseases”), or that affect very few people, such as Lou Gehrig’s disease (an “orphan disease”). In each case, the dearth of lucrative markets has led to inadequate investment in development with respect to both basic and applied research.

In a nutshell, understanding of these diseases is either insufficient, or, where it has been achieved, it has not translated into tangible benefits for patients suffering from these illnesses. As a consequence, millions die every year.

In the past decade, a number of new approaches have emerged to overcome the challenges of neglected and orphan diseases. The novelty of these approaches lies in their models of cooperation, their work practice, and the incentives they create for actors in the public and private domains.

Three innovators will be present at this panel. The first two, Global Alliance for TB Drug Development (TB Alliance) and the Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi), share missions to develop treatments for tuberculosis, malaria and other neglected diseases. These organizations rely on new forms of cooperation between public and private partners to identify and test promising drug candidates for the neglected diseases they target. Both organizations have already successfully brought new drugs to the market and are considered to be highly promising examples of the public-private partnership model in global health.

In contrast, Prize4Life pioneers another model that has been receiving increasing

attention in the biomedical domain: that of the inducement prize. Prize4Life targets an orphan disease of unknown cause, ALS (Lou Gehrig's disease). The organization's primary purpose is to induce scientific breakthroughs that could eventually lead to a treatment or cure for this devastating disease. Its strategy is to offer large prizes for defined scientific contributions to ALS research. Prize4Life's experience will have lessons for other health problems across the global health domain.

In this panel, we will examine how these innovators cover a range of basic research and discovery, and development and access to innovations in their respective domains. Among other topics, we will discuss how these approaches differ from earlier approaches to the problems they target, what larger institutional landscape these actors need in order to succeed, how policy makers can help ensure their success, and how these innovators can make sure that the fruits of their labors will actually become available to patients who need them.

William C. Clark is the Harvey Brooks Professor of International Science, Public Policy, and Human Development at the Harvard Kennedy School. Trained as an ecologist, his research focuses on the interactions of environment, development, and security concerns in international affairs. Clark is coauthor of *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management*, and coeditor of *Sustainable Development of the Biosphere; The Earth as Transformed by Human Action; Learning to Manage Global Environmental Risks*; and, *Global Environmental Assessments: Information and Influence*. Dr. Clark is a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and co-chaired the National Research Council study on *Our Common Journey: A Transition toward Sustainability*. He chairs the environmental reporting program of the Heinz Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment, which produces a periodic report on *The State of the Nations Ecosystems*. Dr. Clark is a recipient of the MacArthur Prize, the Humboldt Prize, and the Harvard Kennedy School's Carballo Award for Excellence in Teaching.

New Approaches to Neglected Diseases

Global Alliance for TB Drug Development (TB Alliance): A Public-Private Partnership to Develop Accessible and Faster-Acting TB Medicines

Maria Freire

mfreire@laskerfoundation.org

What was the problem?

Routine treatments for tuberculosis (TB) are not working; current therapies take between six to nine months to be effective, and TB drug resistance is on the rise worldwide. Despite the clear need for new medicines to treat TB, pharmaceutical company development of such drugs has foundered due to lack of profit. The cost of developing a new drug currently averages between 800 million and 1 billion dollars, and TB overwhelmingly affects impoverished communities throughout the developing world. Without a clear profit motive, the private sector has been largely indifferent to development of new treatments for tuberculosis, leaving TB research stagnant.

What was the innovation?

Faced with the challenge of treating tuberculosis patients effectively and quickly in the face of corporate indifference to neglected diseases such as TB, the Rockefeller Foundation convened a meeting of practitioners and philanthropists in Cape Town, South Africa, in 2000. In the wake of this meeting, innovators set aside 15 million dollars in seed money to champion tuberculosis drug development.

The newly formed TB Alliance identified a need for tuberculosis treatments and acknowledged that neither pharmaceutical companies nor governments were performing the necessary research, so innovators borrowed pharmaceutical company techniques for nonprofit goals. The TB Alliance is a virtual research platform with a small staff and low overhead, that adapts corporate research (made available to the Alliance through agreements with large pharmaceutical companies) to combine existing drug therapies in new and innovative ways. By working with existing drugs in combination, researchers can attack tuberculosis on multiple fronts while maximizing existing drug therapy effectiveness. In addition to existing therapies, the TB Alliance works in concert with government and corporate entities to organize new drug research, making the TB Alliance the organization with the biggest pipeline of TB drugs in varying stages of development and trials in the world.

What were the obstacles?

The first challenge was overcoming skepticism. Finding government funding was difficult initially because the TB Alliance is neither a university nor a government agency. Nor is it a pharmaceutical company, meaning that it did not fit preexisting government categories of research institutions. The drug therapies with which the TB Alliance works were also not readily available because pharmaceutical companies maintain little institutional memory of their own compound research for infectious diseases. The TB Alliance had to map out which companies developed what, facing the legal obstacle of getting access to drugs while maintaining patent protection. Thus, the TB Alliance blazed trails not only in the virtual company model itself, but also in the agreements it forged with drug developers. Finally, the difficulty facing all innovative organization models is long-term sustainability. While the TB Alliance is relatively inexpensive for pharmaceutical research and development, the costs remain high.

What were the results?

As an advocacy organization, the TB Alliance convinced key players and policy makers that TB remains an important disease in need of new treatments. The Alliance also demonstrated that the virtual platform model of networked drug research could work, but there must be sustainable funding to ensure that the organization's research can be completed.

Maria C. Freire, Ph.D. is President of The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation. Prior to her appointment at the Lasker Foundation, Dr. Freire was the Chief Executive Officer and President of the Global Alliance for TB Drug Development. An internationally recognized expert in technology commercialization, Dr. Freire directed the Office of Technology Transfer at the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) from 1995 to 2001. Before her position at the NIH, Dr. Freire established and headed the Office of Technology Development at the University of Maryland at Baltimore and the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. Dr. Freire trained at the Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia in Lima, Peru. She received a doctorate in Biophysics from the University of Virginia and completed post-graduate work in immunology and virology at the University of Virginia and the University of Tennessee, respectively. She is the recipient of a Fulbright Fellowship as well as two US Congressional Science Fellowships. Dr. Freire has been active on a number of national and international boards and committees. She is the recipient of numerous awards, including the US Department of Health and Human Services Secretary's Award for Distinguished Service, the 1999 Arthur S. Flemming Award, and the 2002 Bayh-Dole Award.

New Approaches to Neglected Diseases

Building Partnerships to Ensure Needs-Driven Research and Development

Bennett M. Shapiro, M.D.

benshap@pipeline.com

What was the problem?

Despite phenomenal changes in medicine over the past half-century, drug discovery for diseases affecting poor populations in the developing world remains a neglected and stagnant field. Parasitic diseases such as malaria, Chagas disease, and African sleeping sickness (human African trypanosomiasis) cause many deaths each year, and yet, because of a combination of market and public policy failures, no clinically useful and effective drugs have emerged to treat them. Of the 1,556 new drugs approved between 1975 and 2004, only 21 (1.3%) were specifically developed for tropical diseases and tuberculosis, even though these diseases account for 11.4% of the global disease burden. Furthermore, existing therapies are often toxic, expensive, and administered for long periods by injection, characteristics that are inappropriate for the environments in which they are used. For example, African sleeping sickness, a fatal disease if not treated, threatens more than 50 million people in 36 countries but has limited treatment options using toxic, antiquated drugs. Chagas disease, which affects 18 million, and puts 100 million at risk in Central and South America, has no effective therapy to prevent chronic and debilitating cardiac sequelae that result in up to 30% of those infected.

What was the innovation?

In 2003, the frustrations of treating sick people with inadequate therapies drove innovators from seven organizations around the world to establish the Drugs for Neglected Diseases initiative (DNDi). The DNDi was formed by Brazil's Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, the Indian Council for Medical Research, the Kenya Medical Research Institute, the Ministry of Health of Malaysia, France's Pasteur Institute, Médecins sans Frontières (Doctors without Borders), and the UNDP/World Bank/World Health Organization's Special Program for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases. DNDi began with the understanding that a great deal of academic research had emerged about the parasites that cause these diseases, research that could be coupled with techniques of modern drug discovery to develop accessible treatments for neglected diseases.

DNDi neither maintains research facilities, nor conducts research to develop its treatments; rather, it acts as a virtual pharmaceutical company whereby DNDi personnel with

a range of experience in different aspects of drug discovery manage the outsourcing of research and development. To gather information on local patient needs, capacity, and expertise, DNDi depends on its regional networks of scientists and clinicians actively involved in drug research for neglected diseases in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The strong clinical presence of Médecins sans Frontières throughout the world enables DNDi to perform trials and distribute new clinical entities in many of these regions. The initiative has also reached agreements with several large pharmaceutical and biotech companies to gain access to research and to benefit from in-kind contributions from these corporations on specific projects. Its virtual organization model limits costs while maximizing flexibility.

In addition to supporting existing capacity in countries where neglected diseases are endemic, DNDi works with its partners to build additional capacity in a sustainable manner through technology transfer for drug research and development. This includes access to chemical diversity, pharmaceutical and clinical development, and working closely with national control programs through, for example, the Leishmaniasis East Africa Platform (LEAP) and Human African Trypanosomiasis (HAT) platforms in Africa.

What were the obstacles?

It is critical to focus efforts on defined, specific disease categories, to identify the optimal balance between research, development, and access to therapies, and to raise the funds needed to make such an effort successful. One organizational challenge for such initiatives is to maintain a pipeline of drugs in different stages of development so that good therapies can emerge relatively quickly, while the search for optimal drug treatments continues. Equally important is the selection of appropriate partners for all stages of the drug discovery process. There are a growing number of players in the field of neglected diseases and different organizations must learn to communicate sufficiently to encourage innovators with different approaches to avoid competition or excessive overlap. Sustainability of such efforts is the biggest concern, as current attention afforded to global health may soon turn to other issues. Public leadership is needed to create policy change that will support funding for, adoption of, and equitable access to, essential health tools.

What were the results?

To give an example of DNDi's achievements, while building DNDi's structure, innovators identified an immediate clinical problem: drug resistance in malaria is an emerging issue worldwide, resulting in a complex treatment regimen of several drugs to reduce the possibility of resistance. To insure that such drugs were taken together, DNDi produced two fixed-dose drug combinations as an initial project to utilize the skills of the DNDi team for an urgent public health need. In addition to the convenience of these anti-malarials (1 to 2 tablets per day over a three-day treatment course), they are also the first such combination therapy to

be available in both adult and pediatric doses. DNDi's industrial partner, Sanofi-aventis, has distributed over 1 million treatments of ASAQ (a combination of artesunate and amodiaquine), and the treatment is now registered in 21 African countries. ASMQ, a fixed-dose combination of artesunate and mefloquine has completed phase 3 clinical trials and has been used in an intervention study of over 15,000 patients in Brazil.

As of late 2007, DNDi has a full pipeline, with drug candidates at all stages of development. There are 18 programs in the initiative's portfolio: six clinical, three preclinical, and nine discovery projects. The insights DNDi has gleaned from developing and delivering ASAQ to Africa will prove invaluable as DNDi moves forward in its goal, not only to deliver new treatments for the most neglected, but also to build a robust portfolio that will produce truly innovative drugs.

Bennett Shapiro, M.D. is currently the Chair of the DNDi (Drugs for Neglected Diseases initiative) North America Board of Directors. Most recently, he was Executive Vice President of Worldwide Licensing and External Research for Merck. Dr. Shapiro joined Merck Research Laboratories in September 1990 as Executive Vice President of Basic Research, Merck Research Laboratories. In this position, he was responsible for all the basic and preclinical research activities at Merck worldwide. Previously, he was Professor and Chairman of the Department of Biochemistry at the University of Washington. Dr. Shapiro has served on many advisory boards and is currently a member of the board of Momenta and Elixir, among other venture-backed companies.

New Approaches to Neglected Diseases

Prize4Life: A Nonprofit Search for a Cure for ALS (Lou Gehrig's Disease)

Nicole Szlezák, M.D.
nicole_szlezak@ksg04.harvard.edu

What was the problem?

ALS (amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease) is a fatal neurodegenerative illness that kills patients within an average of three to five years. Patients become progressively paralyzed until vital functions like breathing can no longer be sustained. Its causes are little understood, and there is no cure. Each year, about five to six thousand Americans are diagnosed with ALS. At any given time, there are relatively few people suffering from ALS because it is so aggressive and progresses rapidly. Because the

disease is relatively rare and the causes unknown, it has attracted fewer research dollars than other diseases. ALS is considered an “orphan disease.”

Currently, the only ALS drug on the market prolongs life by an average of a mere two to three months. Systematic large-scale drug development efforts are urgently needed, and many pharmaceutical companies would like to enter the market for ALS treatment, estimated to be worth at least a billion dollars. However, the difficulty of conducting large-scale drug testing on ALS makes clinical trials lengthy and very expensive, discouraging most companies from undertaking further research.

What was the innovation?

Prize4Life was founded by an ALS patient with a mission to accelerate the search for a cure for ALS. Innovators at Prize4Life offer large financial prizes for defined breakthroughs in ALS research. Unlike awards like the Nobel Prize, which honor past scientific achievements, inducement prizes offer money for breakthroughs that are urgently needed but have not yet happened. By offering prizes in ALS research, Prize4Life wants to attract new minds, new attention, and new money to ALS research.

In November 2006, Prize4Life launched its first prize of \$1 million for an ALS biomarker; a measure that would allow clinical researchers to track the progression of the disease. Such a biomarker would dramatically reduce the cost of ALS clinical trials and therefore make it easier for clinical investigators to test potential ALS drugs. It would also remove an important obstacle that is currently keeping pharmaceutical companies from entering the ALS field.

What were the obstacles?

Biomedical innovation is a highly complex arena. Breakthroughs almost always depend on the interaction of a variety of players in the research domain. Prize4Life is introducing a results-based model that in many ways turns the traditional research model on its head, and yet it is also interdependent and complementary to existing efforts in ALS research. Among the many challenges that this poses, four stand out. First, clinically oriented biomedical research is very expensive. While the inducement prize does offer a cash reward, individual researchers, or wealthy foundations must still be inspired to invest their own money to undertake their research. Second, many researchers are often more familiar with the upfront funding mechanisms of grants and may first react with skepticism to the idea of inducement prizes. This requires a great amount of communication and outreach work. Third, Prize4Life needs to strike the right balance between competitive and cooperative aspects of the prize model. On one hand, prizes introduce an element of competition and acceleration into the domain in which they operate. On the other hand, they can also lead to the initiation of new collaborations among researchers inside and outside the ALS field.

A final challenge is the general dearth of information and resources in the ALS research field. This hampers researchers' efforts in multiple ways. Prize4Life is currently initiating several projects to improve access to information and infrastructure for the ALS research community. These include a platform for the exchange of research-related information and a database for collecting and pooling patient data.

What were the results?

In the one year since its inception, Prize4Life has already been able to attract new minds and money to the field of ALS. In May 2007, Prize4Life awarded a series of small prizes (\$15,000 each) to a number of new and promising approaches to finding an ALS biomarker. Several of these originated outside the immediate ALS field and have led to new interdisciplinary collaborations. The results of the first prize competition will be available in November 2008, when the deadline for the ALS Biomarker Prize arrives. Prize4Life plans to launch two more prizes in 2008.

Nicole Szlezák is a Doctoral Fellow in the Sustainability Science Program at Harvard University's Center for International Development and a doctoral candidate in the Public Policy Program at the Harvard Kennedy School. Her dissertation investigates the role of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria and recent changes in China's AIDS policy. She is also interested in institutional arrangements to foster drug development and delivery for diseases that receive little attention in terms of research and development. Together with William Clark, Dr. Szlezák leads the Institutional Innovations for Linking Knowledge with Action in Global Health Project, which studies institutions cooperating in the arena of global health, with a particular focus on lessons from the field of malaria prevention and control. Prior to coming to Harvard, Dr. Szlezák was a clinical researcher at the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Tübingen, Germany, and at the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Gabon, where her work focused on malaria and schistosomiasis. Dr. Szlezák holds a medical degree from Humboldt University in Berlin, and a Doctor of Medicine degree from the University of Tübingen, Germany. She is also a graduate of the Master in Public Administration Program at the Harvard Kennedy School.

The Dubai Experience of Government Innovation

His Excellency Nabil Ali Alyousuf
hassan.hourani@teo.ae

Dubai started its development journey as a local township with humble credentials. At that time, Dubai had a modest economy and population, but a determined mindset and a clear vision to achieve international excellence and global city standing. Dubai's entrepreneurial leadership defined a challenging strategy to the city, setting the skies as the limit for growth.

Entrepreneurial spirit, good planning, and determination for success made Dubai a thriving international open city. Even though it is surrounded by oil-producing countries with larger financial capabilities, Dubai successfully positioned itself as central hub catering various services for more than 2 billion people: transportation, logistics, tourism, media, education, and financial services are among the successful sectors developed in the city from scratch.

Recently, Dubai developed a comprehensive, long-term, and detailed socioeconomic government agenda called the "Dubai Strategic Plan 2015." The plan will address future challenges in all areas related to economy, infrastructure, human development, environment, and society.

Nabil Ali Alyousuf is Executive President of the Dubai School of Government and Chairman of the Dubai Institute for Human Resources Development. Throughout his career, he has focused on public sector development, human development, and community development. He improved government performance in Dubai during his time as General Coordinator of the Dubai Government Excellence Program, which grants awards for excellence based on global standards. He introduced the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) system and reinforced accountability in the public sector, while guiding the restructuring of the Dubai Government. Mr. Alyousuf led the strategy development team for the Dubai Strategic Plan 2015, a United Arab Emirates program to develop its most dynamic economic sectors; and served as Vice-Chairman of the Arab Strategy Forum. In 2004, he helped to establish the Dubai School of Government, a research and teaching institution that aims to promote good governance through enhancing the region's capacity for effective public policy. In the field of human development, Mr. Alyousuf helped to establish the Dubai Institute for Human Resources Development, as well as the Emirates Nationals Development Program, and managed the Mohammed bin Rashid Program for Leadership Development. Nabil Ali Alyousuf has a bachelor's in science in Industrial Engineering from the University of Arizona (USA), a

master's in science in Operations Research from the Georgia Institute of Technology (USA), and a master's in business administration from the University of Strathclyde (UK).

Roundtable: Government Innovation and Social Justice

Peter Spink
peter.spink@fgv.br

There are few places in the world where everybody starts from a level playing field. On the contrary, concerns with social, economic, racial, ethnic, and gender inequalities, amongst others, are a constant theme and a constant challenge. For most of the second half of the twentieth century, it was felt that greater economic development and better government services would in time lead to a reduction in inequalities. Unfortunately, as report after report has pointed out, that has not proved to be the case. Increasingly, governments are being asked to “put people first.” The focus is on services in terms of their contribution to the construction of citizenship, and the guarantees of individual and collective rights. Social justice has become a transversal theme, a question to be asked of all areas of public policy provision. In this panel, members of the Liaison Group for Innovations in Governance and Public Action will take a critical look at the progress being made.

Through support from the Ford Foundation and contributions by the individual programs, the Liaison Group was established in 2002 as a means to enhance the collaboration among the programs for shared learning and global dissemination of our individual and collective knowledge and experiences. Liaison Group activities include workshops, research, and publications. The group consists of the following partner programs:

- American Indian Tribes in the United States of America: Honoring Nations Program
- Brazil: Public Management and Citizenship Program
- Chile: Citizen Participation and Public Politics Program
- China: The Innovations and Excellence in Chinese Local Governance Program
- East Africa: The Mashariki Innovations in Local Governance Awards Program
- Mexico: Government and Local Management Award
- Peru: Participation and Local Management Program
- Philippines: The Galing Pook Foundation Awards for Outstanding Local Government Programs
- South Africa: Impumelelo Innovations Award Trust
- United States of America: Innovations in American Government Awards Program

While each of these programs adapts its innovations approach to local concerns and priorities, they all share a strong allegiance to the core idea that government can be improved

through the identification and dissemination of samples of effective solutions to public sector problems.

Discussants:

Rhoda Kadalie is the Executive Director of the Impumelelo Innovations Award Trust. Prior to joining Impumelelo, she was a Human Rights Commissioner for the Western Cape and Northern Cape. Ms. Kadalie is also an academic, and the founder of the Gender Equity Unit at the University of the Western Cape. She has traveled extensively, presenting lectures and papers on human rights and gender politics in South Africa at conferences across the world. In 1999, Ms. Kadalie received an honorary doctorate in liberal arts from the University of Uppsala, Sweden.

Cecilia Kinuthia-Njenga is a Human Settlements officer at United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) in the fields of local development and governance. She has coordinated a range of regional and national technical cooperation projects, including research and advocacy work on numerous local and urban planning issues in Africa and Asia. Ms. Kinuthia-Njenga is the founder of the Mashariki Innovations in Local Governance Awards Program; and serves as the task manager of the Lake Victoria Region City Development Strategies Initiative, a program for improved environmental sustainability and poverty reduction. Before joining UN-HABITAT, Ms. Kinuthia-Njenga worked in the international nongovernmental organization sector and as a consultant in sectoral and macroeconomic policy areas. Her research interests include civil society involvement in governance, sustainable economic development, HIV/AIDS health and education, participatory planning, and small and microenterprise development.

Gonzalo Portocarrero Maisch is the Principal Professor of the Department of Social Sciences at the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú) and Dean of the School of Sociologists of Peru. He is a Member of the Directive Committee of the Network for Social Scientific Development in Peru. Among Dr. Portocarrero's most recent publications are *Peru Through the School*, *Racism and Mestization*, and *Reasons of Blood and Face: Creole Culture and Transgression in Peruvian Society*. He holds a doctorate in Sociology from the University of Essex in England.

Amy Besaw Medford is Director of the Honoring Nations Program at the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. Ms. Medford is also currently a member of the Board of Directors for the Northwest Indian College Foundation. She has served as a Research Associate in family strengthening in Indian Country at the Harvard Project and as

an Administrative Fellow at the Harvard University Native American Program. Ms. Medford holds a bachelor's in Business Administration from the University of Washington, a master's in Organizational Leadership from Chapman University, and a master's in Education in Human Development and Psychology from Harvard University's Graduate School of Education.

Peter Spink is Director of the Center for Public Administration and Government (Programa Gestão Pública e Cidadania) in São Paulo, Brazil, and full Professor at the Getulio Vargas Foundation's São Paulo School of Business Administration. He was a Visiting Scholar at the Center for Latin American Studies and the Faculty for Social Science and Politics at Cambridge University in England in 1998; the Philips Visiting Professor at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin in 2001; and a visiting professor of Social Psychology at the Universidad Autonoma de Barcelona in 2004. Before moving to Brazil, Dr. Spink was a member of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London from 1970 to 1980. He has published widely on topics including subnational governance, public policy, organizational change, and poverty reduction. He holds a doctorate in Organizational Psychology from Birkbeck College at the University of London.

Yang Xuedong is a Fellow and Deputy Director of the China Center for Comparative Politics and Economics. He is also Assistant Director of China Local Governance Innovations Program, an independent, nongovernmental research group focusing on reforms at the local level in China. He received a doctorate degree from Beijing University with major in Comparative Politics. He was a Visiting Fellow at the Harvard Kennedy School from 2001 to 2002. Dr. Xuedong has authored or coauthored books and numerous articles about Chinese local politics and governance, globalization, risk society. His publications include *Globalization Theories and Risk Society and Reconstructing Order*. His doctoral dissertation, published in 2002, was *Market Development, Society Growth and State Building: Take the County as an Analytical Unit*.

Innovations in Emergency Management: Making Governments Flexible and Responsive

Setting the Context

Professor Arnold M. Howitt, Harvard Kennedy School
arnold_howitt@harvard.edu

In the brief history of the twenty-first century, a number of searing events have focused attention on society's capacity to respond to emergencies. These include natural catastrophes like the Pakistan earthquake, the Asian tsunami in 2004, Hurricane Katrina in the United States in 2005, and paralyzing snows in China in 2008. There have also been outbreaks of new, threatening diseases like Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003, and the perceived threat of avian influenza. Technology failures and industrial accidents have occurred, such as mine cave-ins in the United States in 2006 and those that regularly occur in China; and major transportation disasters such as the foundering of an Egyptian ferry in stormy seas that took the lives of more than 1000 people in 2006. Finally, terrorist attacks such as the fateful 9/11 assaults on the World Trade towers and the Pentagon, the anthrax-laced letters that closely followed in 2001, the train bombings in Madrid in 2004, and the London subway and bus bombings in 2005.

Disasters, some more dire than these, have always plagued human society. But, the scale, density, and interconnectedness of modern life magnify the impact of present day catastrophes. The relative ease of modern transportation means that some potential emergencies, most notably, emergent infectious disease or terrorism, can travel very rapidly within a single country or across national boundaries. Those immediately in the path of a major emergency are severely affected, but others linked by family or social ties or by connections to disrupted economic networks also experience the disaster in different ways. Many individuals who suffer no harm directly may nonetheless live in fear that future catastrophes will affect their families; others empathically identify with the pain of victims. Society, moreover, pays high monetary costs in reconstructing damaged physical infrastructure—through public budgets and charitable and personal resources—struggling to restore community vitality, and rehabilitating disrupted lives. With increased realization that such disasters are truly linked in terms of their societal consequences comes recognition that greater personal, organizational, national and international efforts are needed to prepare for future catastrophic events.

There are several possible areas of focus in efforts to confront the threat of disaster. We can try to prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from such events. This panel looks at several dimensions of this problem through innovations in three countries: India, China, and the United States.

Mihir Bhatt focuses on mitigation and response by reporting on a campaign in India to prepare schools for the impacts of the natural disasters such as earthquakes and cyclones that frequently strike his country. This effort to promote the adoption and implementation of improved safety practices in schools began in Gujarat and has spread to other jurisdictions.

Xue Lan reports on an innovation in Nanning, the capital city of the Guangxi Autonomous region of southern China, to integrate telecommunications capability for citizens to report emergencies and to get appropriate response quickly to the scene. By thinking in an “all hazards” mindset and establishing the communications systems that can support that approach, the city has reduced the burden on citizens to know the correct ways to notify different groups of responders, such as firefighters, police, and emergency medical technicians. The integrated system has improved the speed and effectiveness of their operations.

Jim Schwartz will describe how in a major catastrophe, Incident Command Systems enable diverse groups of responders to integrate and operationally coordinate their actions. He utilized the approach in commanding the emergency response to the terrorist attack on the Pentagon in 2001, and the system was, in turn, institutionalized and diffused under Congressional mandate as the National Incident Management System.

Arnold M. Howitt is Executive Director of the A. Alfred Taubman Center for State and Local Government at the Harvard Kennedy School, where he also co-directs the Program on Emergency Preparedness and Crisis Management. He teaches in a number of Kennedy School executive programs, including serving as faculty co-chair of the Crisis Management program, chair of the state health commissioners program, and co-chair of the program for senior officials from Beijing. For four years, he directed the Kennedy School's research program on domestic preparedness for terrorism. Dr. Howitt served on an Institute of Medicine panel that authored *Preparing for Terrorism* and currently serves on a National Research Council/Transportation Research Board panel on emergency evacuation. He is coauthor of the forthcoming book, *Managing Crises: Responses to Large-Scale Emergencies* and is coauthor and coeditor of *Countering Terrorism: Dimensions of Preparedness*. Dr. Howitt's other research focuses on transportation and environmental regulation. In addition, he wrote *Managing Federalism*, a study of the federal grant-in-aid system, and was coauthor and coeditor of *Perspectives on Management Capacity Building*. He received his bachelor's from Columbia University and his master's and doctorate degrees in political science from Harvard University.

Making Governments Flexible and Responsive
A Campaign for Safer Schools

Mihir Bhatt
dmi@icenet.co.in

What was the problem?

Unsafe schools are an unfortunate reality. With the spread of education, more and more children go to schools that are vulnerable to fires, earthquakes, pollution, cyclones, food poisoning, stampedes and more. In India, schools and education are under government control, yet when it comes to school safety, officials do not have sufficient technical expertise to reduce many risks their students face. The months following a disaster provide an opportunity to promote mitigation and preparedness efforts to reduce the impact of subsequent hazards. However, following the 2004 tsunami there were hardly any demonstration projects on school safety in partnership with the Government of Tamil Nadu. This challenge was similar to that following the 2001 Gujarat earthquake. There was a clear need to focus on non-structural mitigation measures beyond constructing new school buildings or upgrading existing ones. Without a comprehensive and up-to-date approach to school preparedness, officials could not and cannot perform their duties. Furthermore, children have a right to education, but their right to safe schools is not recognized or even articulated.

What was the innovation?

The objective of the innovation was to institutionalize school safety activities within the state education department.

The National Campaign on Child's Right to Safer Schools, launched by the All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI) following the 2001 Gujarat earthquake, built a partnership with the District Education Department of the Government of Tamil Nadu to cover the 28 schools affected by the tsunami in the Villupuram District. This was designed as a pilot project to provide:

- a) Training on school safety and first aid.
- b) Insurance coverage for students.
- c) First-hand experience on building evacuations and fire drills.
- d) Preparation of school safety plans.
- e) A wide range of educational material on school safety in Tamil, the local language.

- f) The pilot reached over 400 teachers through trainings on school safety and first aid; it covered over 6,000 students with micro-insurance; it prepared school safety plans; and, included school safety issues in the educational curricula.

What were the obstacles?

India is a large country. Schools cannot be made safe in a year; it is an ongoing process. Upscaling and replicating success from one block to an entire district takes both time and resources. The pace of the joint initiatives undertaken by local authorities and civil society organizations is slow. The drawn out process of attracting the interest of state authorities and policymakers is always slow due to the bureaucratic setup of state decision-making. There cannot be instant results. Endless exchanges of letters can be trying. A much bigger threat is that donors lose patience with the slow progress of such projects or that a political turnaround leads government to focus on other politically driven agendas before achieving an appropriate scale of operations.

What were the results?

AIDMI started this work in 2001 together with the European Union and the Government of Gujarat after the earthquake. Work during the pilot stage generated awareness materials of high quality and made these available to schools and higher authorities. Based on the demand from the government, the National Campaign on Child's Right to Safer Schools has now expanded to cover 200 or more non-tsunami-affected schools in the district of Villupuram. Through its national campaign, AIDMI—by request of the education department—will spread school safety activities across all the 2,200 schools of the Villupuram district in the next two years. Local NGOs and international UN agencies have picked up on the idea. The district level campaign is gaining momentum in terms of increasing demand for school-specific trainings, materials, and demonstrations. AIDMI is expanding teams and exploring resources to support this massive demand. The education department participates actively and ensures support to cover every single school in the district. Their aim is to demonstrate that it is possible to mainstream safety in schools and in the education system. Beyond the pilot area, in four other states of India, and three neighboring countries, schools are showing interest in working with the campaign to promote safety in their own schools.

Mihir R. Bhatt studied and practiced architecture and city planning in Ahmedabad and Delhi, India, and later in the United States, in Cambridge and Washington, DC. On returning to India in 1989, he initiated a project on disaster risk mitigation which is now the 63 member-strong All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI), working in five Indian states and three countries in South Asia. Mr. Bhatt studied at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, received a Russell E. Train Institutional Fellowship from the World Wildlife Fund in 1997,

an Eisenhower Fellowship in 2000, and has been an Ashoka International Fellow since 2004. He has set up the risk transfer initiative—including Afat Vimo, a life- and non-life disaster insurance and mitigation program—for the microenterprise beneficiaries of Livelihood Relief Fund of AIDMI. Recently, he evaluated tsunami recovery for the UK's Disaster Emergency Committee; became a member of the UK's Core Management Group of Tsunami Evaluation Coalition; evaluated the Oxfam International response in South India and Sri Lanka; and helped the UNDP mainstream disaster risk reduction in Sri Lanka. Currently, Mr. Bhatt is reviewing the Asian Development Bank's work on disaster risk reduction in Asia. He is a Senior Fellow at Humanitarian Initiatives at Harvard University (USA), a Full Member of ALNAP (Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action), and a Member of the Advisory Committee for the ProVention Consortium. Mr. Bhatt is also working on integrating the findings of the independent Tsunami Evaluation Coalition into the recovery efforts, upscaling the micro-insurance program, and promoting risk reduction training and learning in key Asian universities.

Making Governments Flexible and Responsive

Incident Management Systems (IMS): An Organizational Template for Operational Coordination

James Schwartz
jswartz@arlingtonva.us

What was the problem?

Large-scale emergencies, like the terrorist attack on the Pentagon and World Trade Center on 9/11, frequently bring together thousands of responders under conditions of confusion and great danger to the public and themselves. Often no one can predict when, where, and in what ways disaster will strike. The responders, who mobilize to face these situations, coming from diverse professional disciplines, different agencies, and many jurisdictions, may not have worked together before and therefore may lack a basis for factoring the problems faced, organizing their response, and coordinating actions to alleviate the emergency. Without a systematic method of operational coordination, they risk wasting effort, failing to help the victims of catastrophe, and perhaps endangering the lives or safety of fellow responders.

What was the innovation?

The Incident Command System (ICS), originally developed in California in the 1970s to address the problem of operational coordination in forest firefighting, is an organizational

template. Its clear definition of emergency response roles, lines of command, and procedures makes it possible for emergency response professionals to learn the system, train and exercise in its use, apply it “in the small” to ordinary response operations, and then utilize it effectively under catastrophic conditions. Over several decades, this organizational innovation spread across professional disciplines and geographically around the United States. It expanded through the wild land fire profession, to urban and structural firefighting, and to other professional fields, including emergency medical services and hospital emergency operations.

At the Pentagon in 2001, with the Arlington County, Virginia, Fire Department in the lead, emergency responders and law enforcement personnel were able to confront and manage the disaster. They launched a massive rescue and fire suppression operation at a huge structure, burning fiercely from the crash impact of a jetliner loaded with fuel, which was simultaneously a major fire site, a crime scene, and the still-operational national military command headquarters. In 2002, to ensure readiness for potential catastrophes of any type, the US Congress mandated that ICS become the basis of a National Incident Management System (NIMS) to be adopted for all emergency response in the United States, irrespective of disaster type or the responders’ professional field, jurisdiction, or level of government.

What were the obstacles?

To disseminate this innovation widely, even with many agencies already using its techniques, particularly in firefighting and emergency medical services, requires a massive diffusion effort, to inform, train, exercise, and develop high levels of competence in a complicated operational system. Notwithstanding the Congressional mandate, doubts remain in some quarters as to whether this approach is wise. The diffusion effort thus requires persuading members of some professions—notably law enforcement—that NIMS makes sense for their purposes as well, and not only for firefighters. This requires an educational campaign in professional fields like transportation, public works, and social services that rarely thought of their role as emergency responders. The massive in-service training necessary to implement the Congressional mandate is expensive, time consuming, and competitive with other priorities faced by emergency response organizations. Opportunities to practice its techniques in advance of a crisis, especially in exercises that involve multiple agencies, jurisdictions, and even states, are few and far between. Full national diffusion and operational implementation of this innovation is seen as at least a decade-long process.

What were the results?

Those jurisdictions that have committed to making NIMS a reality have experienced enhanced ability to respond and operationally coordinate efforts in emergencies. Opportunities to build skills have proved useful. The coordination required has contributed to

building stronger personal and operational bonds among different professional groupings and between jurisdictions. Experience has led to some adaptation of the system to fit the needs of professions that had not previously utilized ICS techniques. Momentum, shaped by the federal regulatory imperative, seems to be building for even more widespread replication.

James Schwartz, Fire Chief, Arlington, Virginia, served as Incident Commander at the Pentagon on 9-11 and became the new Fire Chief of Arlington County, Virginia, on June 28, 2004. Mr. Schwartz joined the Arlington Fire Department in 1984 as a fire fighter. He was the first line fire fighter (non-officer) to serve as an instructor at the Arlington Fire Academy, a position he held for two years. He rose through the ranks to Lieutenant, Captain, Battalion Chief, and Assistant Fire Chief. In 1998, Mr. Schwartz was named Assistant Chief of Operations, overseeing all response-related activities, including fire, emergency medical services, hazardous materials and technical rescue response, and incident management and operational training. When he became Chief he said, “Our primary focus will continue to be providing extraordinary service in our prevention and public education programs, as well as emergency response. In addition, our focus on terrorism and disaster preparedness response will not waiver, nor will the Department's commitment to the professional development of its members.”

Making Governments Flexible and Responsive

Reporting and Responding to Emergencies in Nanning City, China

Lan Xue

Lan_xue@ksg.harvard.edu

What was the problem?

It had been standard practice in China to have separate phone numbers for citizens to report different types of emergencies: 110 for police, 119 for fire, 120 for medical emergencies, 122 for traffic accidents, and in some cities, 12345 for complaints and discussions with the mayor. In Nanning City, the capital of Guangxi Autonomous Region, government agencies could only handle about 800 calls for their four emergency numbers in a coverage area of about 80 square kilometers. Additionally, citizens were often confused about which number stood for what kind of emergency and they often made errors when reporting their problems.

What was the innovation?

City officials realized they had to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the city's ability to respond. In 2001, they decided to adopt a system based on the C4I (command, control, communication, and computer) concept, which uses digital and network technologies. The new system, which was provided by Motorola, not only integrated the current emergency phone numbers into the same platform, it also expanded the city's ability to include phone numbers related to flood control, earthquake, and other basic infrastructure emergencies. The system became operational on May 1, 2002.

Adoption of the new technology required organizational innovation. City agencies had to learn to pool resources, including sending experienced personnel to the emergency response center, and to coordinate efforts to respond to the emergency calls. Relevant government agencies no longer had to deal with emergencies separately. No matter which of the four numbers people called, the call went to the emergency response center that dispatches the appropriate response team to the site. For major incidents, the system also informed the Mayor's office for further actions.

What were the obstacles?

One set of problems was related to technical issues. It took some time for the system to get up and running smoothly. The other challenge was overcoming barriers that existed among government agencies that were unwilling to share resources. Finally, changing the public's behavior was also a challenge. There were proposals for combining all four numbers into one single number to simplify the system, but the public was accustomed to the existing four numbers, a habit which would be difficult to change. So currently, all four emergency numbers are still in use.

What were the results?

The system currently in use in Nanning City is the most advanced system in China; the response time is only 2–3 seconds, much faster than the 10–15 seconds norm. It also has a GIS system that automatically detects the location of the phone call for over 1 million phones registered in the system. This allows for much more accurate responses, which saves time and resources. The citywide system can now handle over 6,000 calls a day. It plays a major role in safeguarding major international events held in Nanning, including the China-ASEAN Expo in 2004. It has become a model that is being followed by many Chinese cities.

Dr. Lan Xue is Professor and Executive Associate Dean of School of Public Policy and Management at Tsinghua University in Beijing. His teaching and research interests include public policy analysis and management, science and technology policy, and crisis management. Dr. Xue holds a doctorate in Engineering and Public Policy from Carnegie

Mellon University, and previously taught at George Washington University in the US before returning to China in 1996. He has served as a policy advisor for many Chinese government agencies and has consulted for the World Bank, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Council, the International Development Research Center, and other international organizations. He is a recipient of 2001 National Distinguished Young Scientist Award. He serves as a Vice President of the China Association of Public Administration and as Vice Chairman of the Chinese National Steering Committee for MPA Education, among others. In 2007 and 2008, he is at Harvard Kennedy School's Ash Institute as a Visiting Research Scholar, while on leave as a member of the Visiting Committee to the Harvard Kennedy School. Dr. Xue will continue his research on the current reforms in the public policy process in China. His focus is on the roles that social institutions have played in these processes, and the impacts and limits of these reforms on the political development in China, in terms of building infrastructure for democracy.

The Future of Innovation: 21st Century Models of Governance

Setting the Context

Professor Elaine Kamarck, Harvard Kennedy School
elaine_kamarck@ksg.harvard.edu

I still remember staring at the telephone. It was one of those big, cream-colored, boxy things with three plastic buttons, one for each line, and a big, red plastic “hold” button. No voicemail, no speakerphone, no conference calling, no automatic redial. I had not seen a phone like that in years.

It was 1993, and my first day on the staff of the new president of the United States, Bill Clinton, and the new vice president, Al Gore. The phone was in the Executive Office of the President—a building within the White House complex and a few hundred yards away from the center of power of the most powerful government in the world. Yet, the phone on my kitchen counter was more sophisticated.

Eventually the White House complex got phones that did what modern ones at that time could do, and we got computers, e-mail, and most of the other things that characterize modern offices. But, I still remember that phone. For the full four-and-a-half years I spent there working on reinventing the federal government, every step forward—from closing obsolete agriculture field offices to passing major procurement legislation to putting government services on the Internet—was greeted with a chorus of complaints from congressional and interest group protectors. As the famous and late management guru Peter Drucker wrote, we were accomplishing things that were remarkable in government, but that would not be so anywhere else. Perhaps that was why, in spite of a series of modest and not-so-modest victories, I never got rid of the nagging suspicion that the government we were trying to reform was like that phone—functioning, but at the same time, hopelessly obsolete. We were operating on a corpse, or rearranging the deck chairs on the ill-fated ship, the *Titanic*, or filling the hole in the dike with chewing gum. You get the picture.

Eight years later, after I had left the government, that feeling came back to haunt me. On September 11, 2001, the United States experienced the largest terrorist attack on its soil in history, and the obsolescence of the government was put into stark relief. Organizations that had defeated the Nazis, the Japanese, and then the Soviet Union, were no match for a handful of terrorists. With the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the defense establishment had to face up to the fact that it had been built in another era and was practically impotent in the face of problems of the twenty-first century.

Four Septembers later, the government failed once again. When a massive hurricane hit New Orleans, the wealthiest government in the world was caught unaware and unprepared. In the pictures beamed round the world, the US government looked no more competent than one in the third world when it came to protecting the health and welfare of its citizens.

In the coming century, the US will look to government to fight a war on terror; deal with the potentially emergent economies of China and India; fund the enormous retirement and health care costs of an aging population; and cope with unanticipated crises, many of which will be natural in cause. It goes without saying that this will cost a great deal of money. But, of equal, if not greater importance is the fact that this will require a government more flexible, more creative, and more able to cope with uncertainty than the government of the twentieth century. My new book, *The End of Government as We Know It: Making Public Policy Work*, is dedicated to the topic of policy implementation in this new century. It is a book about the business of government that goes beyond the ends, to grapple with the means of government.

The cases in this panel transcend the tired politics of the left and the right, presenting a new way of governing—one that is more modern, more flexible, and less bureaucratic. It shows how, by looking beyond bureaucratic options, we can increase the capacity and effectiveness of government in the twenty-first century. And, I am very happy today to have three innovators who will present examples of such new forms of public policy development. The first of the innovations will be presented by Lee Bowes, President of America Works. America Works is one of the oldest and most respected welfare-to-work organizations. In 1996, when welfare reform was enacted in the United States, this company led the way in offering former welfare recipients the skills that allowed them to successfully transition to employment. Next, we will hear from Martyantonett Flumian, who will describe the successful collaborative efforts of the Canadian subnational and national governments in citizen identification. Finally, Carlo Flammet, of Formez, will talk about how the Italian government is eliminating duplicative waste in program development, by sharing best practices and lessons learned.

Elaine C. Kamarck is a Lecturer in Public Policy who came to the Harvard Kennedy School in 1997 after a career in politics and government. In the 1980s, she was one of the founders of the New Democrat movement that helped elect Bill Clinton president. She served in the White House from 1993 to 1997, where she created and managed the Clinton Administration's National Performance Review, also known as reinventing government. At the Kennedy School, Dr. Kamarck served as Director of Visions of Governance for the Twenty-First Century and as Faculty Advisor to the Innovations in American Government Awards Program. In 2000, she took a leave of absence to work as Senior Policy Advisor to

the Gore campaign. She conducts research on twenty-first century government, the role of the Internet in political campaigns, homeland defense, intelligence reorganization, and governmental reform and innovation. Kamarck received her doctorate in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Kamarck is the author of *The End of Government as We Know It: Policy Implementation in the 21st Century*.

21st Century Models of Governance

Shifting the Paradigm of Public Policy Delivery: The Role of America Works

Lee Bowes
awbowes@aol.com

What was the problem?

During the early 1980s, welfare rolls were skyrocketing even as unemployment was falling. There was interest in creating solutions to this problem: public sentiment had turned against the US welfare model and government seemed unable to create a new public policy model for gainfully employing welfare recipients.

What was the innovation?

America Works designed a program that demonstrated that women on welfare wanted work, not welfare, and could be successful in obtaining and keeping jobs. By proposing a plan where recipients would only be paid if they got and kept a job for six months, America Works was able to present a package to state governments showing a tremendous return on investment. America Works showed that by quickly getting someone a job and building support services, such as job coaching and outside social services, the retention rates and success of the model was very attractive to the government.

America Works created a market for its company in Ohio, Connecticut, and New York by running successful demonstrations for each state in major cities. These demonstrations gained national publicity. Politicians and their staffs traveled to the sites to learn more about how they could reduce welfare, get people working, and reduce costs. At the same time, the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) and the Manhattan Institute began to write about and study the effects of the broader issues of welfare reform. They wrote articles, which included America Works and had outside researchers conduct studies.

What were the obstacles?

State and federal laws prevented new forms of program delivery, including performance-based contracting.

What were the results?

Members of Congress began to introduce bills for welfare reform. This included both Republicans and Democrats. Finally, in 1996, Bill Clinton signed historic federal welfare reform legislation. At that point, America Works expanded its programs to both using its model to run programs and consulting with groups concerning how to market the population to the business community. Twelve years later, welfare rolls have decreased 60% nationwide. Through a creative partnership between first local, and then federal, governments, the hands-on experience of America Works helped (as one of many players) shape a government reform that most agree has been uniquely successful.

Lee Bowes is Chief Executive Officer at America Works, a post she has held since 1987. While a graduate student at Columbia University's School of Social Work, she formulated her theory that employment should be central to social policy. Rather than emphasizing income support and social services, policy should be directed toward providing jobs. In 1978, Dr. Bowes joined the nonprofit Transitional Employment Enterprises (TEE). The Ford Foundation and MDRC (formerly, the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation) founded TEE to operate the national supported work demonstration. It was here that she designed the private sector model that is the foundation of America Works. Currently, Dr. Bowes directs all activities of America Works' \$7 million business. America Works is a 25-year-old, for-profit company that has placed over 100,000 people in jobs throughout the United States. America Works has advocated such policy initiatives as welfare reform; performance-based contracting; work first; and, most recently, prison-to-work. Dr. Bowes also serves as an Adjunct Professor at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs, where she lectures on human resource management, social policy, and innovative management techniques. She has recently completed a book on human resource management under contract with Harpers, and she is widely published in journals such as *The New Democrat*, *The Entrepreneurial Economy*, and *Social Policy Research*. Dr. Bowes is a frequent guest and speaker at associations on welfare-to-work. Most recently, she has appeared at the Public Welfare Association, the Democratic Leadership Council, the Renaissance Weekend, and the Association of Community Development Corporations. She holds a doctorate in Sociology from Boston University.

21st Century Models of Governance

The Role of BuoniEsempi.it (Good Practices in Public Administration)

Carlo Flamment
presidenza@formez.it

What was the problem?

Successful public administration experiences in Italy were usually framed in a local context. When a local Italian authority encountered a problem, it created and implemented a project without knowing that a local authority in another Italian region had already been implemented the same project. The lack of promoting, sharing and enhancing Italian experiences in innovation caused a considerable waste of energies in terms of costs and efforts. The project BuoniEsempi.it (Good Practices in Public Administration) is changing that.

What was the innovation?

BuoniEsempi.it (www.buoniesempi.it) represents the most comprehensive data bank of innovations in public administration in Italy. The BuoniEsempi.it data bank has been in operation since May 2003. The data bank collects projects and successful experiences in innovation from all levels of government: central, local, even primary and secondary schools and academies. It promotes the value of each “good practice” in a context that stresses the transferability of learning and experience. BuoniEsempi.it is also a way of sharing learning; for example, training sessions focus on models of innovation and interactive communication methodologies for both the Internet and digital television. In other words, learning is even available through one’s personal computer at home or one’s mobile telephone.

The BuoniEsempi.it database currently houses about 2,250 projects, organized and classified by content criteria. It includes project support documentation, and shares operating materials, guides, interactive tools and papers from laboratories. The data bank is updated weekly through cooperation with the administrations themselves, and a dedicated staff of high-level editors.

Beginning in July 2004, an international section of the Web site (international.buoniesempi.it) became operational. Its aim is to share experiences in innovation, to collect European good practices, and to foster horizontal cooperation among public administrations in Europe.

What were the obstacles?

The lack of a “digital culture” made it difficult, in the beginning, to make the BuoniEsempi.it project understood among potential contributors and users. Access to the Internet is growing quite quickly in Italy, yet we still have to work to stimulate a culture of interaction among all levels of public administration. Also, “learning from sharing” experiences is a concept that still needs to be promoted in the public administration.

What are the results?

There are myriad results. One very interesting project is Partecipa.net (www.partecipa.net), which is an e-democracy project of the Emilia-Romagna Region of 4 million inhabitants. It began in September 2005, and is one example of institutional collaboration that promotes participation through the new mechanisms and a new information system.

The project includes the following areas: digital citizenship development, information society actions and projects, cooperation among government administrations, and networks and technologies. It was created through a partnership that includes 22 public administrations and nine associations from the region. It uses and integrates best practices developed regionally: UNOX1, Demos, and CRC (regional centers of competence in e-government). It provides for evaluation of results and has created a committed working community. According to Partecipa.net, e-democracy allows the local government to reach the following objectives:

- a) It improves administrative transparency that increases institutions' and citizens' attitudes towards self-responsibility, and promotes collective learning by spreading and sharing information too often not well understood by citizen.
- b) It increases the effectiveness of administrative actions and supports political institutions in defining problems through appropriate analysis and evaluation of solutions.
- c) It increases the efficiency of administrative actions and broadens the approval area of the administrations.

As of today, Partecipa.net involves 42% of about 88% of Emilia-Romagna population over the age of 15. That percentage corresponds to the population of seven municipalities and two provinces. It is equivalent to more than 1,600,000 inhabitants. The project pays particular attention to young people, focusing on students of the regional high schools, aiming to involve at least 20% of them (about 24,000 students). Currently, six administrations of different institutional levels (regions, countries, and municipalities) have implemented the toolkit provided by Partecipa.net. They have created more than 100 online informative newsletters, 15 discussion forums, and 10 mailboxes for questions. In the same

Emilia-Romagna region, they have also implemented indicators for measuring government performance, with quite a good success in improving the performance and quality of services.

The participation toolkit has always been thought to be an easy tool that can be used by all agencies. Its greatest benefit is its ability to be adapted and reused. In fact, it consists of different tools, which work separately or together, to match the needs of the different citizens groups. The kit software modules are very affordable. The innovative aspects of Partecipa.net have also been recognized by the United Nations. The project was selected as a finalist for the UNPSA (United Nations Public Service Award) in 2007.

Carlo Flamment was born in Rome in 1955. In 1978, he graduated from the La Sapienza University in Rome with a First Class Honors Degree in Economics. Between 1977 and 1978, he studied at the London School of Economics. Then he attended courses in management, finance, and business at IMEDE (now IMD) and INSEAD Business Schools in Fontainebleau, France, and Lausanne, Switzerland, respectively. Mr. Flamment then became a Member of the Board of Directors of the Financial Investment Agency of the Regione Lazio (Filas), and in 1993 was elected President of Filas. From 1993 to 1997, he held the position of Councilor and President of the Council Committee “Roma Capitale” for the Jubilee 2000. In December 1999, he was nominated as President of FORMEZ, a position he currently holds.

21st Century Models of Governance

Identity Management: Unlocking the Door to Multi-jurisdictional Collaboration in Transforming Service

Maryantonett Flumian
maryantonett.flumian@uottawa.ca

What was the problem?

Research in Canada and around the world shows that citizens continue to find government complex, fragmented, frustrating, and hard to access. What citizens say they want is timely, consistent, personalized, and convenient service. They will consent to sharing information if it is more convenient to transact their business with government. With their consent, information given to one government agency can be accessed by multiple jurisdictions. With appropriate protection, access to information enables governments to serve citizens in a far more transparent fashion while reducing the costs to government. The process of establishing and “creating” identity begins at birth. This is one of the most important roles that governments will continue to play.

A short time ago in Canada, registering a birth in the province of Ontario was a lengthy and time-consuming process. It was complicated and actually engaged governments across departmental and jurisdictional boundaries. It involved many departments and multiple forms. Some of the process had to be undertaken in person and some by mail. The application and issuance of documents had to follow a predetermined sequencing that was not obvious to citizens.

At a minimum, parents had to complete three separate paper applications for three different levels of government. They included obtaining a birth registration, a birth certificate, and a Social Insurance Number. After submitting the birth registration to the municipality, they had to wait to receive confirmation before they could apply for a birth certificate from the province. Then when the birth certificate arrived, they could apply to the federal government for a Social Insurance Number.

What was the innovation?

Working in close partnership, the province of Ontario and Service Canada introduced the Newborn Registration Service, an innovation that enables parents to register their baby's birth, apply for the child's birth certificate and their Social Insurance number, all at the same time. Before parents leave the hospital, they are provided with a birth information package that encourages them to apply for their baby's registration online. When they do so, they are offered the additional service of requesting their baby's birth certificate and Social Insurance Number without having to go through three separate processes and application forms and without having to duplicate the required information.

What were the obstacles?

In Canada, the constitution mandates that the management of vital events information be handled at the provincial level. Over time, this has resulted in all levels of government collecting information and managing it in their own way for their own purposes. Understanding this and scrutinizing it has allowed multiple levels of government to work together in a very different way.

It took a great deal of dialogue, time, and trust to build relationships that allowed all governmental actors to put the interests of the citizen ahead of program, budget, and traditional methods of delivery that had resulted in the existing systems. All jurisdictions had to trust that one could collect and manage the transfer of information to all. They had to believe that this would enhance the integrity and quality of data to all.

Through the partnership, new possibilities were explored for changes and improvements. The team had to answer such questions as: Is it really possible to collect information once and use it often? How would privacy protection, accuracy, and transparency of citizen information be enhanced? How could jurisdictions improve collection and use of

information? And, finally, could service be provided for multiple jurisdictions at point of contact?

Senior levels of management at both the federal and provincial governments had to be engaged. A dedicated project management team was established to sort out the issues associated with implementation. A joint business and technology team was also appointed to work through all of the business issues. These groups reported all obstacles back to a Steering Committee. The process took over two years to make implementation of the service a reality. The teams were multidisciplinary. They involved policy, program, operations, legal, and technology expertise.

What were the results?

By streamlining the three application processes into one integrated online service, the Newborn Registration Service has cut the time for processing important identity documents in half. Continuing improvements in the processes continue to result in enhanced speed of service and further cutting the processing time from months to weeks.

In addition to increasing operational efficiencies and speed of service, the Newborn Registration Service offers parents the assurance that the privacy of their personal information is protected. The service has the advantage of enhancing the data that is captured and maintained in provincial and federal registers. The electronic application process greatly reduces the number of errors that tend to plague paper-based processes.

There is no doubt that developing partnerships leverages the potential for collaboration across governments. By leveraging each other's capabilities, governments are able to improve service, and at the same time, lower costs. The collaborative potential is enormous. This partnership also allowed governments to share "the back office". As confidence has grown as a result of this success, the parties are increasingly looking for ways to increase the members to the partnership, adding greatly to the numbers of services that can now be added. Programs and services now under consideration include health cards, passports, child education savings grants, child tax benefits, and childcare payments. The possibilities are endless. In the process, two levels of government working together have also "created" a very direct link between the role of governments in managing identity on a continuum that begins at birth and includes services and programs. Citizens' expectations that multiple levels of government with complementary programs work together to achieve interlinked outcomes has also been achieved. This was achieved by understanding that managing identity in a collaborative fashion provides the backbone to "joining up" services from many jurisdictions.

Maryantonett Flumian is Senior Fellow in the Program for Networked Government at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa, Canada. She holds

a bachelor's in History from the University of Toronto, a master's in History from the University of Ottawa, and is completing her doctoral studies at the University of Ottawa on the administrative history of the Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada. At the University of Ottawa, she has also been an Executive-in-Residence and the 2006 Jarislowsky Chair in Public Management. Professor Flumian is a seasoned senior executive at the Deputy Minister level in the Canadian federal Public Service with more than 20 years of large-scale operational experience in the economic, social, and federal and provincial domains. She is the visionary that created Service Canada, the federal government's focal point for one-stop service delivery to Canadians that places the needs, expectations and priorities of citizens and communities at the center of the design and delivery of services. Professor Flumian sits on the advisory board of the Harvard Policy Group for Network-Enabled Services and Government of the Leadership for a Networked World Program at the Harvard Kennedy School. She also serves on the advisory group of the Government 2.0: Wikinomics, Government and Democracy global research project.