

Q3. What could be done to make the GNL best-of-class when it comes to collaboration?

- More equal-less power imbalance
- Distinguish what is a true collaboration vs transactions
- Providing money doesn't equal a partnership
- More communications internal (within departments and among departments) to have a better understanding of how to help/work better
- Improve internal collaborations
- Identify the mutual benefits by thinking outside of our own needs
- Assigned single employees to be a navigator or champion inside government
- Make information easy to access and find
- Some departments are not suited to collaborate with outside sources, such as information management.
- There has to be clear guidelines as to who can do this collaboration with the public
- The guidelines should state who can do it, what they can say, decide who to collaborate
- The employee has to be in a position to make a collaboration (other times public servants cannot do that, left to the minister)
- An example of the finance department to collaborate with stakeholders in order to develop complex models and assess impact on something, say someone's pension.
- To give share authority, make partnerships 50-50, for the greater good – as a government, will we ever get there?
- "I don't know if as a government we will ever 100 per cent actually collaborate."
- Sometimes it works out nice that the public said something and then the government does it, so that's kind of collaboration but is it really dialogue with a happy coincidence?
- Manage and clarify the expectations of such collaborations or partnerships
- Once in the confederation building, you lose perspective so collaboration with public stakeholders is absolutely needed to bring back that perspective in policy and decision making
- Provide a telephone number or such mechanisms for people to provide such feedback
- People also have to be aware of such chances to give feedback
- Multiple methods of gathering information must be gathered in order to get a variety of opinions
- Display proof that the public did in fact have impact in policy and decision making, so that people can see that they can make a difference; such an idea can remove apathy
- But what if government heard everything and then goes the opposite direction, makes people think what they say doesn't matter

- How representative is one situation, such a news story that pulls on the heart string, of the whole population? Should that one story affect policy making decisions?
- Talk to people active in the community, seek out such people and tell people in person about such events, seeking out those who just wouldn't automatically come to such events (Town hall meetings for example)
- If the questions for this meeting were sent a week in advance, we'd have more time to think about it and have better answers now instead of two minutes to think about it. Don't like having to do that. It gives deeper and more thoughtful answers
- Outline an agenda beforehand, so that people are aware at such meetings what will be talked about so that they can have thoughts ready to go.
- The younger generation don't care as much, there should be creative ways to let them know that they have such a chance to make a difference or have an impact on policy decision making.
- We can't always get what we want because of conflicting interests
- Ask first why collaboration is needed in the first place
- What is the best solution and what is the priority?
- Assign a single employee to be an official go-between or facilitator between a partner and the government, especially if they have to be dealing with multiple departments
- Willingness to collaborate
- Who are the partners?
- Government initiate/identity mutual benefit
- Early engagement
- Government should not always be the "lead" even if we provide money
- Money does not always make a good collaboration or partnership
- The level of political interest/profile can undermine partnerships
- Sometimes partnerships are best used for knowledge sharing and not always just about money
- Collaboration takes time and is not a quick fix
- Integrity, trust accountability can be counter to the quick timelines of govt.
- The budget processes of govt. use criteria that do not lend themselves to the type of evaluation criteria that these collaborations produce.
- Place a higher value in our evaluation work to showcase the benefits of these collaborations that can't be defined by the numbers that our system currently used.
- Be comfortable with the long term approach which collaborations are often best placed to address
- Explore different ways to collaborate with other entities that benefit the partnership
- Improve our internal collaboration within GNL
- We already have concerned citizen committees, where we engage them to get input and to provide them with information, but we don't give them the power to override our decision making

- Ultimately citizens don't have a veto, but you collaborate on ideas
- We can't have it where we are panning drafts back and forth 15 or 16 times, but we can get input and have conversations and draft from then
- When you present to the public, then you say it's not just government presenting, but gov and stakeholders presenting
- We have a lot of facilities in the province that fall under criticism so we have committees now formed that sit monthly so that they can have input and that leaves an open line of communication
- Having representatives from the community and community governments, so all voices heard, so it's a collaboration and integrated approach
- One resource that we have a problem with are the smaller unincorporated communities, that don't have the paid resources, such as watershed. No one wants to be the bad guy in these case, but government doesn't have to have the resource to be the bad guy
- We can't mistake our failure to be an open government from negative feedback, because not everyone will get what they want after a decision making process, so there will always be negative dissenting voices. So we can't always be reactive
- Sometimes you have to make a hard decision, but the way to combat that is to say you did collaboration, you met with stakeholders, you had dialogue
- You put up all your reports online to be open, but then resources are taken up by having to constantly answer questions from the public and media
- Putting policies up online can be open to interpretation, so that can also cause a problem when uploading them
- The point with collaborations is that it is individual dialogues, but with multiple more people
- The thing to see is that it's a partnership, but not quid pro quo, decisions still need to be made
- However, if you meet with stakeholders and go another way, then you'll be accused of not listening and it all being a farce
- Using the Mt pearl school board thing as an example, where parents felt they weren't listened to and the decision was already made
- Too much collaboration can cause more trouble
- The outcome that results may or may not be obvious to the stakeholders, despite the fact it was considered
- The earlier the stage that people come in for collaboration, the better
- This is why cabinet minutes are secret, so that they can have an open discussion so they can develop from there, so also could be used in partnerships
- Make a stakeholders advisory committee to make decisions better
- Or maybe have it so that it so that people can see how a decision was come to, so that people know why the government came to their conclusion and that stakeholders weren't ignored

- Increase the pool of stakeholders, so that it gets more interest groups to collaborate with
- Look to other jurisdictions for models that work
- Ensuring that departments get better at communicating what they do with requested data from other departments
- Informal discussion spaces (e.g. DM breakfasts) for (at least) management level employees to interface and develop relationships could aid collaboration
- Communities of practice (but perhaps not so formal) that exist in an open, comfortable environment (without superiors present) could help peers in government learn roles and gain expertise
- Determining where like-minded entities with a lot in common exist, and 'building bridges' (movement of staff, collaboration on projects).
- Reducing fear around sharing good ideas because they think credit for them will be 'stolen'. Is there a root to this fear? Determining this may be very useful. Coming up with less formal 'backchannels' for resource-sharing might be one way to achieve faster sharing.
- The internal "stove pipes" of government need to be improved. In some cases we have a collaborative process but then information that comes in afterwards is not shared with the earlier group and then could undermine the process or enthusiasm that was there.
- What do we need to do and let's ensure we do it the same time vs. multiple groups doing at separate times.
- Internal collaboration needs to be better. I.e. You can be at a public meeting and most of the opposition is coming from another department. This can be embarrassing. This points to no internal collaboration.
- Things seem to more centralized and less on the ground this making it hard to be collaborative when you are not one the ground.
- Hard to talk about collaboration when approval to travel to this session was questioned.
- Having trust in partners. Understanding roles relinquishing control
- Faster and cheaper means to get the "pulse"
- Improve internal collaboration first
- Exec level need to encourage internal collaboration
- Internal collaboration first
- Settle internal challenges before going to the public meetings
- More outreach to community partners more accessible
- More internal work and collaboration needed
- Relinquish power of control
- Trusting subordinate organization to control own
- Municipalities NL have parent/child relations with government of NL

- Need to find a way to bring the collective voice of rural communities/groups together
- Government departments need to work cross-departmentally on common issues/areas
- Need a better mechanism for this
- Will allow for clearer/consistent messages to the public
- Government employees/departments need the ability to be more involved in their communities
- Better relationships with communities/citizens/stakeholders
- Need to ensure we have the right players at the table
- Government needs to be better at our prep work to ensure we have the right people there
- Assess the issue to ensure all relevant people are invited to participate
- Government needs to provide a forum for government departments to meet in regions
- Partner networks in Burin and Clarendville
- Regional management committees
- University across Canada partners
- Formalizing partnerships are needed to secure funding
- Creative approach to avoid using personal time
- Alberta's experience can be followed
- Supported and recognized contribution of each partner
- Internal collaboration: Respect to expertise and respect to the mandate of each department.
- too much turf protection
- avoid duplication
- Exec. support for common interest
- Again, it is a communication issue
- RIT was a good example
- leaving the egos outside the room
- expertise is available, utilize it, trust building