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Introduction

1. This paper is intended to present a general picture of what the current thinking is in the NZ Public Service on shared workspace; how that thinking is being translated into technology initiatives relating to policy development and project management; and how this compares to what is available and happening in other jurisdictions.

2. The project team has now completed the main part of the investigation work to identify existing shared workspace initiatives in the New Zealand Public Service and other jurisdictions. This work will continue as the rest of the project unfolds, but the team is confident that we have identified a broad sample of initiatives currently underway in the NZ Public Service and have a reasonable indication of the general international picture insofar as we are able, given the limited nature of the investigation.

3. The intention of the team is to use the material we have at this point in time, to provide a basis for further discussion, and yet more investigation. This is an input into the broader project and should not be read as a definitive statement but rather, a work in progress. Themes and issues emerging will be identified. Our thinking to date on the relative importance and impact of some of these issues will be discussed.

Background

4. The Department of Statistics kindly provided us with a record of some of the early correspondence between its previous Chief Executive, Len Cook and the Chief Executives Forum on ‘the secure exchange of electronic information in government’ between March and May 1999. We understand this work was the precursor to the current project. The Department of Statistics has a strong interest in IT investment and has made considerable progress to leveraging existing technologies to automate as many of its service delivery functions as possible.

5. Len Cook saw an opportunity to expand this work broadly within the Public Service to manage cross agency investments and increase the potential for collaboration in developing policy advice. He believed the tools for using technology to streamline inter-agency processes already existed and should be utilised as quickly as possible. In May 1999, he argued there were two significant costs the government faced in not proceeding with a shared workspace initiative immediately: “… one is the cost of inaction, and the other is the cost of needless experimentation”.

6. The thrust of Cook’s argument was that the government sector should seek to gain “… the highest possible leverage from existing ‘workspace’ practices and systems in the public sector, and working [sic] with commonly used tools, of industry leaders” (May 1999). In an attempt to have the project work progressed as quickly as possible, Len Cook and DPM&C supported Lotus Notes/IBM to do some initial work scoping out the possibilities for

---

1 This paper has been co-authored by the Project Team members, Rose O’Neill (Project Manager); Sandi Beatie (Synergy International); and Franz Ombler (Treasury). It is written in the first person, as a work-in-progress. The project is owned and managed by the State Services Commission as a subproject to the Secure Electronic Environment work.

2 The papers supplied by the Department of Statistics included papers Len had written outlining his vision for a government workspace project, and his view on the key issues relating to the implementation of such an initiative.
application of shared workspace technology in the Public Service. The ideas and issues identified in the Lotus Notes work are discussed in greater detail in this paper.

7 In March 1999 Len Cook noted, “… There is a significant support at CE level for the project, in principle. To a number of departments, we have not provided a good enough proposal for them to be sure that it will work for them. We have moved too quickly in involving IBM/Lotus, in the minds of some. … Others simply say “get on with it.” …”. This reaction from chief executives is important in the context of the current workspace project. It is obvious that this project picks up from the thinking that has been around in the Public Service for some time, and it is necessary to ensure that the concerns of chief executives are adequately addressed to secure support for progressing further when, and if, appropriate.

8 In May 1999, the project initiated by Len Cook was stopped and CE’s were formally advised. At that time, the Secure Electronic Environment (SEE) project was initiated to develop a secure infrastructure for exchanging information in the Public Service. It was seen as appropriate to wait for the secure infrastructure to be built, tested and implemented before progressing the workspace ideas further. The State Services Commission has since moved to develop an e-government strategy and vision that was formally adopted by Government in November 1999. The current project is part of the e-government programme and it picks up, and expands, the early work done on shared policy workspace.

Comment

9 Apart from being a useful exercise in tracking the genesis of the current workspace project, the papers provided by Statistics are also useful for identifying the critical assumptions that underpinned the thinking of Public Service leaders on the issue of shared workspace. It is clear that the early work gained considerable support for the ‘principle of a central government intranet’ (Cook: May 1999), and this may prove to be invaluable.

10 What is less clear is what was meant by the term ‘shared workspace’; whether there was a common understanding of the products and processes involved; the implications of implementation on the public management system; or how the workspace would be utilised, by whom and for what purpose. Issues of ownership and accountability also appear to have been raised, but not resolved.

11 Examining the documentation on this subject has led the project team to identify a number of questions and issues including:

- the definition, and boundaries of the ‘shared workspace’ concept;
- ways in which a shared workspace can contribute to the efficiency or effectiveness of policy development and/or project management;
- point(s) in the policy development [project management] process where it is most appropriate to utilise a shared workspace;
- intranet, extranet, internet interface – are there significant policy, or technological, differences between these?

12 The process of looking critically at these issues has given us a sense of the key issues and what we need to be looking at in the next phase when we explore the concept of a ‘shared workspace’ with policy managers in the Public Service. This paper discusses these issues, and lays the foundation for further investigation in phase two of the project.
Methodology

Sources of information

The investigation phase has been primarily a combination of examining three sources of information:

- Literature, including published and unpublished papers, e-mails and other relevant correspondence;
- associated websites; and
- interviews with Public Service contacts on existing technology-assisted collaboration initiatives.¹

In addition, several of the Public Service contacts we met with demonstrated products to us that could loosely be categorised as ‘shared workspace’ technologies. Members of the project team attended a technology demonstration (SPEX) held by Standards New Zealand,² and participated in a group discussion on the application of the technology. A small number of overseas contacts were also made to obtain a broad-based view of how collaborative technologies are utilised in other jurisdictions (supplementing information obtained from other sources).

The project team have accumulated a range of additional contacts in the course of our investigation that we have not yet had the time to follow through. This includes information on collaborative project management websites (e.g. Health), security intelligence networks and possibly military applications as well as some private sector initiatives. It is intended to supplement the existing information by further investigation in phase two of the project.

A table is provided (Attachment 1) that summarises the range of initiatives we have identified to date. This list does not cover all existing Public Service electronic projects, but provides a sample of the range of activities currently underway.

Review of other jurisdictions

The project team undertook a scan of relevant literature sources, URL sites and initiatives sponsored by overseas jurisdictions. It is apparent that not only are there quite a lot of initiatives being explored both in New Zealand and overseas, but there is also the will amongst government officials to be part of developing improved means of collaboration supported by enabling technologies. The imperatives for this include citizen driven demands for access to real time information and improved quality of service, as well as politicians’ expectations and demands for improved and more robust policy advice in an increasingly complex environment.

Governments (both State and Federal) of Australia, Canada, Finland, Netherlands, United States and UK are, like New Zealand, grappling with technological advances and their implications for the business of government. Most have developed a vision and particular strategies around the information age and knowledge economy. These governments tend to be the leading proponents of better quality communication and information access about and from public bodies for the public and specific stakeholder groups.

¹ A bibliography of key documents, relevant websites and contacts is attached.
² It should be noted that with the exception of Standards NZ who offered us a demonstration of their technology, the project team has not investigated any other initiatives in the wider State sector.
While the Victoria State Government is considered the most advanced in Australia its focus in terms of e-government has been on technologies to assist citizens’ access to information and to doing business (for example, obtaining licences and forms), in a seamless way with the various Government departments. Cross-department procurement is also under development. The approach of other jurisdictions has been largely to explore both citizen access to information and online services. For example, the Netherlands and the UK have developed specific strategies for modernising policy processes.

The Netherlands started experimenting with electronic means for quite significant policy development initiatives in the early nineties. These have been both within a department (e.g. Environment, Transport) as well as in an interdepartmental context. The latter also involves business and other stakeholder consultation and input. The organisational framework for these initiatives was based on ‘systems thinking’ methods and the concept of ‘networks’ rather than hierarchies. The technologies are based primarily on group support systems application (GSS). These are similar to the Decision Support Centre technologies promoted by Victoria University of Wellington, where groups of people meet to brainstorm and debate on-line. Research conducted by Delft University of Technology concluded that people need to be competent and confident in using the technologies and understand the processes to be used and that there is a need for protocols around electronic based interaction.

In the UK, the Cabinet Office IT Unit is spearheading the Blair Government’s strategies and initiatives for modernising the public service. Part of this programme includes the reform of the policy making process. These reforms are based upon taking a more ‘corporate’ approach to achieving crosscutting goals, and utilising the opportunities presented via the “information age” to achieve better integration of processes and systems for policy-making.

Our scan of the international environment found that the use of more advanced technologies for knowledge management, research and information retrieval and for the efficient conduct of the business of government, have become increasingly important and urgent issues for the public sector to address. These are also issues that the private sector is advancing. Large multinationals such as the ‘Big 5” consulting firms, also have international intranets and systems for information access and knowledge exchange.

Globalisation, coupled with greater sophistication in the technologies available, has meant more companies are establishing cross-country ‘virtual teams’ for specific activities such as product development and/or specific projects. These teams are expected to function and conduct their business in much the same way as a team that meets face to face. The literature provides some useful lessons from the experiences of virtual teams that will be helpful when defining questions of ownership, governance and work practices in a policy environment.

New Zealand Public Service review

‘Top of the head’ issues for the officials we have met with so far, centre on more cohesive and efficient approaches to collaboration, communication and information sharing. There is a groundswell of support for enabling technologies that will allow policy development and project management processes to be conducted electronically. Technology is seen as both enabling efficient processes and as the catalyst for ‘raising the game’ in terms of the conduct of public sector business.

5 Research paper based on post-implementation evaluation of experiences with facilitating policy meetings.
6 KPMG, Ernst Young, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Deloittes, Andersens.
The shared workspace project starts from the supposition that over the past 10-20 years much of the development of technology in the Public Service has involved the automation of core paper processes. For example, all Public Service policy analysts now have some degree of computer literacy, and at the very least do their own word processing. In some parts of the Public Service, automating paper records is still the primary focus of technology development (e.g. the current exercise being carried out by LINZ to transfer all titles and survey records from paper to computer form).

Recently, departments have become more sophisticated in their use of technology and with the development of the Internet and e-mail systems, computers are used more and more for interactive engagement both within and across organisations, and within and across national boundaries. Many departments have developed good quality intranet services for staff, and are moving towards ensuring that core documents including operation manuals, departmental policies and papers of interest are being made available to staff on-line. Some initiatives are underway to provide core government resources (e.g. legislation) as a central electronic database. Internet is used as a basic resource tool for research and evaluation purposes. Increasingly, technology options for engaging the public and commercial interests in government processing are also being explored.

The way government departments interact with each other, however, appears to be an area where little work has been done. An array of technologies is available that will enable greater connectivity in the policy making process. What is required, however, is not only the application of new technologies but a fundamental adjustment in the way that we think about work processes, and the way officials interact. The ‘real’ issues lie in:

- reaching an agreed definition of the requirements of shared workspace;
- exploring and addressing the impact of automation on the current policy processes;
- developing a model of how departments and officials will need to work together; and
- establishing protocols that will need to accompany electronic shared workspace.

Considerable progress has been made in the Public Service towards active electronic project management. The Department of Statistics, LINZ and Standards New Zealand for example, all have project management systems that range from template-based process management to electronic archival systems, and interactive discussion groups where project members can develop thinking on specific topics as input to formal papers.

Protocols and ways of working with these technologies are still undergoing development, but the basic interactive processes are available. Public consultation as a part of project implementation is also being managed electronically (alongside manual options). The Royal Commission on Genetic Modification (Internal Affairs) and the Public Works Act review (LINZ) are examples of this. As both of these are in the early stages of development, it is too early to assess how successful they are.

Where technology is being used for policy development processes the absence of a secure environment is a major restraint. Some groups have closed websites (e.g. LINZ – Public Works Act review and hydrography) but these are primarily where the host department posts static information. They are basically information-sharing forums. Development work, and policy production processes are still operated semi-manually (i.e.
discussion meetings; word processing of drafts which are either delivered manually to departments for comment or circulated via the e-mail). Other policy development initiatives have set up ‘interest group’ e-mail systems for discussing key issues (e.g. Oceans policy). These are not secure, and have proved to be difficult in terms of managing collective input to core documents.

31 We observe a degree of impatience within the Public Service to just get on with implementing whatever needs to be done to enable better cross-boundary work. The electronic initiatives being spearheaded by various departments are genuine attempts to not only innovate, but also to realise gains from greater connectivity. There is also the assumption that security and flexibility will be key considerations in whatever technologies are chosen to achieve a ‘corporate’ style electronic policy development capability. The project team received a clear sense that if shared policy workspace is not developed in the near future in a coordinated and managed way across the Public Service, it will emerge anyway in an ad hoc manner.

Developing a shared policy workspace

32 Some of the advantages to the adoption of electronic methods of working in the Public Service include:

- enabling greater accessibility to information, research and dialogue;
- fast, efficient means of communication and the transmission of ideas and options;
- improving the quality of advice through a wider range of inputs;
- utilisation of technical capability and capacity of the new ‘e’ enabled technologies; and
- facilitating efficient changes to work practices.

33 The elements of information-gathering, exchange, analysis, discussion and exploration of options, and the formulation of conclusions and recommendations, make the craft of policy development a prime candidate for shared workspace. While e-mail systems are the most common means of electronic interaction these are severely limited as a tool for sharing large amounts of information, and as a means of actively engaging people in critical thinking and/or processing information.

34 What is required is a conceptual framework that allows us to understand more fully what is included in a consideration of ‘intra-government’ (i.e. interaction between government agencies), and what the boundaries are with wider e-government processes, including citizen access to government. The diagram on the following page describes the thinking of the project team to date on the boundaries of intra-government activities, and the relationship with other e-government services, and is a starting point for further discussion.

35 In the diagram, we have identified the key functions government agencies may perform electronically (either partially or fully). This includes service delivery and commercial transactions, for example. Each function may involve different activities depending on whether government agencies are interacting with each other, or with citizens (including business interests). Examples of this are provided. At this time, the project team sees the organisation of Public Service information and knowledge as an intra-government activity.
INTRA-GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY: BOUNDARIES AND RELATIONSHIPS

Intra-Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and Policy Workspace</th>
<th>Legislation, CFISnet, Lessons learned, Public admin info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of Public Service Information and Knowledge</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject expertise, Policy input</th>
<th>Stats datasets</th>
<th>Purchase of stats databases</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>PAYE returns, Benefit payments, Land titles &amp; survey</td>
<td>e-Procurement, Land titles &amp; survey</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest group Engagement</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Commercial Transactions</th>
<th>Static Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions, Consultation, Subject expertise</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Web sites, Legislation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizen/Business ↔ Government

Refer paragraphs 34-35
The project team has examined models of policy development and project management in an effort to understand how technology can be applied to streamline, or simply to automate some of these processes. A discussion of the models available follows. Considerable work remains to be done on this as part of the next phases of work.

**Policy Mapping**

Part of the early work completed on the shared workspace concept for Statistics New Zealand, included mapping the policy development process. The map was predicated on an assumption that the production of Cabinet papers, and the Cabinet decision-making process, is the core of government policy development activity. Thus, the depiction of the policy development process starts with the assignment of a policy advisor and jumps directly into the drafting of the first Cabinet paper.

This approach misses the iterative processes that constitute policy development in the Public Service and captures only the production processes associated with one of the key outputs. The project team sees the shared workspace concept as being only in part about the production of policy products. It also encapsulates the use of technology for:

- sharing information and ideas;
- formulating concepts and frameworks that can usefully be applied to the analysis of policy issues;
- utilising research and evaluations as input to analysis; and
- carrying out a range of relevant analyses to shape and formulate specific policies (e.g. social impact/economic/cost-benefit/gender etc.)

**Quality of policy advice project**

The SSC published work on *Improving the quality of policy advice in the Public Service* adopts a more high level approach to policy mapping. The model used identifies the interdependencies and relationships between several inputs to the policy development process.
This model is useful in that it identifies some of the key processes that need to be considered. It is limited, however, in that it does not map out the way these processes are used in the development of policy; how they are affected by multiparty contributions; or how the nature of inter-agency collaboration changes the dynamic interaction between separate processes.

To analyse how a policy development shared workspace might work most effectively a more accurate picture of the iterative process of policy development, and how this operates in a collaborative environment, needs to be reached. Clear workflow mapping is required. This is one of the key outcomes sought in the second phase of this project, in discussion with Public sector policy managers.

The project team sees policy development and project management as processes with distinct workflow patterns, which can be inter-related, but are not dependent on each other. Project management processes can be used in both operational and applied situations that do not involve policy development (e.g. building a house; reorganising a department). Equally, policy development can be done on issues that are not large enough to require project management, i.e. single-stream issues relevant to only a limited number of stakeholders (e.g. fees and charges regime for titles and survey searches).

The mapping of policy management processes is less complicated than that of policy development. The Department of Statistics provided the project team with project management templates available for managing and tracking project activities. These are attached (Attachment 2) and provide a useful starting point for looking at project management workflow in the next phase of this project.

Electronic shared policy workspace – high level concept

The project team has begun to develop its thinking on what an electronic shared workspace could be like using the analogy of a [secure] shopping mall where there are common spaces, and shared access routes, together with private facilities (e.g shops, movie theatres, management offices). From the research undertaken so far, a shared policy workspace would need to take account of three sets of interests: public stakeholders, government stakeholders, and interdepartmental project teams.

A very high level overview of the electronic workspace design would include:

- **Provision of a secure environment for the work of the project team** – this could include a shared workspace that enables the sharing and exchange of pre-production information and documents; facilities for brainstorming/white-boarding and discussion; a library of key documents (both policy and project management related); a shared area for the production of, and consultation on, the policy product and, secure access channels to related Public Service areas as required (e.g., the Cabinet Office).

- **Defined user group access to the project work** – we do not envisage ‘open’ access to project rooms. That is, the project team would define the user groups and the level of access for individuals within the group.
• **Provision of a public area** - officials (not part of the defined user group), the public, and/or external stakeholders in a particular project could view ‘public’ documents (e.g. terms of reference, draft discussion papers). This public area could also be used for generating and receiving public submissions.

• **Provision of a common area (or room)** - primarily an information base and knowledge manager for the sector. For example, legislation, statistical data, past reports, cabinet papers and minutes could be located in a common area. The ‘common room’ would also contain notice-board and chat-room facilities.

46 A pictorial depiction of how this might look, and the associated technological processes are presented on the following page. The project team will develop this concept to use as a discussion starter with Public sector policy and project managers in the next phase of this project. This will provide us with a tool to explore ideas around shared policy workspace and start to piece together its various components, and how it might all fit together.

47 In technological terms, this functionality required for this concept includes a common interface and architecture for electronic shared workspace across the sector, a portal to all projects, and inter-project links and dependencies. We also envisage that common systems administration would be required for ensuring security standards, user set-up, etc. Currently it does seem that the technologies required are already available on the market. At a later stage, careful exploration of the degree to which modification, and/or bespoke interfaces would need to be developed will be required.

48 In spite of considerable rhetoric, the extensive use of shared workspaces (whether they are referred to as virtual teams, or virtual communities) is not widespread in the New Zealand Public Service at the current time. People are keen, but are waiting for the availability of a secure electronic environment, and for the appropriate tools to facilitate efficient interaction.

49 Most of the current technology development, insofar as we could ascertain, is concerned with making information more accessible to a wider range of people, rather than using technology in an interactive manner. This includes departmental internet sites available to the public, and intra-government initiatives where technology is seen as a means of providing centralised information (i.e. an on-line library of key documents). There are far fewer examples of online workspaces, and the primary means of exchanging information remains the e-mail system.

50 The project team is of the view that it is not the technologies that present the greatest test or challenges, but the principles and protocols that sit behind the workspace concept, and the need to adjust to a new way of thinking about work practices. We have identified a range of issues relating to governance and accountability, collaboration, strategy, and structural adjustment that require further exploration. These issues are summarised in Attachment 3 and will be addressed in the next phase of the project.
A: Depiction of the types of functions that might be available to the stakeholders in the shared workspace.
- a project team space for policy development and production;
- viewing access, and input to documents (e.g. peer review), by Public Service and external stakeholders outside the project team.

B: Who the key players are, and the different roles they may have.

C: Portal to other applications on-line.

- Public Works Act Review is used as an example to demonstrate the concepts.

Refer paragraphs 44-50
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**ATTACHMENT 1**

**SAMPLE OF EXISTING PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRONIC INITIATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Australia** Victoria – government IT strategy (partnering with business is an integral component. Investment and innovation is encouraged)  
 Vicnet – electronic publishing  
 MAXI – online payment through kiosks  
 Dept. of Infrastructure – regional cooperation for project management – virtual team concept.  
 Tasmanian parliament – model for e-legislation |
| **Canada** Canadian Intelligence network – secure network between defence, RCMP, Prime Ministers Office, Foreign Affairs and Security Intelligence Bureau. |
| **United Kingdom** Central Computing & Telecommunications Agency (CCTA) operating through Performance and Innovation Unit (PIU) in Cabinet Office |
| **United States** USA House of Representatives – model for e-legislation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Zealand Public Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong> – Royal Commission on Genetic Modification website that accepts public submissions. No online analysis provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **E-procurement** – policy development phase under E-Government Unit.  
 STA piloting procurement portal from 31 October 2000. Customised to schools. |
| **GOVIS** – web forum.  
 Mail/distribution list.  
 Bulletin boards (don’t work – people prefer e-mail).  
 Files with folder structure – online archives of minutes. |
| **GCSB** Intelligence network [To be investigated further] |
| **Health** Hosts ‘team room’ – virtual project space for other departments. [To be further investigated] |
| **LINZ** GIDE – government information and discovery enhancement (metadata). Shared application to be resident in NZGO. |
Hydrography – website to exchange views.
OCGD - Officials Committee on Geospatial Data – Internet. Metadata. Web enabled
distribution.

Metadata – leveraging off existing infrastructure (e.g. NZGO) to provide geospatial
eenhancements to provide a greater range of government-to-citizen services.

Public Works Act review – sharing information. Static information published by LINZ.
Intention to be interactive. New software not required.
Public consultation – online submission form.

Topography - closed website. Not full security but do exchange commercially sensitive
material. User name/password access.
Topo-database: dispersed offices could do update/maintenance of database.

LPMG & WINZ – keen to share intranets. Initial scoping work completed but require
secure network.

MAF
e-certificates for export certificates. Using PKI system.
Virtual conferencing using interactive bulletin boards.

MFAT – secure network application [To be further investigated]

NZGO – collection of links to other websites.

Oceans policy – e-mail group.

Parliamentary Council Office
Developing an online environment for publishing and developing legislation.

(*Standards New Zealand – extranet project management system with discussion forum)
*Crown entity not Public sector entity.

Statistics
Documents for public comment available on website.
Registered users discussion groups.
Online service delivery – customisation of datasets, payment, delivery by e-mail.
INFOS – information network for official statistics (attempt to make more information
available on the web for free).
LBMS – project management methodology – template based.
Archival system (project database) for agendas/ minutes.

Treasury
Crown Financial Information System (CFIS) – secure web-based system to facilitate the
annual budget process; to monitor financial actuals; and to automate various other
processes related to Crown financial management. The system is used by several users in
all government agencies, and by most Treasury analysts. End-users have digital certificates,
and smart cards for authentication to the CFISnet server.
The following diagrams illustrate the core project management processes. These are reasonably generic and can be applied to a range of projects regardless of differences in substantive content. The project team sees these maps as useful as a basis for analysing how the various components can be translated into automated processes.

Project pre-initiation phase
51 Standards New Zealand has been developing project management workspace using an extranet (SPEX), and has mapped out the iterative processes involved. This may be useful as a basis for discussion with Public Service project managers in the next phase.
ATTACHMENT 3: SUMMARY OF EMERGING ISSUES

Summarised below are some of the key issues and questions that have emerged to date. More detailed analysis of these will be incorporated into phase two of this project.

Ownership, governance and accountability

- Political sponsorship of e-government and by extension reforms to the policy development process to enable an electronic shared workspace.
- Degree to which the Public Service takes a leadership role.
- Shared funding of technologies and their implementation.
- Common set of application development standards.
- Risk management.
- Security protocols.
- Work practice principles and protocols that enhance and support electronic shared workspace/s for policy development and project management including issues such as:
  - coherence and co-ordination;
  - efficient and effective policy development processes;
  - balance between ‘online’ and face to face;
  - interdepartmental and public consultation;
  - clear sponsorship of project teams;
  - quality assurance of the end products.

Models of collaboration

- Definition of a model that will work effectively in the New Zealand context and addresses issues such as:
  - use of technology tools to aid workflow and the production chain;
  - ease of access to information; and
  - enhanced mechanisms for communication;
  - balance between electronic working and face to face interaction.

Strategy and structural adjustment

- Definition of clear goals and a strategy around the future direction of policy development for the Public Service.
- Extent of changes to the way project teams are structured and managed.
- Capability of Public Service staff in relation to the competent use of technologies.
- Upskilling of policy and project staff to work in ‘new’ environment.