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Editor's Note

Since my first meeting with the OpenGov team at the Office of Personnel Management, I have been impressed with their perspective and deep understanding of the complexities of implementing open government. During the planning stages for the focus forum on Owning Transparency, it became clear that what they were trying to accomplish was deeper and more sustainable than the efforts put forth by most agencies in their Open Government Plans. I attribute this to their early realization that technology alone would not accomplish their goals. Their flagship OpenGov initiative is an agency-wide knowledge management system, and while setting this up and turning it on would be relatively simple, they saw that the real challenge was getting employees to abandon the seven current knowledge management systems spread across the agency, and instead focus their efforts on the new agency-wide system.

This line of thinking led to some unique initiatives and ultimately, the creation of this guide.

Wayne Moses Burke
Executive Director, Open Forum Foundation
Executive Summary

An open, transparent and participatory government is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. These are the democratic principles upon which our country is built. Internet-based tools and technologies have made it easier to realize these values. Officially recognized by President Obama’s January 21, 2009 Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government, two-way, interactive web 2.0 tools and technologies make information sharing, citizen participation, and public and private sector collaboration easier than ever before.

Transparency of government practices and information, both within government agencies and between the government and its stakeholders, is the heart of open government. Transparency is as much about open-mindedness and information sharing, as it is about increased communication and information access. Citizen engagement, public-private sector partnerships, and inter-agency initiatives are all predicated upon transparency.

Transparency fosters the engagement of government employees and citizens alike, so they feel a part of the conversation, process, and decisions; and, thereby, a part of their government. This heightened sense of ownership, accountability, and trust makes government more responsive and enables agencies to more efficiently and effectively accomplish their missions: from government operations to government products.

Despite the efforts by government and private organizations to increase government transparency over the past few years, the results of transparency efforts have been met with mixed reviews. Critics argue that the focus on transparency as the end-state is the error: transparency is an
operating state; it is not a goal, in and of itself. Proponents point out that the public value of transparency of information/data is an increased trust in the responsiveness of government.

Although we talk of open government as a panacea, full government transparency is not only not possible; it’s not necessarily the ideal. The digital environment not only makes transparency easier, but also amplifies the volume of data making it difficult to locate and retrieve data, increases the speed of both technical innovation and obsolescence, enhances expectations for customized access to data and information, and heightens cybersecurity risks. Transparency must be counterbalanced with maintaining citizens’ privacy, protecting national security, and the costs associated with the technical capacity of government to make information available and accessible.

To harness the benefits of transparency while simultaneously mitigating the risks, agencies must align their organizational strategies, systems, values, and culture with open government principles. Transparency must become a part of the organization's ecosystem.

Culture change doesn’t “just happen.” Creating transparency in a government agency requires a directed, proactive effort that is driven by its leadership's vision and supported at all levels by a strategic plan; implements support mechanisms to transform the agency; and actively builds understanding, engagement, and support from employees and external stakeholders alike.

The Office of Personnel Management’s (OPM’s) Core and Component Team governance structure, Action Learning approach, IdeaFactory employee idea-sourcing platform, Results-Oriented Work Environment pilot, and the focus forum Owning Transparency are all examples of how OPM is using transparent processes to transform itself into an open agency.
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Introduction

On February 18th, 2011, OPM hosted a focus forum at their headquarters in Washington, DC entitled Owning Transparency: People, Processes, and Technology. Spawned from the agency's concern for the sustainability of its flagship OpenGov initiative, it reached out beyond agency boundaries to get inter-agency and extra-governmental advice through a collaborative process that engaged OPM employees, federal employees from other agencies, and external stakeholders (such as representatives of private companies and academia). This four-hour event fostered new thinking and captured potential solutions around the topics of the value of transparency to an agency, implementing sustainable OpenGov efforts, and internal culture change.

The Guide to Owning Transparency

The purpose of this guide is to provide new perspectives on the rationale for governmental transparency and its implementation. It examines multiple facets of transparency by blending research and practice, and ultimately provides a Framework to Owning Transparency that we hope will be useful to federal government agencies. It is written for federal government personnel at all levels, researchers and practitioners interested in the issues of transparency, and transparency advocates in non-profit organizations.

The foundation of this guide is the rich idea exchange that happened during the focus forum. The discussions during this event, as well as notes captured by writers during each breakout session to give a voice to participants, were typed and analyzed for emerging themes by volunteer contributors from the OPM Open Government Component Teams.
Other sources for the guide include responses to the question “How Can an Agency Benefit from Transparency?” and other blog posts on GovLoop.com, a social network for government employees. The guide also incorporates the results from recent research about transparency conducted by the volunteer contributors. The structure of the guide was determined by the volunteers, who defined topics for each chapter of the guide. Chapters were written separately by individual volunteer authors, with the exception of the final chapter, which is a multi-author collaboration.

This Guide aims to provide new context and knowledge to anyone interested in federal government transparency. It may be read straight through or as individual chapters, as they are only loosely integrated. Chapter 1 defines transparency in all of its complexity. Chapter 2 considers the value that the public gains from a transparent government. Chapter 3 investigates the benefits that the government itself may gain from implementing sustainable transparency. Chapter 4 looks at technical constraints that need to be considered when implementing transparency, and Chapter 5 evaluates the cultural barriers and what can be done about them. Chapter 6 presents an overview of what factors inside an agency create a fertile foundation for transparency to take root, and Chapter 7 presents a Framework for Owning Transparency utilizing OPM’s current initiatives as examples where appropriate.
“...transparency means making the government processes and law-making as comprehensible as possible so that they are more easily understood by the public, as well as engaging citizens and enabling them to provide feedback on government activities.”

CHAPTER 1

What is Transparency?
by Irina V. Popova-Nowak, Ph.D.

With increased attention on the issue of transparency in modern politics, researchers and practitioners agree that overall, transparency means making the government processes and law-making as comprehensible as possible so that they are more easily understood by the public, as well as engaging citizens and enabling them to provide feedback on government activities (Birkinshaw, 2006; White House, January 21, 2009; Ferranti, 2009). Making the governance process comprehensible includes opening the government to public scrutiny by disclosing the “observable records of official decisions and activities,” providing fast access to these records, and providing reasoned explanations for government decisions (Birkinshaw, 2006, p. 189; Quinn, 2003).

Origins of Transparency

The notion of transparency can be traced to the Founding Fathers’ belief in the open official publishing of government information and the necessity of providing information access to citizens as a precondition for the existence of a democratic society that requires citizen’s active engagement in the dialogue on social and political issues (Jaeger, 2005). A crucial step in facilitating access to government information was the passage of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) in 1966 that made the U.S. “the first nation with a law guaranteeing a legal right to request government information” (Jaeger & Bertot, 2010, p. 371; Quinn, 2003; for an overview and relevant legislation see McDermott, 2010; for a more detailed discussion of this legislation as it relates to transparency and its history, see Chapter 4 of this guide). FOIA enables federal agencies...
to negotiate between the public’s right to know and justified needs for secrecy, giving citizens a mechanism for requesting information that would otherwise not be released.

In the past two decades, the Internet and information technologies have revolutionized dissemination of government information. President Obama’s Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government signed January 21, 2009 recognized these new technologies and their crucial role in rapidly disclosing information “in forms that the public can readily find and use.” The President challenged executive departments and agencies to “harness new technologies to put information about their operations and decisions online and readily available to the public.” Executive departments and agencies are also expected to solicit public feedback to identify information of greatest use to the public (White House, January 21, 2009).

Access to government information has been facilitated by several websites such as Regulations.gov, which was created in the early 2000s to inform citizens about tools to find proposed regulations, USAspending.gov (2006) that provides information on federal contract spending, and Data.gov (2009) that posts downloadable datasets, provides examples of data use, and offers opportunities to submit proposals for improvement. In the legislative branch, the Congressional Transparency Caucus (2010) adopted a set of principles to guide legislation and formalize transparency into federal law (Dawes, 2010).

Transparency has been promoted by several public advocacy organizations, for instance Sunshine Week, a national initiative to encourage an ongoing discussion related to transparency, and the Open Government Working Group that brings together thirty advocates of open government. The group has suggested eight principles as regards to public access and use of government data: the data should be complete, primary, timely, accessible, machine-processable, non-discriminatory, non-proprietary, and license-free (Opengovdata.org, 2007). Another example is OMB Watch, an advocacy organization based in Washington, DC that convened an independent task force to focus on transparency in the rulemaking process and produced recommendations on improving transparency in July 2008. The recommendations included improving the FOIA request process and encouraging proactive release of government agency records using online document repositories (Coglianese, 2009).

Despite the government and public efforts, the results of transparency
initiatives have been mixed. For example, an audit of the FOIA administration by federal agencies conducted by the National Security Archive at the George Washington University revealed that only a minority of agencies made improvements to their FOIA practices (White, 2010). A survey of 5,107 Americans by ForeSee Results and Nextgov in August-September 2010 revealed that all federal agencies scored low on a 100-point transparency scale with the White House receiving the highest scores and Congress receiving the lowest (ForeSee Results, 2010; OMB Watch, 2010). On the other hand, the annual report of ForeSee Results that measures government website visitors’ perceptions of transparency using the E-Government Transparency Index shows that citizens’ ratings of online transparency are high (76.2 on a 100-point scale), yet there is little progress over the past year (Feed, 2011).

**Dimensions of Transparency**

Debates around transparency have highlighted its several dimensions. As pointed out by the participants of the focus forum, transparency is both a principle and a practice. As a principle, it highlights what a government agency should aspire to do in order to become transparent, and as a practice, it is the specific actions that enable a government agency to become more transparent to its employees and external stakeholders through, for instance, improved communication.

An important dimension of transparency is defining what information to disclose to the public. As the focus forum participants noted, “transparency does not come from 10,000-page reports produced at the end of a project,” since a “technical report for experts is perhaps not suitable for/understanding by the general public.” In other words, transparency is not just “a data dump that has no context or tells no story.” Participants advocated what Coglianese (2009) calls “reasoned” transparency that “demands that government officials offer explicit explanations for their actions” and show why alternative decisions or actions were rejected (p. 537), as opposed to the “fishbowl” transparency where every move of a government official may be observed and scrutinized. As one focus forum participant remarked, transparency is defined “not just by ‘what’ but ‘how’ you communicate.” Reasoned transparency does not mean that “they can force you to change your actions or give them the opportunity to affect the outcome of your actions.” As revealed in the stories shared by the focus forum participants,
reasoned transparency has a potential of making an impact and facilitating greater understanding of issues related to government activities by the public.

Another dimension of transparency is its internal vs. external nature. In other words, transparency can involve making agency data and policies available within the agency by its employees (internal transparency), or outside the agency to external stakeholders (external transparency). There is also a temporal dimension of transparency, since it is not only about fast access to information that people seek at the moment (short-term transparency), but about making this information accessible long-term (long-term transparency), as discussed in more details in Chapter 4 of this guide. The use of social media may create challenges for transparency, since a key precondition of transparency is the ability to locate and retrieve information, and the growing amount of government information being distributed through social media could impede people's ability to locate and retrieve this information (Jaeger & Bertot, 2010; Jaeger, 2005).

As pointed out above, transparency that is focused on access to government information (Quinn, 2003) has drawn the most attention of researchers and practitioners given the advances of information technologies. However, government agencies have to make sure that the information is not damaged, is ready for use, and that its content is helpful and beneficial to intended users (Dawes, 2010). Jaeger and Bertot (2010) highlight three types of access to government information: physical access (being able to read it), intellectual access (being able to understand it), and social access (being able to share it). Information-based transparency also includes the holistic presentation of multiple views and perspectives on an issue for both citizens and government employees alike, as pointed out by Jaeger (2005) and the focus forum participants. One participant, for instance, remarked that “decisions are ‘smarter and wiser’ when you have a diversity of perspectives… smart business gives you access to perspectives/knowledge you might otherwise not have.”

At the same time, as the focus forum participants noted, transparency is larger than access to information and communication. In their view, human factors that support transparency include a state of mind and willingness of an agency to make itself an object of public scrutiny (cf. Jaeger & Bertot, 2010). The forum participants also noted that transparency includes citizen-centeredness of federal agencies, employees’ eagerness to share knowledge and information, commitment to ongoing

"Decisions are 'smarter and wiser' when you have a diversity of perspectives... smart business gives you access to perspectives/knowledge you might otherwise not have."
- Focus Forum Participant
learning, as well as willingness to break down silos and to communicate across department and agency boundaries. On the part of the citizens, transparency involves active engagement in government initiatives through information search and submitting feedback to government agencies.

**Conclusion**

Transparency is a complex construct with a long history that implies increased government openness to public scrutiny, increased citizens’ access to government information and engagement in the decision-making process, and making agencies more transparent to their employees through facilitating access to information, knowledge sharing and collaboration. With the advance of technology, the primary focus of transparency initiatives of the federal agencies has been on access to information, though transparency also includes behaviors, attitudes, and practices of both citizens and government employees.
Understanding the value of transparency is an area that deserves closer attention. Many critics of government transparency efforts have asked how transparency is assessed, wondering if open government efforts have really increased openness. However, a different question may bring us closer to understanding the idea of openness; namely, a question of how public value can accrue as a result of an open government initiative. “Without timely, comprehensive, reliable, and relevant information (as described by Ferranti, 2009), citizens are unable to hold government accountable for their actions. In a representative democracy, in which citizens delegate authority for decision making, such information is essential in providing a continuing basis for consent. Transparency is the way government makes data and documents available to society in order to understand and assess government action” (Harrison et al., 2011).

By taking a public value perspective, the notion of pursuing transparency is assessed by identifying its value (e.g. social, political, strategic, financial, ideological, etc). The end goal is to accrue public value and transparency is the means to achieve it. That is, transparency is not an end society pursues for its own sake.

Citizens may desire that their government be transparent, but that is largely because something else is at stake: their ability to hold government accountable. Information and actions must be transparent in order to assess the concrete outcomes of government action or to prompt some other kind of action. In short, more information allows a particular...
stakeholder to do something, which will result in a form of public value. It comes down to determining what types of transparency initiatives deliver the most public value.

Public Value

Public value is not a new concept. As Moore (1995) points out, administrative organizations make decisions that are inevitably political and makes the case that managers must determine how best to make such decisions. Just as private sector organizations create “private value” for their owners, public value yields benefits for citizens and a wide range of other stakeholders (Harrison et al., 2011).

Open government efforts, at the most basic level, are designed to produce benefits. The creation of public value is foundational to the principles on which democratic governments are founded and organized. Public value, in the most general sense, is linked to individual and societal interests and to the institutional forms and actions of government. But employing the public value proposition in efforts for opening government requires a deeper examination of an overriding assumption about open government—that it is a good idea and that the value and benefits are largely self-evident.

That assumption may be a good starting point, but alone it is a poor foundation for assessing the results of existing open government efforts or for planning and implementing new ones. Those activities require answers to the basic assessment questions: Good or valuable in what sense? For whom? By what mechanisms? Under what conditions?

The public value assessment begins by distinguishing between the intrinsic value of government as a societal asset and the instrumental value of government actions and policies that deliver specific benefits directly to individuals, groups, or organizations. This distinction extends the idea of public value beyond financial and other private returns and is broader than estimates of aggregate economic or social benefits to a society (Cresswell et al., 2006).

This broader view includes public value that results from greater integrity and transparency of government, leading to increased trust and satisfaction with the government overall. But the public value is accrued not only to society as a whole, but also a very distinct set of stakeholders. Value is distributed across different stakeholders according to their particular interests and expectations for government. Understanding how
transparency leads to public value means considering a stakeholder point of view.

**Transparency to Whom?**

In order to identify and understand the public value impacts of any transparency initiative, an analysis must be completed against a comprehensive list of stakeholders. Particular groups of people with particular needs and desires will accrue different categories of value. Knowing who is impacted by an initiative is a critical element of identifying public value.

For example, if all stakeholders were treated the same, as like-minded citizens, outcomes would miss the mark. The range of stakeholders requires organizations to have an understanding of the possible benefits across diverse groups. Therefore, the concept of public value is a multidimensional set of outcomes that vary across stakeholder groups with interests linked to particular open government initiatives.

Completing an analysis of public value for any transparency initiative requires identifying those with an interest in the value generating process: the stakeholders. Identifying the stakeholders presents a critical element in the overall analysis and has three main parts:

1. identifying the persons or groups (including organizations) whose interests are potentially affected,
2. identifying what their specific interests may be, and
3. assessing their role and potential influence in the delivery of public value.

Identifying stakeholders for the framework will depend on in-depth knowledge of the context of the investment and the agencies involved in its development and use. Typically, stakeholder analysis engages a group of participants with extensive knowledge of the political and organizational setting of the investment and who hopefully have experience with this kind of analysis (Cresswell et al., 2006).

**Public Value Impacts**

In 2006, the Center for Technology in Government (CTG) released a report detailing new methods for defining, measuring, and
communicating public returns from information technology (IT) investments in the government sector (Cresswell et al., 2006). The report presents CTG’s public value framework and recommendations for using these methods in planning and decision making. As such, the framework presents a construct for understanding public value. The following are the value impacts stated within the framework:

- **Economic** - impacts on current or future income, asset values, liabilities, entitlements, or other aspects of wealth or risks to any of the above.
- **Political** - impacts on a person’s or group’s influence on government actions or policy, on their role in political affairs, influence in political parties, or prospects for public office.
- **Social** - impacts on family or community relationships, social mobility, status, and identity.
- **Strategic** - impacts on a person’s or group’s economic or political advantage or opportunities, goals, and resources for innovation or planning.
- **Quality of Life** - impacts on individual and household health, security, satisfaction, and general wellbeing.
- **Ideological** - impacts on beliefs, moral, or ethical commitments, alignment of government actions or policies or social outcomes with beliefs, moral, or ethical positions.
- **Stewardship** - impacts on the public’s view of government officials as faithful stewards or guardians of the value of the government in terms of public trust, integrity, and legitimacy.

**Public Value Mechanisms**

By looking at a transparency initiative and identifying the basic types of value impacts, we can start to understand what the end results might be for a set of stakeholders. But in order to know how that value gets generated we must identify the mechanisms or the “means” to that end. More specifically, we need to answer these questions: Value in what sense? How is value generated? For whom, by what mechanisms, and under what conditions?

The following mechanism categories help identify how the value is generated and thus uncover specific stakeholder interests. More specifically, the means are described by the following categories:
- **Efficiency** - changes in the outputs or goal attainment with the same resources, or obtaining the same outputs or goals with lower resource consumption.

- **Effectiveness** - changes in the quality and/or quantity of the desired outcome.

- **Intrinsic enhancements** - changing the environment or circumstances of a stakeholder in ways that are valued for their own sake.

- **Transparency** - changes in access to information about the actions of government officials or operation of government programs that enhances accountability or citizen influence on government.

- **Participation** - changes in frequency and intensity of direct citizen involvement in decision making about or operation of government programs or in selection of or actions of officials.

- **Collaboration** - changes in frequency or duration of activities in which more than one set of stakeholders share responsibility or authority for decisions about operation, policies, or actions of government.

**Transparency and Public Value**

As Fung (2010) states, transparency is not an unalloyed good. Maximizing the transparency of government processes, for example, may bring into sharp focus the ways in which government decision making is problematic, without due regard for the goods and benefits that are produced along with these problems.

Many might argue that transparency itself is the public value. But public value is the benefit achieved by some government action, such as the release of data. In that example, transparency is the action of releasing the data; the benefits from that action are still undefined. This perspective may take some getting used to, but it is based on the premise that organizations work to yield value for stakeholders. In this case, government works to provide public value to a range of individuals and organizations.

The actions government takes to become transparent may have the effect of enabling a citizen to derive substantive financial, social, political, or strategic values, as well as intrinsic value related to government itself. The open government principles can be relatively easy to operationalize. However, implementation without reference to value carries the risk that such actions will not translate to real change. Transparency, for example,
will not be achieved through merely downloading data sets. The data sets must consist of reliable and valid data, the data must be useful, and, most crucially, they must enable citizens to do something they find valuable and important. If not, transparency will not yield its intended impacts and as such hold no true public value.

**Conclusion**

The open government principle of transparency is best viewed as a strategy that government uses to accomplish its objectives, which should already be rooted in public values. More specifically, transparency can be viewed as a mechanism to achieving a greater good that both government and society desire.

It is important to note that the public value analysis is just one piece of information among many that leaders can use to make decisions. And public value analysis generates needed information, but must complement information generated by cost-benefit and risk analyses. A holistic picture of open government efforts includes both an identification of impact value and a more detailed analysis of cost and risk. For example, when an agency is planning to make data accessible, it incorporates several factors into that decision making, such as the costs associated with changing policies and practices. Releasing a data set may yield very high public value to some stakeholders, but it needs to be balanced with the real costs associated in making it happen.

A tool to assist governments in identifying the public value of their open government efforts can be found at [http://www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/online/pvat/](http://www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/online/pvat/). The Open Government Portfolio Public Value Assessment Tool (PVAT) offers a structured way to assess the public value of an initiative so that an agency can review the expected public value across its entire portfolio of open government initiatives.

Finally, open government holds the promise of changing the relationship between stakeholder and government, specifically by modifying the historical push/pull tension between them. There is great hope that it will produce more innovative forms of organizing and more access and use of government data and information. But while this implementation is still underway, a public value analysis may be the best possible argument for stimulating and justifying such changes.
CHAPTER 3

Benefits of Transparency in the Federal Government
Adelaide O’Brien, MBA, MPA

By engaging key stakeholders through use of technology, transparent and open government provides a voice for government employees and citizens alike. This personal engagement fosters credibility and trust in government’s decision-making attributes that support preparedness for situations when things go wrong. Transparency is smart business for government that provides access to perspectives/knowledge that the government has.

Empowering Citizens and Government Employees

Transparency enables government employees to build trust with internal and external stakeholders and gain credibility in addition to sharing knowledge. One focus forum participant indicated that transparency has the ability to change the negative perception of the federal government and restore public trust in government “to levels not seen since WWII.” Transparency can enhance the credibility of government decision-making; it breaks down barriers and bridges the divide between government and citizens, providing an opportunity for learning on all sides of an issue; and it has the real potential to reduce/eliminate any adversarial relationships that can develop when information is not shared nor understood.

When government starts with constituents in mind, and does what is best and most relevant for citizens and key stakeholders, transparency fosters the engagement of citizens so they feel a part of the conversation,
process, and decisions; thereby, a part of their government. This allows
government to be more responsive to the changing requirements of
citizens, and enables agencies to more effectively accomplish their
mission.

In addition to empowering citizens to be a part of their government,
transparency and openness give a new voice to government employees,
often unleashing innovative ideas through opening new lines of
communication. Transparency makes the internal workings of the
department more understandable by making data and resources available
to employees and internal departments of the agency, or by making this
data available to other agencies. Agencies such as OPM are establishing
knowledge management systems that would enable collaboration and
engagement, and getting buy-in from employees to use such systems to
improve their productivity and responsiveness.

**Improving Morale and Trust in Government Agencies**

Internal transparency improves trust and morale in an agency. If
an agency is willing to not only share new information, but also elicit
and listen to employees’ feedback, it takes transparency to a whole new
level of supporting the other pillars of open government, fostering
collaboration and participation by employees and citizens, leading to
innovations in the operations and services of an agency. More and more
agencies are discussing culture change that involves front line employees
earlier and more frequently in decision making. Labor working directly
with management to formulate plans and strategies is a win-win for
both groups and enables the employees, who often are the first point of
contact for constituents, to be involved in the decision-making process.
Transparency also facilitates goal sharing with all employees. People
support what they help to create. One of the benefits of goal sharing is
that employees who clearly understand expectations and agency goals
(promotion potential, workload, individual recognition) are more willing
to work toward those goals. A benefit of getting management and labor
together in the beginning of idea/process/changes is employee buy-in.
Agencies can gain internal transparency through the establishment of
knowledge management systems, getting buy-in from employees to make
the systems useful, and through other means that enable collaboration and
engagement.

Interagency transparency is just as important as internal transparency.
In addition to having internal transparency between management and employees, agencies must also share information and communicate with other agencies to meet mission requirements and better serve their constituents.

A retired government employee who participated in the focus forum indicated that had there been better interagency communication and sharing of employee work history from the various agencies that they worked in, OPM could have computed their retirement benefits more accurately and efficiently, and the process would have been much less time consuming for them. The bottom line is that sharing information throughout a government entity results in customer service improvements.

**Transparency Benefits**

Collaboration and transparency are fundamental to making government more efficient, as they reduce costs through improved efficiencies of operation and less duplication of efforts. As pointed out by the focus forum participants, transparency enables government to deploy more efficient procurements, with less duplication of purchases by entities buying compatible technologies, and increases the ability to leverage solutions already deployed by other government entities. Open government prompts agencies to look at the technology environment from a collaborative level, better understanding what IT solutions other parts of the agency have in process or planned. This allows agencies to leverage existing solutions and/or share cross agency specifications to deploy more comprehensive solutions. By sharing planned solutions, agencies can avoid getting left behind in technologies most commonly used inside and outside their organization. Forum participants identified saving investment costs and resources as a major benefit of technology-sharing arrangements—critical during these times of tight budgets.

By providing high value data that is easier to find and use, and by providing contextual information that explains the significance of this data, governments can minimize the cost of information management, while maximizing the usefulness of the information provided to the public, businesses, and other government entities. An example is the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), an agency that makes regulatory compliance and administrative enforcement activities accessible, downloadable, and searchable online. The Enforcement and Compliance
History Online site of EPA (www.epa-echo.gov) provides EPA and state data, including inspections, violations, and enforcements of such things as the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and hazardous waste laws, for more than 800,000 regulated facilities. Users are able to mouse over icons to search for facilities, review state-by-state analytics and trends, and/or search results based on EPA and state high-priority violations. The EPA site also is able to accept comments from the public, and citizen participation is enhanced; for example, the public can flag errors in effluent charts, with suggested changes routed to the authorized state or EPA regional office where corrections can be made.

Another example of government dynamically sharing information is Recalls.gov—a mobile application of USA.gov. This application puts recalls at the public’s fingertips, provides vital safety information whenever and wherever citizens need it, and is a good example of using mash-up applications across agencies to better serve citizens and make information more meaningful, authentic, and timely. The Consumer Product Safety Commission, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Food and Drug Administration, and Department of Agriculture all monitor the safety of thousands of products and issue hundreds of recall announcements each year. Product recall information from these agencies is mashed up and available to citizens on their smartphones. This application allows citizens to stay informed and safe and access product recalls at their fingertips. Simply by typing a product’s name into their phone, citizens learn immediately whether that product has been recalled because of a safety concern. This application also provides product photos and instructions of how to dispose of recalled products.

Technologies that support transparency through accessible data repositories, unified communication, knowledge management systems, interactive websites, and mashups allow government entities to harness information that is difficult to obtain through more traditional channels, provide an opportunity for learning from all sides through a greater access to diversity of perspectives and knowledge, and thus allows for faster and wiser decisions.

Government agencies can achieve additional efficiencies through reduced data duplication, reduced project backlogs, and reduced errors from sharing a common database. By dynamically sharing information, agencies are able to reduce the time spent processing and searching for data. Data that is effectively managed represents increased opportunity,
less risk and liability exposure, effective utilization of resources, business effectiveness, and better delivery of mission.

Conclusion

Transparency and open government facilitate increased knowledge and understanding on the part of citizens and employees, provide an opportunity for learning on all sides of an issue, foster greater accountability on the part of government and citizens, and, ultimately, enhance public trust in government. Transparency is fundamental to making government more efficient, enabling each agency to more effectively accomplish its mission, and also be more responsive to the changing requirements of citizens.
Constraints on Transparency
Tom Moritz, BSFS, MLS

Transparency is an objective standard that focuses on the degree to which the structure, operations and work products of any organization, whether public or private, are visible and available to independent observers for analysis, assessment, and use. Reflecting on the value of transparency in all settings, the noted American jurist Louis Brandeis (1914) commented: “Publicity is justly commended as a remedy for social and industrial diseases. Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.”

In the private sector, transparency focuses on disclosures of information and data essential to the informed evaluation of the performance of for-profit corporations and not-for-profit organizations. In the public sector, open government seeks to improve the transparency of government operations so that both the government and the public can make well-informed judgments about the relative efficiency and effectiveness of government, about the success of government programs in meeting their intended missions. Thomas Jefferson argued that such transparency would enable “every member of Congress, and every man of any mind in the Union… to comprehend…, to investigate abuses, and consequently to control them…” (Jefferson, 1802, as quoted in Rawson and Miner, 2006).

Transparency in government also seeks to make usefully available the products of government activity such as research, monitoring, surveys, maps, images, documents, hearings, evaluations, software and regulatory decisions. As President Obama has noted in the Memorandum on the Freedom of Information Act (White House, January 20, 2009), these products of government are “national assets.”

In either respect, transparency is a fundamental precondition...
for healthy democratic government. Failure of transparency risks development of an “aristocracy of access”—access to the understanding of government or to the fruits of publicly-supported government activity. The deprivation of full access to information and data, particularly when coupled with civic illiteracy as a consequence of weakened public education, produces a weakened civil society.

As a corollary risk, the failure to achieve transparency, may also have a discouraging effect on democratic processes, when citizens—lacking access to government information—are held to be less qualified than those with privileged access, to make informed decisions about public policy (“Secrecy as a Policy Disabler,” Wills. 2010, p.161-174).

The recent decision by the U.S. National Science Foundation to require all grant applicants to submit data management plans as a part of their grant – effective in January 2011 – is strong indication of the heightened awareness of the value of transparency in the public sector. (NSF, 2011)

Of course, complete transparency is an ideal goal. In this chapter, we will focus primarily on legal and technical constraints acknowledging that they may be augmented by budgetary limitations. Cultural constraints, as they affect individuals or organizations, are addressed in Chapter 5. These constraints typically do not operate independently but act in combination to limit how transparency is actually accomplished.

Finally, while emphasis in this analysis is upon the executive branch of government, it is important to note that open government has strong implications for transparency by all branches of government: executive, legislative, and judicial.

Some History: Transparency in the “Hardcopy” Environment

In considering the challenges of transparency in the contemporary digital networked environment, it is helpful to consider how it has previously been addressed in the traditional “hardcopy” (or “analog”) environment of the pre-digital age. Historically, government information was primarily published and distributed in hardcopy, print-paper or other physical (“analog”) formats. Periodic published reports, Congressional hearings, and investigative journalism were often the primary source of insight into government operations. Original distribution of government publications was handled by an originating agency, by the Government
In 1813, Congress initiated efforts to insure the availability of government documents (U.S. GPO, 2009). This effort ultimately resulted in the Federal Depository Library Program to insure that published government documents were freely available for public access in every U.S. Congressional District (USC Title 44, Chapter 19). International access to the U.S. government information was primarily handled through the network of U.S. Information Agency information centers, through the international programs of the various federal departments or agencies, and through broadcast media. Access to unpublished government information was handled primarily by direct requests to the originating agency. For citizens frustrated in their quest for government information, Congressional offices were often the last recourse available. Management and retention/disposition of data and information were not consistently handled from agency to agency across the federal government.

In 1966, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) was signed into law with the intention of guaranteeing citizens’ rights to access to government information and for the purpose of standardizing modes of access to information across the government. The FOIA has been subject to modification and specifically several standard exemptions, reflecting concerns with both privacy and confidentiality have been recognized. These exemptions occur in Title 5 Section 552 of the U.S. Code:

“(1)(A) specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and (B) are in fact properly classified pursuant to such Executive order;
(2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency;
(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than section 552b of this title), provided that such statute (A) requires that the matters be withheld from the public in such a manner as to leave no discretion on the issue, or (B) establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld;
(4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential;
(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency;
(6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(7) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that the production of such law enforcement records or information (A) could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings, (B) would deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or an impartial adjudication, (C) could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, (D) could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of a confidential source, including a State, local, or foreign agency or authority or any private institution which furnished information on a confidential basis, and, in the case of a record or information compiled by a criminal law enforcement authority in the course of a criminal investigation or by an agency conducting a lawful national security intelligence investigation, information furnished by a confidential source, (E) would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or would disclose guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law, or (F) could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual;

(8) contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of an agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; or

(9) geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells.”

These exemptions and subsequent modifications offer ample protections against disclosures of information that might be damaging to individuals or to legitimate government operations. In general, they suggest two primary objective constraints on the complete disclosure of government information: *privacy* and *confidentiality*.

**Constraints on Transparency**

*Privacy*

Respecting the right to personal privacy, government is not free to disclose personally identifiable information (“PII”) without the formal consent of person or persons described (Warren & Brandeis, 1890; Smith, 2006). In the intensely networked Internet environment, there is well-
justified concern for the intentional or inadvertent disclosure of such personally identifiable information. Government must exercise all due caution in restricting disclosures of PII gathered as a necessary part of normal government functions. As the “human resources agency” for the federal government, OPM has a special obligation to maintain the difficult balance between protection of the privacy of individuals and provision of the operational details of government sufficient for objective scrutiny and evaluation.

Confidentiality

Respecting confidentiality, government is not free to disclose information which might jeopardize the security of the nation or which might disrupt the performance of legitimate government functions (Kosar, 2009). Nor may it disclose information that would be injurious to businesses in the competitive marketplace—unless disclosure of such information is directly relevant to public regulatory decisions.

The recent “Wikileaks” controversies have sharpened the focus on the need for the government to maintain appropriate levels of confidentiality about ongoing government activity, as pointed out by the participants of the focus forum. Yet, while, the mechanisms or the processes of disclosure should not hinder the deliberate, day-to-day processes that are normal to any organization—and that are essential to good government—concerns have been raised by some critics about the increased use of “classification” of government information as an unwarranted means of excluding government activities that should otherwise be subject to public scrutiny (Wills, 2010). Finding the proper balance between what is legitimately confidential and what is appropriately transparent remains a serious challenge.

Technical Capacity: “Data” and the Digital Environment

From a practical, operational standpoint, a third factor, technical capacity, may also operate to constrain best-possible transparency. In our contemporary digital environment, virtually all forms of data and information can be far more rapidly, efficiently, and widely disseminated than previously possible. Given this fact, government agencies are assumed to have adequate capacity to make their data and information available to clients and citizens. Yet, despite good faith intentions agencies
may lack necessary budget, technical infrastructure or knowledge of stakeholder needs to inform and support transparency.

In considering technical constraints on transparency, it is useful to first describe the primary characteristics of the digital environment in which technical capacity is developed.

**Definitions: “Data”?**

In current usage “data” has at least two distinct meanings. In the information technology community “data” commonly refers to any set of machine-readable code that allows information to be captured by, read by, stored in, accessed by, or shared by computers. This is the “bits and bytes” definition of “data”. In this sense, the National Science Foundation (NSF) DataNet program defines “data” as:

*Any information that can be stored in digital form and accessed electronically, including, but not limited to, numeric data, text, publications, sensor streams, video, audio, algorithms, software, models and simulations, images, etc.* (NSF, 2007)

For scientists and researchers, “data” has a second common meaning as:

*Precise, well-defined representations of observations, descriptions or measurements of a referent (object, phenomena or event) recorded and reported in some standard, well-specified way.* (AnthroDPA, 2009)

This second, more limited, definition is important in considering the way in which data is defined, described, and placed in context, to provide for online discovery and to support all appropriate uses. In making data and information transparently available for access and use by different audiences, government is responsible not merely for assuring that the authentic, original data are preserved and made available intact but also for insuring that meaningful descriptions, including citations of the provenance and lineage of original sources, are bound to, or closely associated with, those data.

**Challenges of the Digital Environment**

Government agencies are presumed to be capable of managing data and information in ways that conform to current best-practice community
standards for “full life cycle” management and in ways that are practically useful to various stakeholders groups. The need to use current technology for best-practice management of data and information and for provision of access creates a significant burden for federal agencies already facing serious budgetary constraints.

The rapid and ongoing evolution of digital technology adds to the complexity of the problems of data and information management. In 1965, Gordon Moore of Intel formulated his law that the number of transistors on a chip will double about every two years (Moore, 1965). In common usage, this law has been extended more generally to suggest the exponential pace at which digital technology advances (and the more rapid cycling of technology also implies an increased rate of obsolescence). This accelerated cycling of technology and knowledge means that standards suitable only a few years previously, may no longer be technically useable.

If we consider simply the evolution of digital storage media and supporting technology for digital data over the past 20 years—magnetic tape, hard drives, floppy disks, CDs and DVDs, flash drives, cloud storage, often used in combination—it becomes clear that guaranteeing useful access to data is not always simple.

Specifically, consider the problem of data stored on a now-obsolete 5¼ inch “floppy disk,” the potential problems for sustained access to recorded legacy data become very clear. Is the disk itself undamaged? Do we have the required hardware to read the disk? Do we have the required software to read the disk? Is the data structured in a way that is understandable and compatible with contemporary standards? Do we have adequate descriptive information (“metadata”) about the data?

Conceptually, one way of analyzing this problem is to contrast the strategy of migrating data from a previous digital environment (a system of hardware/software/file formats/standards) to another with the alternative strategy of preserving or emulating the original digital environment. Migration risks the inadvertent transformation of the original digital content by the migration process itself or by introduction
of variations in the presentation of data entailed by the newer environment; emulation, a much discussed—but more costly—alternative, seeks to emulate the original technical environment (i.e. hardware, software, standards) thus insuring that the data are preserved and accessed in their original form (Rothenberg, 1999). Migration often represents the course of least resistance but with complex digital formats (for example, three-dimensional formats) emulation may be required to insure minimal corruption (Doyle, 2009).

“Full Life-Cycle” Management

In defining “full life cycle” management, the Federal Interagency Working Group on Digital Data (U.S. IWGDD, 2009) uses the sequential model: plan, create, keep, dispose with certain primary activities applying throughout the cycle: document, organize, protect access. It is thus assumed that government data and information will be preserved in secure, stable, persistent ways that insure their authenticity, their original integrity, and their meaning will be preserved for examination and use in the future.

Data and information are the evidence for policy formation and for decision making; hence, this preservation of original integrity of data and information is essential to the ongoing process of deliberation and of evaluation and re-evaluation of government policies and decision making. This requirement for providing sustained access over time raises significant problems for the management of our nation’s digital resources.

Integrity and “Born-Digital” Documents

Respecting “born-digital” documents or datasets—data or information originally created and disseminated in digital form—there is an additional burden of identifying precisely the definitive, “canonical” form of the original dataset or document. What exactly constitutes this original, authentic form of a digital file can be difficult to define (Buckland, 1998; Lynch, 1999; Lynch, 2000). Moreover, digital objects are potentially much more volatile than “hardcopy” and are more easily subject to decay, to corruption, to degradation or to tampering. In the early phases of digital technology, during the emergence of the Internet, there were few if any accepted community-wide standards for definition, deposit, and preservation of digital objects. Such standards have continued to evolve and are the subject of active international study and testing. Leaving aside
the question of preserving the integrity of data and information, the issue of systematic retention and disposition of data and information must also be addressed.

Retention and Disposition

In the digital environment, increasingly large volumes of data are being generated by a broad range of technological means (IWGDD, 2009). It has been forecasted that worldwide in 2007, “…the amount of information created, captured, or replicated exceeded available storage for the first time” and that “by 2011, almost half of the digital universe will not have a permanent home” (Gantz, et al., 2008, p. 2). This fact implies a daunting question: Is the government responsible for maintaining all of its data and information, as “national assets,” for all time?

Paper/print repositories of data—whether libraries, archives or records management repositories—have traditionally maintained “disposition schedules” for various classes of records. These schedules represent an acknowledgement that not all records will be kept forever. With careful review and consent by legal counsel and senior managers, certain classes of records are subject to limited retention, hence the National Archivist of the U.S. provides a General Records Schedule “to provide disposition authorization for records common to several or all agencies of the Federal Government” (U.S. National Archives, 2010). In assessing the costs of transparent data and information management for the federal government, careful provision must be made for scheduled retention and disposition; consumers of government data and information must also be given clear and reasonable notice of whether data and information will be retained in perpetuity or will be disposed of after prescribed periods of time.

Effective Access

The Open Government Initiative assumes that data and information, not otherwise constrained, should be not simply “accessible” but accessible in ways that makes them easily useful to various stakeholder groups. In addition to warranting the original quality and integrity of the data and information provided by government, government is also responsible for the suitability of the actual presentation and documentation of data to meet the needs and expectations of diverse stakeholder groups. The US office of
Management and Budget has declared: “‘Utility’ refers to the usefulness of the information for the intended audience’s anticipated purposes” (US OMB, 2002).

There are two very clear, well-evolved precedents for this type of responsibility: these precedents involve access to information related to public health and access to information for the disabled.

Respecting matters of public or environmental health, it is now routine to provide government information in *multiple languages* with notices and other information tailored to all local or regional cultural communities with significant representation in the population. Diseases and toxicities do not respect language barriers and communication of such public health messages is both humanitarian and practical.

Respecting disabled citizens, Section 508 of the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973* provides a clear Congressional mandate for unrestricted access to government information for the disabled. *Section 508* was “enacted to eliminate barriers in information technology, open new opportunities for people with disabilities, and encourage development of technologies that will help achieve these goals” (US GSA ITAW, 2011).

These precedents, by requiring careful attention by government to *effective, suitable access*, challenge government to consider, more generally, what other forms of information demand refined treatment to meet the needs of diverse stakeholder groups: public servants, the legal system, businesspeople, journalists, educators, students, researchers, and general citizens. For these groups, the determination of standards for suitable, effective access remains complex and less well-defined.

As a corollary to this mandate to make data and information useful, federal agencies are responsible for clearly defining *why* limitations on transparency are permitted and agencies are, moreover, responsible for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of *how* stakeholders make continuing use of data and information. Agencies are responsible for consistently seeking feedback from their user communities to insure best possible delivery of data and information.

In the private sector, sophisticated technology exists for the tracking and assessment of consumer uses of digital resources, but government agencies have lagged behind the private sector in development and application of these technologies. And the fact that the identities and activities of users are being tracked has generated new concerns about invasions of privacy. Moreover, the advent of the Web 2.0 model and
the recognized desirability of collaboratively engaging consumers of data information have increased the potential risks of inadvertent or intentional damage or loss of data and information (O’Reilly, 2005).

Cybersecurity

In recent years, cybersecurity has become an issue of major concern in both the private and public sectors (Gorman et al., 2003; Reitlinger, 2011). Best data management practices will insure that what is private or confidential will be secured from accidental disclosure or from hacking, espionage, or other forms of deliberate, illegal access. In addition, data and information that are made transparently available must also be protected against vandalism and unauthorized transformations (“hacking”). U.S. national strategic thinking has now recognized the potential threats associated with cybersecurity both at the level of infrastructure and networks and at the level of depositories of data and information. Individual agencies are best advised to align themselves with still emergent government-wide defensive standards, tools, and methodologies.

Conclusion

The need for government transparency has been long recognized. As early as 1813, government had taken measures to insure the broad availability of government information and in the “hardcopy” environment, an evolving series of mechanisms have been used to insure broad dissemination of information and data. Full government transparency is constrained by three primary factors: 1) the need to protect the right to privacy, 2) the need to defend national security (in all its requirements), and 3) the technical capacity of government to recognize and to satisfy the needs of key stakeholder groups for data and information. The still-emergent networked digital environment has made the effort to achieve transparency significantly more complex. The sheer volume of data generated digitally has increased dramatically—this intensifies issues of systematic retention and disposition. Unlike the hardcopy (“analog”) environment, the original, authentic form of “born-digital” data and information must be rigorously defined. Cycles of technical innovation and obsolescence are markedly shorter in the digital environment (Moore’s Law), thus agencies must maintain current

"New York Times fired their social media SME [subject matter expert] because (s) he was no longer needed because people were now versed on using social media. Social media is now natural part of the work plan and nomenclature so everyone is a SME. Agencies will get to a point where OpenGov is a natural part of the work plan and nomenclature."

- Focus Forum Participant
awareness of technology and must equip themselves accordingly. The social Web 2.0 environment has increased the expectations of stakeholders for customized access to data and information and has also increased expectations for collaborative, interactive relations with government. Cybersecurity has become a serious concern whether considering vulnerabilities of networks and other basic infrastructure, repositories of data, or individual databases.
What is Organizational Culture?

Organizational culture represents complex patterns of beliefs, expectations, values, attitudes, and behaviors shared by members of an organization (Colquitt, Lepine & Wesson, 2011; Hellriegel, Slocum & Woodman, 2001). An organizational culture forms in response to two major challenges that confront every organization: a) external adaptation and survival: addressing mission and purpose, goals, means to achieving goals and establishing criteria to determine how well employees and teams are accomplishing their goals, b) internal integration, which addresses the need to establish and maintain effective working relationships among employees and units of an organization.

OPM’s current efforts to establish an open culture aim at fulfilling the requirements of the Open Government Directive of December 2009 (OMB M-10-06). As discussed during Component Team meetings, openness is present within OPM’s organizational values and strategic plans, however it is not consistently practiced throughout the Agency, and the success of an open culture at OPM is critically dependent upon addressing the two aforementioned challenges. An open culture is likely to emerge when employees share knowledge and assumptions, as they discover or develop ways to cope with the issues of external adaptation and internal integration (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). This sharing of knowledge among employees can best be promoted through ensuring a “long-term, reasoned internal transparency” (as pointed out in Chapter 1 of this guide that defines transparency). From this perspective, internal
transparency becomes a valuable tool for promoting an open culture to offer a participatory and collaborative work environment that ensures accountability, rewards, and sensible risk taking. In addition, it “improves morale and trust” in the organization, as discussed in Chapter 3 of this guide on benefits of transparency in the federal government.

**Culture Change**

Culture change is essentially a movement away from a present state towards a future state (Fox-Wolfram, Boal & Hunt, 1998; George & Jones, 1995). It involves changing ineffective employee behavior and organizational systems in a meaningful way to enact and institutionalize the new desired values. However, managing change presents complex challenges. Planned change may not work, or it may have consequences far different from those intended (Hellriegel, et al., 2001). When organizations fail to change, the costs of the failure can be high and often results in employee dissatisfaction, frustration, and loss of credibility.

Implementing a well-planned culture change successfully tests the ability of the managers to adapt rapidly and develop appropriate organizational systems. Effectively changing organizational culture requires understanding the existing culture to be aware of the current values of the organization, and then providing adequate support and encouragement for employees and teams willing to change. Managers must also treat the vision of new culture as a guiding principle for change, and clearly communicate the need and benefits of change. Overall, organizations must have the capacity to modify their management systems by finding and cultivating innovative leadership at the top, which champions the process of change to provide resources and build a support system for change agents. The best leadership strategy is to lead by example in order to highlight the value of a new culture.

**Barriers to Transparency**

“There are silos here. There are pockets of transparency here and there but not throughout the Agency.”

- Focus Forum Participants

Inevitably, both individuals and groups in the organization resist change. Often times, the nature and structure of the organization can also serve as powerful sources of resistance. Identifying, modifying, and managing sources of resistance, henceforth, are valuable in culture change.
The focus forum participants identified several barriers to transparency that currently hinder employees’ ability to be more responsive to external stakeholders, share useful information, and derive satisfaction from their day-to-day jobs. These range from individual resistance to a lack of total Agency buy-in, and are reported below.

**Misalignment of Organizational and Individual Values**

> “Not only managers/employees are dealing with changing the organizational culture, they are also dealing with the culture we grow up with.”
> -Focus Forum Participant

The critical first step to implementing culture change is aligning organizational values with that of individual employee values. If employee behavior deviates from the expected norms, the organization will have a difficult time implementing and sustaining a new culture. One participant from the focus forum noted, “Parents stress individual achievement to their kids as they grow up (you have to be in the best day care and best school to get a competitive advantage). As children grow up into adults, they bring their behavior to work. Unfortunately this type of behavior does not exhibit collaboration or transparency.” In other words, individual employee values are contrary to collective values of transparency, collaboration, and participation that open culture promotes. This contradiction is further reinforced within the Agency through its reward incentives. Another participant at the focus forum stated, “Right now, it is about individual achievement because performance standards focus on individual achievement. At end of the day, you are evaluated on your individual results because this is the way agreements are set up and how employees are rewarded.”

**Fear of Change**

> “People around here are afraid to share knowledge and change.’
> -Focus Forum Participant

Researchers have highlighted the fear of the unknown situation and changing responsibilities as the most common and frequently important source of resistance (Collquitt, et al., 2011). Participants in the focus forum also pointed out that people at OPM are afraid to change and share. Various reasons were cited, including performance anxiety, uncertain work situation and changing expectations etc.
Existence of Sub-Cultures

“Age discrimination is more prevalent because younger workers take leadership roles. Thirty-year olds are in SES positions and don't respect the talent and institutional knowledge of older workers.”

“Managers don't believe they need to share information with labor unions.”
-Focus Forum Participants

Sub-cultures within a large organization are likely to exist, when the overall organizational culture is supplemented by another culture governing a more specific group of employees (Schein, 2010). Participants at the focus forum also talked about a number of sub-cultures within OPM. These included generational groups, labor and management as well as the differences between military and civilian employees. These differences do lead to differing views on transparency and often result in frustration, miscommunication, and confusion within the Agency.

Old Habits

“People need to lose old knowledge to share knowledge more effectively.”
-Focus Forum Participant

Although a habit can be a source of comfort and security and satisfaction for an individual, it becomes a primary source of resistance when organizations require individuals to modify their behavior in order to perform their jobs effectively (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Participants at the focus forum noted that some people within OPM are loyal to outdated processes and hinder sharing of knowledge. In particular, one participant commented, “People need to lose old knowledge to share knowledge more effectively”.

Rigid Organizational Design

“Communication doesn't always filter down to lower levels.”

“There is too much information overload. Relying on emails as the only tool for communication is not effective.”
-Focus Forum Participants

Organizational design provides a certain structure, within which individuals have assigned roles, established procedures for getting the job done, and consistent ways of getting information and sharing information (Baligh, 1994). The use of a rigid design, an emphasis on hierarchy, and inflexible authority may lead employees to narrowly focus on their jobs. Hence they are less likely to coordinate with other units, thereby creating silos in the organization. Participants at the focus forum also highlighted
inadequacies of the current mechanistic organizational design that related with the information overload, lack of accuracy of data, organizational politics, communication barriers, and silos. It is critical that OPM adopt a more flexible and organic structure to facilitate knowledge sharing and support collaboration across the Agency for an effective Agency-wide buy-in of the culture change.

Existing HR Systems

"Another factor that impedes progress is when innovative people leave. When innovative people leave, their forward-thinking ideas and innovative work can go nowhere because the innovative culture leaves with the person."
- Focus Forum Participant

Human resource (HR) management systems facilitate and institutionalize expected norms, behavior, and values. Practices of hiring the right employees, developing their skills, and retaining them with appropriate rewards are critical to employee motivation, and help sustain an organizational culture by reinforcing the intended values. If HR systems are not aligned with the intended culture, then the culture become weakened or differentiated (Ulrich & Brockbank, 2005). Participants in the focus forum intuitively discussed the demoralizing effect of unfair hiring practices and outlined the need to modify performance assessment to reflect expected norms in improving transparency in the organization. One participant remarked, “Another factor that impedes progress is when innovative people leave. When innovative people leave, their forward-thinking ideas and innovative work can go nowhere because the innovative culture leaves with the person.”

Leadership Buy-in

"Leadership must support collaboration."
- Focus Forum Participants

Effective leadership is critical to successful culture change. Leaders help create a vision, energize commitment within the organization, describe a desired future state, and provide resources for change. Without their support, commitment, and action, it is difficult to manage the transition and influence key stakeholders within the organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Participants at the focus forum talked about obtaining executive buy-in in order to facilitate greater knowledge sharing, transparency, and collaboration.
Conclusion

Aforementioned barriers are typical of any large bureaucratic organization and, as discussed, previously exist at both the individual and organizational levels. Managers and employees have to overcome these barriers in order to provide momentum to the implementation of change. Strategic planning, development of an organic organizational structure, alignment of HR systems with the new organizational values of transparency, participation, and collaboration, and shaping and molding employee behavior through effective socialization and development efforts would ensure sustainability of a culture change.

An open culture represents federal government’s initial response to addressing the overarching challenge of external adaptation. OPM and other agencies must manage the challenge of external adaptation and internal integration to address the need to establish and maintain effective working relationships among employees and units of an organization, and promote transparency, participation, and collaboration.
CHAPTER 6

Building a Foundation for Transparency in Government
Richard F. Huff, Ph.D.

Introduction

Transparency in government can be viewed as a means to an end. It creates a mechanism for more closely aligning the interests of the public with its representatives to achieve greater accountability in government (Brito & Perraut, 2010). This addresses one dimension of transparency where “answerability” for public official decisions is monitored and sanctions applied. A second dimension of “responsiveness” is offered by Stirton and Lodge (2001). They broaden the concept of transparency beyond accountability and prefer to see the focal point of transparency as “…the existence of a two-way street in which public services may be described as transparent when they are responsive to service users as well as answerable to them” (p. 475). They go on to say:

Transparency in its fullest sense thus requires that citizens be able to exert an influence on (to ‘control’) the way that public services are provided, based on their views or preferences about how they are provided, as well as knowing about the decisions that are made (p. 476).

Fairbanks, Plowman & Rawlins (2007) also emphasize a “two-way symmetrical model of communication” where they point out that beyond the open sharing of information the most effective organization also seeks to understand and involve their publics in decision making and help them
better understand the organization.

These views take transparency beyond information and knowledge sharing and suggest it is more of an unending process of interaction striving for greater willingness to give a meaningful and accurate account of agency performance, involvement with the public, improved mutual understanding and “…the active participation in acquiring, distributing and creating knowledge” (Cotterrell, 1999, p. 419).

This chapter will build upon a brief discussion of the rationale for transparency to illustrate what precursors may be necessary for building a firm foundation of openness in an organization. Following from this discussion will be a summary of what could be considered “best practices” or promising techniques useful for achieving a degree of transparency valued by both government agency and the public.

**Rationale for Transparency**

As a core element of democratic governance, transparency is important to ensuring government does its work openly. Graham Allison (2006) points out:

(\textit{T})he final guardian of the government’s responsibility—both positive and negative—was neither the Constitutions nor some high authority. That duty rests squarely on the shoulders of the informed citizenry and requires their steady participation in the business of the nation (p. 71).

Fung (2006) suggests the democratic process is seriously threatened when the interest of the professional representative (bureaucrat or politician) departs from their constituency and when civic engagement with government is too weak to compel representatives to respond to citizen interests. In a modern and complex society public bureaucracies conduct much of the public business. Career administrators likely enjoy advantages over elected officials and civic organizations in information, capability and energy. Taken together these facts make efforts to involve the public in government processes all the more urgent. These conditions give rise for concern about accountability, a call for a more open government and methods for aligning the work of government with the public. This begins with transparency.

Deregulation in the public sector over the past 30 years and associated shifts from public to private ownership of public services through
contracts, separation of policy making from service delivery functions, and other reforms have resulted in a rather diverse array of arrangements and institutions for serving the public. It is argued this transition was often made without regard for accountability issues associated with these decentralized arrangements (Stirton & Lodge, 2001). The lack of accountability resulting from further distancing government from its constituents, one consequence of dissipating who provides service (e.g. contractors), elevates the need for transparency even more.

Transparency can be viewed as *retroactive* (publishing background analysis and research for public view after the fact), *reactive* (responding to FOIA requests), and *proactive* (collaboration and involvement in policy formulation) (Heald, 2006). Brito & Perraut (2010) view transparency as a process where truthful and substantive disclosure about performance outcomes is required to those entitled to know. At the basic retroactive level, public agencies and officials should disclose progress on performance in terms of outcomes vs. outputs to the public at reasonable intervals. While this and the legal FOIA compliance are essential, a proactive approach ideally seems most beneficial in achieving the purposes of two-way information sharing and seeking involvement of the public, being more responsive to the public, improving the public’s understanding of the agency, bringing more accountability to government, reducing opportunity for corruption, and improving performance. Striving for this ideal requires commitment of the leadership of an organization, “buy in” from all organization membership and a cultural shift toward openness where public officials need to draw citizens into the process.

**Directions of Transparency**

Heald (2006) conceptualizes transparency as occurring in a number of directions. As transparency “within” relates to hierarchical relationships, *upwards transparency* allows superiors to observe the conduct and behavior of subordinates and *downwards transparency* is when subordinates can observe the conduct, behavior, and “results” of their superiors. Where upwards and downwards transparency occurs together there is vertical transparency; otherwise if one exists and another does not exist, transparency is either completely absent or asymmetrical. For example, upwards transparency is likely to exist without downwards transparency in authoritarian governments. Downwards transparency is
demanded of democratic states. Therefore, vertical transparency within a government is likely symmetrical in democratic states to a greater degree. One can also add a dimension of horizontal transparency within an organization. Here, where program elements operate as “stovepipes” horizontal transparency “within” is limited. Where collaboration and open communication occur horizontally and break down internal barriers of stovepipe operations, transparency will increase. The core and component team approach at OPM to address open government with its internal cross-cutting membership combines both vertical and horizontal movement toward transparency. Attention needs to be given to the nature of vertical and horizontal transparency internal to an organization in order to move toward *outwards transparency* or an ability to overcome insular tendencies and see outside the organization, and *inwards transparency* or the ability for the outside to see inside the organization (openness) (Figure 1).

**FIGURE 1:**
Directions of Transparency
Adapted from Heald (2000)
Precursors for Transparency

In order for an agency to move toward openness, certain conditions seem necessary as “precursors” for developing effective multi-dimensional transparency:

1. **Introducing transparency** – A context for transparency and a clear definition of the concept need to be developed to ensure it has meaning for everyone in the organization. Transparency can take on different meanings and forms depending on the mission of the agency. There needs to be a clear rationale for its introduction and it needs to be seen as valuable. Awareness on the part of leadership and change agents of the implications for organization culture change is essential.

2. **Top-down emphasis** – Communication from top leadership stressing the importance of transparency for the organization and the benefits it offers all agency employees is critical. The values of transparency need to be incorporated in the strategic plan, mission statement, and performance management system, and be reflected in the agency goals and objectives. The appointment of a senior official as the primary proponent for transparency organization-wide helps send a message as to its priority and importance.

3. **Bottom-up support** – Incorporating, reinforcing, and rewarding transparency in day-to-day operations helps build support agency-wide. A series of agency workshops, information sessions, and inclusion in staff meetings helps build consensus. It is important for all employees to see how transparency can benefit them, from improving work processes through collaboration to rewards for transparency initiatives. All agency members benefit from an informed public opinion based on factual information.

4. A **commitment** is needed by all to the value of proactively seeking the involvement of the public and stakeholders in decision making and achieving mutual understanding of expectations for what is possible.

5. The **recognition** by public officials that transparency is a tool for reputation management and the demonstration of trustworthiness (Fairbanks, et al., 2007).

6. A **willingness** and ability to develop feedback channels enabling officials and citizens alike to evaluate and adjust policies in “real time.”

7. **Recognizing and adapting** elements of open communication by using a variety of communication channels to disseminate information, seek
public feedback, avoid mixing politics with communication and make managers responsible for the organization’s communication culture (Fairbanks, et al., 2007).

8. **A commitment to performance measurement:**
   • There needs to be consistency in the emphasis on identifying and measuring performance outcomes (objective and subjective). This consistency needs to be reflected in mission statement, strategic plan, functions, and individual performance standards. Effective transparency needs to provide the public with progress made toward achieving performance outcomes at reasonable intervals.
   • There needs to be a credible performance management system in place as performance reporting is seen as a critical component of true transparency. If one must disclose performance (or the outcome of one’s effort) there is a disincentive for self-interest at the expense of the agency as well as an incentive to perform well, especially if rewards are tied to performance (Brito & Perraut, 2010). This has a two-fold purpose: it discourages corruption and encourages better performance.

9. **The ongoing recognition and appreciation for the power of organization culture** – Change is difficult but may be needed in a number of areas depending on the degree of transition needed for achieving transparency. Woodman (1989) suggests organization mechanisms that maintain culture are areas where culture may need to be influenced or changed such as:
   • What managers pay attention to, measure, and control;
   • Ways managers react to critical incidents and crises;
   • Role modeling, coaching, and organization training;
   • Criteria for allocating awards and status;
   • Criteria for personnel recruitment, selection, promotion, and removal.

10. **Effective information management** – Due to the immense amount of government information available, develop protocols for public access to lower their monitoring costs (Brito & Perraut, 2010), and increase benefits for both public and agency. Include both retroactive (posting reports, past events, background analysis, research) and “real time” transparency (collaboration with the public in policy formulation).
11. **Recognize the limits to transparency yet take a considered approach to exceptions** – Exceptions to transparency may exist due to privacy interests, national security, and internal agency deliberations (Brito & Perraut, 2010). A dilemma is introduced with these possibilities and, while legitimate in some situations, transparency can be undermined due to the varying definitions and resulting claims for these exceptions.

It is important for citizens to have access to unbiased facts and an avenue for expressing their independent opinions. The public cannot rely on the controlled information of the media and special interests for objective facts. Both the public and agency benefit from a more factually informed and engaged public. However, while it is possible for an organization to be open about its documents and procedures it may not be transparent to its intended audience if the information is perceived as incoherent (Heald, 2006). Therefore, the quality of communication must be understandable to the audience intended.

**Conditions for “Best Practices”**

How transparent an agency is to the public and its stakeholders may depend on the level of development of their transparency within organization boundaries. The level of development of horizontal, upwards, and downwards transparency within the organization will likely impact the effectiveness of inwards and outwards transparency beyond organization boundaries. This is important because ultimately agencies should strive for inwards transparency by opening operations for public view in retroactive and real time to encourage participation and collaboration. The following are a number of conditions found in the literature thought to lead to best practices in government transparency:

- **Open Culture** – Encourage behavior and culture change within the organization to build dialogue between citizens, other stakeholders, and government where officials seek to draw them into the process.
- **Clear Purpose** – The mission statement of the organization is written in unambiguous terms and clearly states what the organization stands for. Measurable objectives are then built on a clear statement of purpose with progress reports possible at reasonable intervals.
• **Proactive** – Release of information is not only retroactive (background analysis, research) or reactive (FOIA), but also proactive in real time (webcasts & archives) to engage and inform the public debate.

• **Convenience** – Reduce monitoring costs of the public and increase benefit by making access convenient on the Internet, live and on demand. Good quality, timely information is taken another step by giving citizens the opportunity to engage officials throughout the policy making process and beyond.

• **Outcome Reporting** – Provide information at regular intervals about inputs and outputs (measures of actions taken), and also outcome data, or a measurement of progress toward a defined public benefit.

• **Clear Communication** – Reports communicating important performance results and other information are written for the ordinary citizen, taxpayer, and relevant audiences. These reports are accessible, readable, and usable. Measures, if reported, make sense and the results identify ways to improve performance.

• **Alignment** – There is an ongoing effort to ensure government incentives for developing and providing programs and services align with the public and other stakeholder needs for these programs and services.

• **Audit** – Performance-based annual reports are audited by an outside, third party rather than the agency producing the report. This increases objectivity and credibility with the public (Brito & Perrault, 2010).

• **Review Exceptions** – Ensures a rigorous independent review of exceptions to transparency (Brito & Perrault, 2010).

• **Integrated Public Records** – For public meetings, agendas, minutes, audio/video recordings, and related digital documents are archived, cross-linked, and searchable by keyword (Granicus, n.d.).

• **ADA Compliance and Closed Captioning** – All web applications should meet ADA guidelines to ensure accessibility for all citizens (Granicus, n.d.).

• **Sharing** – All participants should have the ability to quickly share with others elements of the integrated public record using a preferred social network such as Facebook. (Granicus, n.d.).
• **Updated Formats & Standards** – Flexibility in video formats and other webcasting standards is essential due to the speed of technology standards. Formats should not be dictated (Granicus, n.d.).

• **Free** – Access to all public documents should be at no cost in order to ensure convenience for the citizen and contribute to unprecedented transparency (Granicus, n.d.).

**Conclusion**

Transparency has a number of meanings, dimensions, and directions and is a basic element of democratic governance. It is a means to achieve greater accountability in government by better aligning citizen and government interests. It also can contribute to greater understanding of citizen and stakeholder needs and their involvement in evaluating and modifying policy. Its success relies on a number of conditions, utmost of which are leadership and employee commitment, an appreciation for organization culture, a commitment to performance management, and clear communication. An organization should plan for and perhaps take incremental steps toward increasing inwards transparency. Overcoming barriers to transparency within organization boundaries seems a necessary condition to achieving more proactive transparency with the public and other stakeholders. This is difficult work because the organizational culture can be resistant to change and impede progress toward transparency initiatives. It seems movement toward greater transparency also requires imagination and creativity. As such, an emphasis on effectiveness over efficiency would seem to open an organization to a greater range of possibilities. Secondary efficiencies would likely be realized however, as a primary objective, efficiency may limit the range of creative possibilities considered.
CHAPTER 7

A Framework for Owning Transparency
Shaista E. Khilji, Ph.D., Irina Popova-Nowak, Ph.D., Richard F. Huff, Ph.D., Maria Cseh, Ph.D.

Introduction

This final chapter of the Guide to Owning Transparency outlines a systemic framework to support federal government agencies in the midst of implementing transparency. It marks the culmination of the knowledge collected in the Guide and builds upon the previous chapters. In review, Chapter 1 defined transparency. Chapters 2 and 3 identified the benefits it may provide for both the general public and for the implementing agency. Chapter 4 discussed the technical constraints that impose upon its effective implementation. Chapter 5 considered the complexities of the necessary culture change that effective implementation of transparency must confront, as well as the barriers to accomplishing that, and Chapter 6 provided an overview of the necessary conditions within an agency that is serious about owning transparency.

Using the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) as an example, this final chapter presents a systemic framework that may be used by agencies as a foundational resource. We provide general guidelines on how to transform organizational culture and build supporting organizational systems. It is important to note as an example, this final chapter presents a systemic framework that may be used by agencies as a foundational resource. We provide general guidelines on how to transform organizational culture and build supporting organizational systems. It
is important to note, however, that learning on this front is ongoing; we hope that the suggested framework spurs fresh thinking, extends further exploration, and enhances understanding about transparency across all agencies. Our goal is to help agencies develop the necessary organizational capabilities and in turn, strengthen their ability to customize planning and implementation of agency-specific actions and initiatives that enable successful achievement of their goals and mission.

We begin the chapter by presenting some of the unique initiatives that OPM has implemented, and then present the framework and describe it with reference to OPM’s accomplishments.

**Current Initiatives at OPM**

In the past two years, since the Open Government Directive of Dec. 2009 (OMB M-10-06) was circulated, OPM has implemented several innovative initiatives to not only introduce transparency, but also make the necessary culture changes that will ensure its sustainability.

**Core and Component Teams**

In order to implement their open government plan, OPM developed a governance structure that moved beyond meeting the letter of the directive, and also met its spirit. OPM realized that open government could not be implemented if it was viewed as an additional set of tasks, but instead needed to be seen as a more efficient means of accomplishing the agency’s mission.

Consequently, OPM established a cross-agency Core Team that includes senior leadership and their representatives, and five Component Teams composed of OPM employees as well as members from outside the agency representing academia, unions, and non-profit organizations. The Core Team works to implement measures that make OPM more transparent and open, and the Component Teams support the Core Team, each with a specific focus:

- Management, Policy, and Sustainability
- Flagship Initiative
- Data, Information, and Privacy
- Communication, Collaboration, and Education
- Evaluation
This innovative team structure allows OPM to incorporate the subject expertise and perspectives of the external team members while simultaneously benefiting from cross-agency knowledge sharing (a form of transparency) and enhanced openness and collaboration.

Action Learning

In order to facilitate an environment where healthy dialogue is generated, OPM has utilized an Action Learning (AL) approach. AL (Marquardt, 1999, 2004) is a strategic effort to foster fresh thinking, enable people to effectively respond to change, and encourage them to learn as they explore new ways of solving problems. This learning-while-working approach builds upon generating new questions to existing knowledge followed by periods of reflection and action. The Core Team and the Component Teams work in concert in order to explore a variety of solutions in making OPM more transparent and open.

IdeaFactory

In January 2011, OPM implemented this open source, crowd-sourcing tool originally developed by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2011) to empower its “large and dispersed workforce to submit and collaborate on innovative ideas to improve TSA” (WhiteHouse.gov, 2011). IdeaFactory is like a super-charged suggestion box, enabling employees across the agency to suggest improvements to OPM processes and procedures, and vote on the suggestions that others have made. It also includes social networking functionality so that employees can begin to connect across departmental boundaries.

ROWE

ROWE is a human resource management strategy that focuses on the results of employees’ work, increases employees’ engagement and productivity, and decreases turnover. In ROWE, each employee “is free to do whatever they want, whenever they want, as long as the work gets done” (Ferriss, 2008). Thus, ROWE means not only flexible work schedules and teleworking, but also a workplace culture that empowers employees to control their lives. ROWE has been successfully implemented in the private sector in large companies such as Best Buy.
and GAP (Ferriss, 2008).

OPM began piloting ROWE in Retirement Claims, the Office of the Director, Communications, and HR Services in April 2010 and the initial results are very positive. A study by Deloitte found significant culture change in terms of a greater focus on results, collaboration between management and employees on developing standards and processes, positive perceptions of leadership, and clarity of priorities from leadership (ROWE, 2011).

**FIGURE 2:**
**TSA IdeaFactory**
([www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov), 2011)

**Focus Forum**

OPM is the first agency to host a focus forum (the one which led to the creation of this Guide). Developed by the Open Forum Foundation based on its open government work with multiple agencies, this format brings together experts from across agencies as well as academia, the private sector, non-profits, and interested citizens to collaboratively discuss and work on a specific issue of interest to the hosting agency.
A Framework for Owning Transparency

Implementing transparency is much more than simply making data publicly available. Figure 3 summarizes a framework that can be used by any agency as a general guideline to establish sustainable transparency that benefits the agency. The components of the framework are mutually supportive and intertwined. That is to say they do not need to be followed consecutively and in fact are more powerful when taken as a group. For example, beginning to implement and utilize the support mechanisms in the development of the strategic plan will not only provide an agency with valuable experience but also create a strategic plan that will be well on its way towards having the organizational support it needs to succeed.

In addition, these components stack. For example, OPM’s Core and Component Team governance structure supports and exemplifies many of the recommendations within the framework.

Develop a Strategic Plan

- Develop a Vision

Implement Support Mechanisms

- Develop Cross-Agency Teams
- Change the Organizational Design
- Internal Alignment of Processes and Policies
- Provide Appropriate Incentives
- Leadership Development

Build Organizational Support

- Enlist Sponsors and Champions
- Participatory Leadership
- Further Engage and Involve Stakeholders

“...systemic culture change... must be achieved through a deliberate strategic planning initiative.”

Among the most blatant examples of a barrier to internal transparency are silos. Federal agencies frequently have information and reporting silos that hinder coordination among agency units and prevent effective sharing of knowledge. Reducing or eliminating these silos requires a systemic culture change, which must be achieved through a deliberate
strategic planning initiative. Developing and implementing this strategic plan ensures that organizational goals serve as the guiding principles of change, and that cultural values that reinforce achievement of these goals are embedded in the plan (Ulrich, 1997). Aligning employees with strategic goals enhances employee engagement, transparency, and collaboration within the organization (Reilley & Williams, 2006). In addition, consciously considering how to create meaningful relationships between employees and units of the agency (aka internal integration, as discussed in Chapter 5) can help to create mutually supportive organizational processes and policies. This, in turn, promotes consistency of implementation (Khilji & Wang, 2006) and minimizes the gaps between formal and informal processes.

Develop a Vision

An effective strategic plan begins with a solid vision. A participant in the focus forum provided a starting place from which to develop a vision, “Open government values need to be part of the organization’s DNA.” This is an astute observation, and has been supported in the literature. For example, Davis et. al. (2010) argue that “an organization’s strategic transformation skills must become part of its unconscious competence, that is, a natural way of managing the organization and a part of everyday business life” (p. 67).

The goal of a vision is to provide an image of the desired end state. Once formulated, the vision may then be communicated throughout the organization so that it cascades and is assimilated, creating shared ownership by the organization members (O’Connell et al., 2010). From the vision, the strategic plan can evolve. Currently, OPM is utilizing an Action Learning approach to engage stakeholders in brainstorming ways of implementing an open culture. Action Learning has proven to be an effective tool to develop, explore, dialogue, create options, strategize, and operationalize OPM’s agency-wide vision and strategy.

Implement Support Mechanisms

Systemic culture change requires broad and diverse involvement to ensure its successful completion. These mechanisms will help to establish the foundation upon which this success may occur.

Develop Cross-Agency Teams
OPM’s Core and Component Team governance structure is a perfect example of effective cross-agency teams. These teams draw on the diverse knowledge of the agency, tying together multiple departments and disseminating the vision and strategy through “embedded” employees.

Change the Organizational Design

"Excessive direction kills initiative. Research shows organizations that excel at a) engaging their staff with the overall mission, as well as, b) engaging their staff with their customers/stakeholders outperform those which do neither by a factor of 3.4 to 1 (340% better). Organizations that excel at only one of these two forms of engagement outperform those who do not by a factor of 1.7 to 1 (70% better)."

- Focus Forum Participant

Based on feedback from focus forum participants, Chapter 5 also identified the current rigidity of agency organizational design and its emphasis on hierarchy as an important barrier to effective culture change. While a bureaucratic and functional structure has strengths in its emphasis on achieving efficiencies through hierarchy and vertical relationships of authority, it is not as conducive to an internally transparent, collaborative, and participatory style of communication as a horizontal structure. An organic structure cutting across organizational functions and comprised of horizontal problem solving teams has a number of advantages for achieving collaboration. It can minimize or remove authority relations, increase team membership diversity, improve information sharing, and increase knowledge of organizational operations. Horizontal team problem solving can bring more imagination and creativity, more breadth in understanding impacts of decision options, and a sense of ownership for team members. It may also help weaken the boundaries between programmatic and functional silos. Linden (2010) illustrates the importance of non-hierarchical relations in successful collaboration (p. 25) in terms of the following six factors:

a. Partners have a shared, specific purpose that they are committed to and cannot achieve (as well) on their own.

b. Partners want to pursue a collaborative solution now and are willing to contribute something to the effort.

c. Appropriate people are at the table.

d. Partners have an open, credible process.

e. The effort has a passionate champion (or champions) with credibility and clout.
Partners have trusting relationships.

OPM’s approach using the Core and Component Teams within their existing hierarchical structure capitalizes on these collaboration factors and has the potential to develop as a hybrid problem-solving model. While maintaining the positive aspects of the vertical hierarchical structure, this horizontal arrangement can perhaps coexist with horizontal and dynamic team problem solving. This arrangement can then be utilized for developing solutions to agency-wide problems. This holds forth the promise of mitigating the weaker aspects of bureaucracy in terms of imaginative and creative policy development and implementation while opening horizontal communication and creating internal collaboration and transparency. These are all important factors in improving the quality of transparency for a wider public participation.

**Internal Alignment of Processes and Policies**

"Process to implement a successful Policy:
(STEP 1) Policy could be more successful if it is developed at the grassroots level;
(STEP 2) collaborate across program offices because this will build a flexible policy;
(STEP 3) obtain top level (i.e., executive) buy-in."

- Focus Forum Participant

Chapter 5 referred to a misalignment between organizational and individual values as a major barrier to effective culture change. An appropriate approach to addressing this concern is employee involvement and a bottom-up approach in problem solving. Together, these support synergy and alignment throughout all levels of the organization. OPM’s Core and Component Team governance structure and Action Learning incorporate a bottoms-up approach and are effective in employee involvement.

In considering these difficulties, agencies should consider both external and internal alignment. Externally, an agency should evaluate whether its strategy is consistent with the environment, its vision and mission, and its beliefs and values. Internally, an agency needs to concern itself with both vertical and horizontal alignment between systems and work processes. This entails making human resource practices as mutually supportive and integrated with both the strategy and agency-wide goals. These practices are likely to enhance employee skills, knowledge, motivation and flexibility (Gephart and Van Buren, 1996).
Provide Appropriate Incentives

"Make sure performance standards encourage employees to find solutions to legal, policy, and technology issues that are barriers to implementing the OpenGov EO."
- Focus Forum Participant

There is evidence that project teams (similar to the OPM Core and Component Teams) have potential advantages such as empowerment and achievement of organizational goals and promotion of a) innovation and change (by multidisciplinary and diverse team members), b) a sense of belonging, and c) organizational learning and knowledge sharing (Taylor, 2010). Given the need for employee participation and collaboration in decision making to ensure both internal and external transparency, a team-based performance assessment integrated in the organization’s strategic human capital management is recommended. Team incentive systems may include team gain sharing/profit sharing, a team goal-based incentive system, team discretionary bonus system, a team skill bonus incentive system, and a team members merit incentive system. Since team performance models have to be tailored to the organization’s mission, vision, culture, and values, it is imperative to develop customized team incentive plans, team performance feedback, and assessment systems in support of the team incentives.

These changes are also likely to attend to the misalignment of organizational and individual values, as well as current inadequacies of the existing human resource systems as mentioned by Open Forum participants and captured in Chapter 5.

Leadership Development

"There is a fear factor of not taking risks because of fear of losing your job. Middle management is the key because if they model OpenGov behavior then employees will emulate them."
- Focus Forum Participant

A review of the barriers to culture change as captured in Chapter 5 and expressed by a focus forum participant (cited above) indicates that leadership is a critical success factor in developing and maintaining transparency. Mutuality of leadership development and individual leader development is crucial to facilitating and encouraging an open culture. Leadership development is “the expansion of a collective’s capacity to produce direction, alignment, and commitment. A collective is any group of people who share work, for example, teams, work groups,
organizations, partnership, communities, and nations” while individual leader development is the “expansion of a person’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and process” (McCauley, Van Velsor & Ruderman, 2010, p. 20). Together, these development programs are likely to ensure that both organizational/group and individual needs are gradually built to sustain a new culture of transparency.

**Build Organizational Support**

Culture change doesn’t happen without the individuals that make up the culture adopting the new behaviours. These recommendations will help to ensure that happens.

**Enlist Sponsors and Champions**

Advocates or “champions” for organizational change, while critical at the top leadership levels, can also be found at any level of the organization, and external to it as well. Warrick (2009) defines a “change champion” as a person skilled at initiating, facilitating, and implementing change (p. 15).

---

**FIGURE 4: The Role of Change Champions. Adapted from Warrick, 2010.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>• Developing a change mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing visionary leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being well informed about the issues, opportunities, and how to get things done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involving key stakeholders and building commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>• Working with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working with teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Networking and getting the right people together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing</td>
<td>• Planning and managing the change process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making things happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keeping people focused and motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing feedback mechanisms to evaluate and monitor progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persevering until the change succeeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clear and consistent emphasis from top organization leadership is essential to bringing about a transformational change. This strength at OPM is evident with emphasis from the Director for incorporating the values of open government—transparency, collaboration, and participation—in the way OPM conducts its business. The OPM CIO is the agency’s “champion” for open government. In addition, OPM has designated a number of “high-impact” internal and external people to facilitate change internally. A clear process and structure has also been established for horizontal collaboration and communication through the Core and Component Teams. A number of team facilitators and members have emerged as champions of change for open government. Similarly, the effective use of employee engagement tools such as IdeaFactory can help to identify change champions from across the agency.

Change champions are incredibly valuable in any culture change effort and should be rewarded and supported in appropriate ways to ensure their continued enthusiasm and buy-in for the effort.

**Participatory Leadership**

Bottom-up support is listed as one of the precursors for transparency in Chapter 6. The best way to ensure this is through participatory leadership. According to Yukl (2008), aspects of participatory leadership include “consultation, joint decision making, power sharing, decentralization, empowerment, and democratic management” (p. 87). The Core and Component Teams governance structure established by OPM in the Open Government Initiative is a clear example of participatory leadership as consultation and joint decision making related to the dimensions of internal and external transparency, benefits, constraints, and success factors in achieving transparency.

**Further Engage and Involve Stakeholders**

"Best way to ensure we put out the "right information" is to ask...ask stakeholders, including public what information do they want to see. Hold focus groups, surveys, collaboration events, IdeaFactory; train/educate public on what data is available and use potential."

- Focus Forum Participant

As explained in Chapters 1, 3, 5, and 7, both citizen and employee engagement are fundamental to transparency. There are many ways to accomplish this, as evidenced by OPM’s Core and Component Teams, IdeaFactory, and the focus forum, Owning Transparency. The important
part for this recommendation is to develop an appreciation for the value of stakeholder involvement.

Conclusion

This guide has provided an opportunity to share OPM’s transparency efforts as an illustrative case study, and lay out a framework for owning transparency. It is intended to provide substantive and valuable information for federal agencies in their efforts to establish a more open and transparent culture. Simultaneously, we recognize that the suggested framework is not universal in nature, but instead can at best serve as a foundational resource to be tailored to the unique cultural context and agency-specific objectives in which it is being applied.

Successful implementation of transparency requires no less than systemic culture change. The good news is that this is not as daunting as it first sounds. By engaging in comprehensive strategic planning, implementing organizational support mechanisms, and building support across the entire agency, it is possible to develop a sustainable transparency culture that benefits the agency.

OPM’s concerted efforts to implement open government are laudable and represent the agency’s dedication to the mission of governing by the Founding Fathers’ belief in open access to government information and providing for an innovative and creative culture within which human potential can be nurtured and developed. The more unique initiatives that it has undertaken include the Core and Component Team governance structure, the use of Action Learning, the implementation of IdeaFactory, piloting ROWE, and holding the focus forum that led to the creation of this Guide. OPM is doing the necessary groundwork to establish an open culture and where one agency has blazed a trail, it is so much easier for others to follow.
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External Member of OPM’s Collaboration, Communication & Education (CCE) Team

Maria Cseh, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Human and Organizational Learning Department at The George Washington University, U.S.A., and Honorary Professor at the University of Pécs, Hungary. She holds a B.S. / M.S. degree in Electronics Engineering, an M.A. degree in Business Administration with a focus on International Management, a certificate in Global Policy Studies, and a Ph.D. degree in Adult Education with a specialization on Global Human Resource Development. Dr. Cseh’s cross-cultural and international research studies on workplace learning, organizational development and change, and leadership were published in peer-reviewed journals and book chapters and presented at international conferences. Her papers received multiple awards such as, Best Paper Award at The Ninth Annual World Business Congress: Managing in a Turbulent Business Environment; Highly Commended Winner at the Emerald Literati Network Awards for Excellence; Award Winning Papers at the International Academy of Human Resource Development Conference. She is a member of the Advisory Board for four international journals, was elected to serve for two terms on the Board of Directors of the Academy of Human Resource Development, lectures internationally and serves as adviser and consultant to organizations.
Richard F. Huff, Ph.D.
Virginia Commonwealth University; Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Administration
External Member of OPM's Management, Policy and Sustainability Component Team

Richard Huff is an Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Administration at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) in Richmond, Virginia, where he teaches graduate courses in public policy, administration and personnel management. He received his PhD from VCU in 2007 following a 26 year career with the federal government where he served in a number of positions as a commissioned officer in the US Army and in executive civil service appointments primarily in Europe. Recognition for his work includes the U.S. Army Commendation Medal, Commander’s Award for Civilian Service, Superior Civilian Service Award (two awards) and the Meritorious Award for Civilian Service. His academic research has focused primarily on relationships between government personnel policy reform and organization performance. Additional research interests include theoretical applications to practice areas associated with public leadership, reform and organizational performance, as well as comparative studies focused on the effects of civil service reforms in developed and developing democracies. He has published in the Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis, Politics & Policy Journal, Global Virtue Ethics Review Journal, The Encyclopedia of Governance and has co-authored policy evaluation reports for the VCU Center for Public Policy.

He has been working as an external member of the Management, Policy and Sustainability Component Team at the US Office of Personnel Management since August 2010.
Shaista E. Khilji, Ph.D.
The George Washington University; Associate Professor of Human and Organizational Learning
External Member of OPM's Management, Policy and Sustainability Component Team

South Asian Journal of Global Business Research; Founding Editor-in-Chief Shaista E. Khilji received her Ph.D. in International Management from University of Cambridge, UK, in 2001. She is the Founding Editor-in-Chief of South Asian Journal of Global Business Research (SAJGBR), and Associate Professor of Human and Organizational Learning at the George Washington University, where she teaches graduate levels courses on Leadership, Organization Change, Consulting and Strategic HR. Her research focuses on issues related to Globalization, Learning, Leadership and Change. In particular, her work has focused upon Global Leadership, Talent Development, Changing National and Individual Values, Innovation, and Cross-Cultural Management. She has published several articles in tier-1 scholarly journals, including the International Journal of Human Resource Management, Journal of World Business, International Business Review, and the Journal of Product Innovation Management, written for several edited volumes, and presented more than 45 research papers at various international conferences. She has received many awards, including “Honorary Lifetime Fellow of Cambridge Commonwealth Society” (UK); “Pride of Profession Award” (India); the “Outstanding Service” and “Best Reviewer” awards by the Academy of Management (USA), “Top 10%” paper award by the Academy of International Business (Italy), and a “Bronze Award” by McGraw Hill Higher Education. She was nominated for the Washingtonian “Rising Star under 40 years” for her all-round academic achievements, ‘Best International Symposium’ and ‘Newman’ awards by Academy of Management. She has consulted with US and Canadian governments, higher educational institutions (in Singapore, Canada, Pakistan, Morocco, and India) and several organizations in the private and non-profit sector globally in order to help them deliver high performance. She has been working as an external member of the Component Team for Management, Policy and Sustainability with the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, since August 2010.
Tom Moritz, BSFS, MLS
Tom Moritz Consultancy; Principal
External Member of OPM’s Data and Privacy Team

Tom Moritz is a knowledge manager and advocate for knowledge equity. His recent work is focused on the problem of "data as evidence" focusing on all aspects of data as the primary resource for evidence-based policy formation and decision making.

Most recently he has worked as Director of Public Programs at the Internet Archive (San Francisco) and at The Getty Research Institute (Los Angeles) as Chief, Knowledge Management / Associate Director for Administration. He has won major grants from the Mellon Foundation, the Sloan Foundation and the US National Science Foundation (Information Technology Research Program). In the Fall of 2005, he served as Visiting Associate Professor at the Pratt Institute Graduate School of Library and Information Science in Brooklyn, NY. At the American Museum of Natural History he was Harold Boeschenstein Director of Library Services, managed scientific publishing and was responsible for the digitization and open release of the full runs of AMNH scientific series.

He has served as an advisor on knowledge management in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Pacific and The Americas, led in the formation of the Biodiversity Heritage Library Project and the UNEP-based Conservation Commons. He led in the development and release of the first World Database on Protected Areas. He serves on numerous advisory bodies -- including the US National Science Digital Library (NSDL) and the US National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII), on visiting committees and peer review panels and is author of numerous publications and presentations.
Adelaide O’Brien, MBA, MPA
IDC Government Insights; Research Director, Government Services Delivery
External Member of OPM’s Flagship Initiative Open Government Team

Adelaide O’Brien provides government decision makers with research-based advisory and consulting services that enable maximizing the business value of technology investments. Publications include research on federal government transforming services delivery and Smart Government maturity models. Adelaide began her career working in various state and local governmental staff positions, including Minnesota State Government, and draws on more than 25 years of experience in high-tech corporations. Adelaide has a long track record of translating customer preferences into actionable business initiatives and leading cross-functional teams to achieve outstanding results through change management and customer focus. She is known for her leadership, strategic thinking, and ability to collaborate on complex projects.

Adelaide also serves as a member of the Digital Government Institute Customer Services Advisory Committee to provide leading-edge education programs to government IT managers. She has received a Volunteer of the Year Award from Women in Technology, and currently is Chair of the American Council of Technology-Industry Advisory Council (ACT-IAC) Collaboration and Transformation Shared Interest Group. Adelaide is often quoted in CIO Magazine, Government Technology, Nextgov.com, and Web 2.0 Journal. She is a frequent speaker/moderator at industry events including ACT-IAC, Women in Technology, CIO Conference, and the Digital Government Institute. She has been working as an external member of the Flagship Initiative Open Government Team for the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, since July 2010.

Adelaide has a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Marquette University, a Masters of Public Affairs from the University of Texas, and a Masters of Business Administration from the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota.
Irina V. Popova-Nowak, Ph.D.
The George Washington University,
Ed.D. Candidate in Human and Organizational Learning
External Member of OPM’s Flagship Initiative Component Team

Irina V. Popova-Nowak has received her Ph.D. in Comparative History of East Central Europe in 1999 from the Central European University, Budapest, Hungary, and is currently pursuing Ed.D. in Human and Organizational Learning at the Graduate School of Education and Human Development at the George Washington University. Her research interests include organizational learning, organizational change, ethnic identity in the workplace, work engagement, cross-cultural communication, and spatial practices. She has published several book chapters and papers, and presented at multiple national and international conferences (to include Academy of Human Resource Development) on topics related to cultural construction of space and cross-cultural communication, work identity and work engagement, ethnic identity in the workplace, e-learning, workplace learning, cultural competence in disaster response, and medical interpreters. She has worked at several federal government agencies as a contractor and lead projects to create technology-based learning solutions, communities of practice, training curriculum development, development of distance learning curricula and interactive web-based learning tools in cultural competence. She has served as a Adjunct Professor and Faculty-Practitioner at Strayer University (where she received an award for teaching excellence) and the University of Phoenix. She has been working as an external member of the Component Team for Flagship Initiative (Implement Collaboration and Knowledge Management Technologies) with the U.S. Office of Personnel Management since July 2010.
About the Editors

Wayne Moses Burke
Open Forum Foundation; Executive Director

I founded the DC-based non-profit Open Forum Foundation to build vibrant communities of engagement around government. While my initial focus was on improving collaboration between citizens and their Congressional representatives, early involvement in the OpenGov movement has led to direct work with real champions inside government agencies. We recently began a series of collaborative events called Focus Forums that are designed to engage external communities in order to advance an agency’s knowledge, or support them in solving a specific problem. Simultaneously, these events facilitate better internal cohesion between employees and increase their perception of the value of external input.

I grew up in rural Michigan, received my Bachelor’s in Engineering at the University of Michigan, and completed my Master’s in Global Affairs at New York University. For work, I bring a rich diversity of entrepreneurial experience in manufacturing, IT, web design and coding, electoral reform, and numerous smaller endeavours. I now live happily in Washington, DC and love to travel, meet new people, and bicycle. In November, I will become a father and am excited to raise a child with the optimism of the future that I spend every day working towards.
Maxine Teller
MiXT Media Strategies; Principal

With over 15 years of public and private sector strategy consulting expertise, Maxine helps government agencies improve mission efficiency and effectiveness by leveraging emerging media tools, technologies and operating principles. Most recently, Maxine developed and co-authored DoD’s social networking policy, conceptualized and launched the Emerging Media Directorate, and secured distribution for the Pentagon Channel in 12 million homes. Maxine has also worked with a variety of civilian agencies and has initiated a number of cross-agency initiatives to reduce duplicative processes.

Maxine conceptualized and produced Gov 2.0 Camp, the first unconference that convened Government 2.0 leaders to share best practices. Her blog, MiXT Media, explores the intersection of media, innovation, communication, society and technology. She presents regularly at conferences and participates in social network discussions. Maxine holds an MBA from Georgetown University and a BA in sociology from Brandeis University.

http://mixtmediastrategies.com/
maxine@mixtmediastrategies.com
202-258-4605
@mixtmedia
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APPENDIX A

Focus Forum Attendee Breakdown

This event was intentionally kept small and off the record to ensure that all civil servants would be comfortable freely participating. In addition, it was heavily advertised primarily to OPM employees, and secondarily to the broader open government community, both within government and outside of it. The attendees were diverse and committed to discussion of the topic at hand.
Number of Attendees

- 71 total, including:
  - 36 OPM employees
  - 18 civil servants from other agencies
  - 17 non-civil servants

The Civil Servants from other federal agencies included:

- US Census Bureau
- Department of Health and Human Services
- Department of Homeland Security
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Department of Commerce
- Food and Drug Administration
- Federal Elections Commission
- Government Accountability Office
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- National Institutes of Health
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- US Merit Systems Protection Board

The Non-Civil Servants represented the following organizations:

- 3T International, Inc.
- GovLoop
- IDC
- International Data Corporation
- Information Dynamics
- LMI
- Mixed Media Strategies
- Phase One Consulting Group
- The George Washington University
- University of Maryland
- Weisman Consulting