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Introduction

**Web 2.0, Enterprise 2.0, Government 2.0**

Government 2.0 is driving transformation. Change. Cultural change. Harnessing knowledge, participation, collaboration and innovative ideas through social networks to improve government results. The challenge: employing effective change management skills in the emerging Government 2.0 open environment.

Government 2.0 leverages Web 2.0 and social networking technology. Many Government 2.0 early adopter organizations have embraced transformational change by leveraging Internet-based applications for social networking. The results are compelling:

- 50% of citizens who engage in government networks are more likely to vote (Digital Communities, 2008).
- 85% of Americans believe a company should interact with its customers via social media (Larrumbide, 2008).
- In 2009, nearly one in two businesses was projected to make use of Web 2.0 software (Young, Burris & Reiss-Davis, 2009).
- 3% of the Internet population, ages 13-54, use social media (Knowledge Networks Press Release, 2009).

Government 2.0—transparency, participation, collaboration—is rapidly growing. Why? Public sector organizations are under increasing pressure to do more with less and to improve results. To harness knowledge. To modernize management practices. To improve productivity with shrinking budgets.

After all, government is in the knowledge business: leveraging knowledge to better serve citizens. Improving food production. Fostering industry innovation. Enhancing health. Educating citizens.

What proven, pre-Government 2.0 management practices do government leaders need to prepare for the social collaboration paradigm shift? What new skills do government leaders need to learn?

This white paper shows how both proven and emerging change management practices enable government leaders to leverage Government 2.0.
From Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 – What’s Different?

Organizations use traditional Internet, or Web 1.0, techniques for 'out of network' behaviors (Kobza, 2008). Using this network metaphor, organizations build relationships by creating and pitching messages into networks of which they are not a part. Like advertising. Outside looking in. And, pushing messages to an audience in hopes of building awareness or influencing behaviour.

Social networking, sometimes called Web 2.0 (O’Reilly, 2005), or Enterprise 2.0 in the business environment (Frappaolo, 2008), enables social collaboration. Web 2.0 turns the Web 1.0 model inside out. Rather than passive onlookers, organizations reside “in-network” — as an integral part of the network, contributing to discussions as peers rather than outsiders.

Web 2.0 capabilities — especially social collaboration — are employed internal and external to organizations.

- Crowdsourcing – generating and selecting ideas from a wide group
- Public Comment – surveying and polling of large groups
- Online Communities – collaborating through knowledge creation, knowledge management, and sharing sites including the use of blogs and wikis
- Marketplaces – transacting in business-to-business or cross-organizational exchanges
- Mobile Communications – generating organizational one-to-many communications through cellular technology

Figure 1: In-Network vs Out-of-Network

Source: Copyright © 2009 INgage Networks
Challenges in Web 2.0

Organizations must learn to participate “in-network” to drive value in the Web 2.0 model. This new style of operating requires developing new ways of thinking and new behaviours.

Organizations in the Web 1.0 model view customer, partner, employee or citizen outreach as a marketing exercise designed to push outward messages. The outreach may take the form of surveys, customer call centers, employee suggestion boxes, town hall meetings, or other formats which may be an effective means of data collection and reporting. However, with limited interpersonal listening or interaction.

Taking up residence in-network changes the organization role by becoming network peers and learning the art of listening. Rather than gatekeepers, organizations become enablers – inviting partners, customers, employees or citizens into conversations.

Figure 2: Towards peer production

Source: by Dion Hinchcliffe. Copyrights © 2009 ZDNet
In the late 1990s, many experts thought that e-Government would transform the nature of government (FreeBalance, 2009-2). This view did not adequately recognize societal and technology trends:

- Flattening of organizational structures to enable more effective decision-making
- Technology innovation making software easier to use and more flexible through people-centric applications (Russom, 1999)
- Recognition of common processes within government, such as the U.S. Government Line of Business initiative

- Use of person-assisted machine learning through folksonomies
- Maturing of semantic technologies
- Focus on enterprise and government performance management

e-Government did not achieve expected results because enabling technology was Web 1.0 oriented.

**Table 1: Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web 2.0</td>
<td>Web applications which facilitate interactive information sharing, interoperability, user-centered design and collaboration on the World Wide Web (Web 2.0, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise 2.0</td>
<td>The use of emergent social software platforms (flexible work models, knowledge sharing, community-building) within organizations, or between organizations and their partners or customers (McAfee, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government 2.0</td>
<td>The application of Web 2.0/Enterprise 2.0 applications and concepts in the public sector (Eggers, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management 2.0</td>
<td>Web 2.0 has broadened the definition to encompass a range of web-based practices used to identify, create, represent, distribute and enable adoption of insights and experiences. There is no widely accepted definition of Knowledge Management, however a broad listing of definitions is provided in the Reference section of this whitepaper (Sims, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Collaboration</td>
<td>Processes that help multiple people interact, share information to achieve any common goal. Such processes find their ‘natural’ environment on the Internet, where collaboration and social dissemination of information are made easier by current innovations (Social Collaboration, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash-up</td>
<td>Data from multiple sources, such as data.gov, combined or “mashed up” to create clarity and insight. (Figure 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harnessing Knowledge Through Government 2.0

Social networking provides governments with a new paradigm: knowledge release rather than knowledge control. This Government 2.0 approach can harness government knowledge to improve results. Government software technology can be categorized (FreeBalance, 2009-1) with the following framework:

- Internal: internal by governments
- External: external to government with government involvement
- Structural: follow government structure and mandate
- Social: enable collaboration

This framework identifies three classes of applications:

- **Back-office**: operational budget, financial and civil service management-transaction management
- **e-Government**: exposing government information and transactions
- **Government 2.0**: social networking whether exclusively internal or collaborating externally

![Figure 3: Framework for Categorizing Government Software Technology](source: FreeBalance)

![Figure 4: How Government 2.0 Improves Government Results](source: FreeBalance)
Knowledge integration among internal and external facing structural and social applications improves government results:

- Leverages internal government communities of experts improves processes
- Techniques for internal government collaboration and knowledge sharing can be extended to the public
- Transparent release of government information to the public can be analyzed to help improve government programs through “mashing up”
- Analysis by the “wisdom of crowds” can make government more accountable and responsive

What is the power of mashups? Mashups deliver unexpected insight by combining data and graphics interactively.

Figure 5: Knowledge Integration from Multiple Sources in the Form of a Mashup

Datamasher.org, created by Forum One Communications, interactively mashes up openly available U.S. state data indicators from data.gov with geographic information. (This site was awarded first place in the Sunlight Foundation “Apps for America 2” contest.)
Knowledge Management Paradigm Shift

Government is in the knowledge business. Web 2.0 dramatically changes the knowledge paradigm. Knowledge Management (KM) technology has primarily been internal and structural in nature by capturing explicit knowledge and by converting tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge. “Traditional KM was not really about knowledge but the management of secrets. By that I mean that management had become so frightened by compliance – especially Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) – that they needed and wanted an iron grip control over the environment. They got that OK but completely stifled creativity in the process so rather than freeing up creativity, they locked it down. What we’re now seeing is KM as it should be – no constraint” (Suarez, 2007). And, there has been some difficulty in defining “knowledge management” (Sims, 2008). This has given rise to numerous technologies that fall within broad definitions of KM to acquire, store, disseminate and apply knowledge:

- Groupware and other collaboration software often project-related or community-of-practice related
- Explicit knowledge repositories
- Content and document management attempting to capture knowledge during content production
- Portals and Intranets attempting to publish explicit knowledge
- Neural network and other machine learning methods that attempt to gather knowledge
- Search and business intelligence technology to assist knowledge discovery and text mining
- Organizational learning, e-learning and other human resources oriented systems
Knowledge Management 2.0 in government extends beyond the internal structural focus to internal social focus to enable collaboration and knowledge sharing (Figure 6). It also leverages the “wisdom of crowds” to engage external experts and citizens. Many see Knowledge Management 2.0 as KM that “people will actually use” (Spanbauer, 2007).

Table 2: Contrasting KM 1.0 and KM 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Management 1.0</th>
<th>Knowledge Management 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top down</td>
<td>Bottom up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly structured</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document-centric</td>
<td>People-centric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine learning</td>
<td>We are the machine-folksonomies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate-driven</td>
<td>Participation-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom of experts</td>
<td>Wisdom of crowds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Evolution of Knowledge Management from 1.0 to 2.0

Source: Okimoto, 2007, IBM Corporation Study entitled, “Industry Trends: The Evolution of Knowledge Management (KM 1.0 vs KM 2.0)”
Government 2.0 – Benefits

The Government 2.0 role is as in-network trusted advisor and enabler. The network effect operates by compounding in value with every connection. With every piece of content. Value for governments, businesses, and citizens in external-facing Government 2.0. And, value through government collaboration in internal-facing Government 2.0. Government 2.0 promises to improve government knowledge management in several ways:

- Reduced cost of engagement through more productive tools and processes
- Simplified knowledge creation and retention through usable applications
- Easier knowledge sharing
- Enhanced information discovery through transparency and data mashups
- Effective cross-pollination through bottom-up social collaboration
- Leveraging internal government and external “wisdom of crowds” to improve government results
- Fostering of innovation, through the use of flexible tools.
- Expanded engagement
- Faster completion of review cycles
- Improved citizen and employee satisfaction

Direct and in-direct benefits accrue over time thanks to social networking. Indirect benefits result in a cascading effect (Hinchcliffe, 2009) beginning with open knowledge management. The cause-and-effect chain reaction is a cascading effect of improved knowledge retention resulting in improved decision-making and more efficient operations.

Figure 7: Cause and Effect Chains with Enterprise 2.0 Tools.
Social Media Creates Government 2.0 Value

Government 2.0 is also reported to create value for public outreach and agency collaboration. Unlike traditional e-government, Government 2.0 engages stakeholders. Project, issues, rules, legislation, events, and emergencies, in addition to public outreach have benefitted from social networking.

Examples also abound of improved agency collaboration as a result of social networking. Benefits have included improved effectiveness in mission fulfillment, intra-agency operations, and coordination.

Table 3: Government 2.0 Examples of Social Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Engagement</th>
<th>Public Service Entity</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public Outreach    | Citizens’ Health Care Working Group (CHCWG) | Under the direction of HHS, CHCWG commissioned by Congress to enlist citizens to provide input to review health care system | • Solution up and running in less than 1 month  
• Section 508 compliance ensured access for all  
• Online participation complemented town hall meetings, quadrupling participation  
• Cost-per-participant decreased 97%; $7.50 online vs. $250 in-person |
| Inter-Agency Collaboration | Defence Acquisition Performance Assessment (DAPA) | Department of Defense (DoD) sought to identify areas for cost savings. Tapped global military leaders for ideas and feedback | • Time to market under 72 hours  
• One employee with limited IT skills managed outreach and incorporated findings into reports  
• DoD benefitted from shared insight and knowledge of military leaders on the ground  
• Report and recommendations delivered to Deputy Secretary of Defense on-time and on-budget |
| Agency Mission Fulfillment | South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) | Online collaboration enabled agencies from multiple jurisdictions to work together and engage citizens | • Online public comment enabled easy access to voice opinions and concerns during the project development process  
• Small project team cost-effectively managed large, complex public involvement project  
• Enabled SFWMD to fulfill Governor-initiated programs for restoration |
| Project Public Outreach | National Public Safety (NPS) | Public invited to help create memorial to honor the passengers and crew of Flight 93 using Web 2.0 “crowdsourcing” | • Online design competition resulted in over 1000 design components submitted by the public  
• Secure, online environment for collaboration among globally dispersed family members and National Public Safety (NPS)  
• Small staff with limited IT skills managed entire process |
| Project Public Outreach | Atlanta Beltline | To secure $2B funding approval for 22-mile loop rail system, development authorities turned to the Web to engage citizens and invite their participation in planning | • Time to market under 2 weeks  
• Participation by 10,000+ residents  
• Small team captured and analyzed public comment, addressed concerns and presented findings – within 6 weeks |
Full Government 2.0 benefits require significant organizational change. Embracing the Web 2.0 paradigm entails collaborating across organizational boundaries and hierarchies to be effective. Government leaders have mandated responsibilities across the lifecycle of executive responsibilities – visioning, strategy development, planning, and operational implementation. Government 2.0 provides government leaders with new approaches to meet these executive responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>1.0 Approach</th>
<th>2.0 Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-gearing Implementation Approaches and Methods</td>
<td><strong>Sequential, Top-Down Approach:</strong> Traditional Work Plan, Cost Baseline, Opportunity Assessment, Opportunity Prioritization, Implementation Roadmap</td>
<td><strong>Design Thinking (Iterate and Refine):</strong> Understand Drivers, Create Enabling Frameworks, Support Initiatives, Drive Adoption and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying Change Management Frameworks</td>
<td><strong>Push:</strong> Cascading through hierarchical levels, sequential communications plans</td>
<td><strong>Pull:</strong> Viral – all points communications plan leveraging key roles for diffusion e.g. Mavens, Connectors and Salesmen (Gladwell, 2002) within and outside the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Critical Mass for Collaboration and Participation</td>
<td><strong>Silo-centric:</strong> Sharing within departmental functions or within organizations</td>
<td><strong>Inclusive:</strong> Valued and reciprocated internal and external sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT (Web 2.0) Tool Selection</td>
<td><strong>Project focus:</strong> Series of unrelated “one-off” projects</td>
<td><strong>Program focus:</strong> Ecosystem of applications working together to achieve goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Implementation Considerations for Web 2.0 capabilities</td>
<td><strong>In-house:</strong> Operations maintain and run licensed software – which Gartner estimates to be 75% of typical IT budgets (Socialtext, 2009)</td>
<td><strong>Hybrid:</strong> Leverage secure Software as a Service (SaaS) subscription model and evaluating Free and Open Source (FOSS), where appropriate, to overall security and risk considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Concerns for Web 2.0 social collaboration</td>
<td><strong>In or Out:</strong> “The single” Enterprise Firewall. Functions are either IN the organization or not operating. Users collaborate on social networks at home or through smart phones</td>
<td><strong>Holistic view:</strong> Multiple security regimes supporting security proportional to social collaboration risk and benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three New Leadership Skills for Implementing Government 2.0

1. Incorporate “design thinking” (Government 2.0 mindset) as a supplement to “management thinking” (Government 1.0 mindset)

“Design thinking” uses a collaborative and iterative style of working that builds up ideas – the best ideas surfacing from a pool of many. Design thinking (Martin, 2009) includes skills such as complex problem-solving in teams. It entails the art of balancing analysis with ideation, visual sensemaking (making the complex simple through pictures), and evaluating, selecting, and executing well on the best ideas. Design thinking leverages leadership’s knowledge of the organization’s operational systems. It promotes holistic, integrated views of the enterprise as a collection of business processes, organizational structures, performance measures, IT applications, skills, and culture aligned to strategic objectives.

Design thinking also includes listening, experimenting, applying and developing the best ideas quickly. Here are some examples of design thinking skills:

- Discover: Discovery can include fact-finding through formal processes that help the organization identify potential high value external networks, e.g., monitoring and analyzing feedback from citizens. Discovery can include capturing facts about internal organizational opportunities and experimenting with networking relationships.

- Experimentation: After discovering potential areas for applying Web 2.0 capabilities, many early adopters of Web 2.0 have piloted appropriate social collaboration techniques. For example, NASA advanced their understanding of Web 2.0 by starting with a pilot for internal workplace collaboration called Spacebook, a Facebook for internal operations.

- Application: Organizations apply lessons learned from Web 2.0 pilots before wider application across the organization. Organizations leverage internal lessons and subsequently develop measurements to assess future benefits. The NASA pilot, for example, enabled the organization to experiment and identify the potential impacts of social collaboration for the organization before scaling to larger communities.

- Develop and Scale: Effective integration of social media is achieved by focusing on the right challenges as validated by customer/citizen online behaviour. This requires applying design thinking in real-time to real challenges. The NASA pilot enabled the organization to address tough challenges such as security and scalability.
2. Improve ability to leverage “viral” change
Web 2.0 and Government 2.0 promise transformational change. Ongoing change has become a defining characteristic of the “new normal.” That’s why the topic of organizational change and development has become widespread in the business, organization, leadership and management literature (McNamara, 2009).

Many organizational change management frameworks in use today are static in nature and “top down” in structure. They were developed during an era that valued top down, internal to a target audience. This approach works for a mandated roll-out of change – where change is pushed out to a target audience. Change Management in the Web 2.0 era is more peer-to-peer, viral – change is pulled by participating constituents, employees, customers.

Today, large-scale change management models involve top-down executive communication – target audiences are communicated “to” from the “outside in.” The dynamics of viral change adoption requires that the organization is “in network” participating in conversations and relationships. Viral change adoption reduces resistance to change through the engagement of peer networks, but frequently challenges leadership. Why?

Web 2.0 brings with it a swift pace of change that requires organizational leaders to adopt new ways of thinking and new behaviours (Kobza, 2008). Leading change in the Government 2.0 era requires new leadership skills that include listening, influencing, collaborating, and stakeholder inclusion. While Government 2.0 early adopters are driving the need for new “pull” methods of change management, the gold standard of effective change management disciplines remain – engage stakeholders up front during project definition and engage in frequent, clear communication. The key difference in the era of Government 2.0 for leaders is in the need to engage with others, to convert value from the network into meaningful products and services and knowledge, and to identify practical solutions to challenges. Leaders also need the facility to operate within multiple networks. Networks of customers, partners, employees, and citizens create compelling organizational value.

3. Web 2.0 means solving problems by making necessary changes in the organization to achieve desired outcomes
Web 2.0 initiatives need to align with strategic organizational objectives. The strategic impact of Web 2.0 on organizational drivers, risks and barriers, stakeholders and culture are first identified. Giving forethought to the anticipated ripple effect of social networks and collaboration on the organization’s business processes, roles, skills, culture and infrastructure lessens negative impacts of reactive change. This reduces the amount of unanticipated impacts which will surface during the pilot or discovery phase.
Leading change in the Government 2.0 era requires developing new mindsets and skills while leveraging proven techniques. Examples of best practices in change management (Gotta, 2007) include:

- Defining what Web 2.0 means to the organization strategic objectives, and value proposition, rather than relying on vague industry definitions and media hype
- Supporting the business model with Web 2.0 technologies — reconciling valid risk concerns such as security needs, separation of duties for checks and balances, or external compliance requirements
- Garnering executive ownership to fully support and adopt the Web 2.0 strategy, but thriving on grass-roots ownership
- Designing end-to-end enterprise value rather than limited functional gains
- Aligning with human resources programs to address multi-generational needs
- Defining “program” metrics in alignment with key organizational goals so that there is agreement in advance on success, failure, progress, and completion of the effort
- Including mechanisms to communicate success, failure and lessons learned across the organization
- Using project governance practices to continuously ensure the validity of knowledge generated with Web 2.0 technologies

In addition, new key roles may be required to leverage Government 2.0 and measure the performance of on-line initiatives. These roles include community evangelists, community management moderators, digital liaisons, brand managers and/or database analysts.

Figure 8: Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches Merge

Source: by Dion Hinchcliffe. Copyrights © 2009 ZDNet
Government 2.0, through the use of social collaboration tools, can and should represent real transformation. Social collaboration, and even electronic outreach that mirrors traditional processes, can make meaningful improvements in every part of every organization.

Executive Order and Memorandum Number 3—issued by President Obama on January 27th, 2009, for improved transparency and open government—has set the direction and pace for Government 2.0 in the United States. Transforming government with new and effective models of transparency, collaboration, and innovation in the public sector is gaining momentum. New Web 2.0 technology is being introduced and adapted for the government context. Privacy, trust, risk, security, and scalability technology issues with Web 2.0 are being overcome. Knowledge capture and retention is improving through collaborative social networking.

Relentless pressure to do more with less in the public sector will continue. To reduce costs, save time, improve results, and create value. To harness and share knowledge more cost effectively. To modernize management practices. All of these factors are creating the need to responsibly leverage new technologies enabling social collaboration. Implication: accelerated organizational transformation and change.

Government 2.0 requires leaders to embrace an enhanced set of change and risk management skills. It requires a paradigm shift from outside-to-inside networks, and right-sizing operational controls. It requires new skills in design thinking, trust, and change leadership. The future is here for public sector organizations, and its name is Government 2.0.
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