HORIZONTALITY AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Final Report to the
Canadian Centre for Management
Development, the Leadership Network,
the Federal Regional Council - Quebec and
the École nationale d'administration publique

Jacques Bourgault and René Lapierre
December 2000

*The opinions expressed in this publication are those
of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the
Canadian Centre for Management Development*

Table of Contents

Table of Acronyms

AGORA   Academy of Management, Professional Orientation, Skill Renewal and Learning

ATA   Area Tourist Associations

CCMD   Canadian Centre for Management Development

CORE   Conseils des organismes régionaux en Estrie

ENAP   École nationale d'administration publique

FN   First Nations

FORD   Federal Office of Regional Development

FRCQ   Federal Regional Council - Quebec

HRDC   Human Resources Development Canada

INAC   Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

LSSS   Locally-shared Support Service

NPM   New Public Management

NPO   Non-profit Organizations

PSC   Public Service Commission of Canada

PWGSC   Public Works and Government Services Canada

RCM   Regional County Municipality

SLAP   St. Lawrence Action Plan

TB   Treasury Board of Canada

UQ   Université du Québec

UQAM   Université du Québec à Montréal

Table of Appendices

Foreword

In the winter of 1999, the president of the Canadian Centre for Management Development (CCMD) invited Québec Council of Senior Federal Officials (QCSFO) to work with the CCMD in order to perform research in the fields of training and management.

As recommended by Board members and following a consultation led by Serge Bastien, it was suggested that research on one of the common priorities of the Council and the CCMD be conducted, namely horizontal management. Nine projects were put forward by Council members, and two were selected, among which was the present project. Between April and June 1999, discussions with representatives of the QCSFO, led by André Gladu and then by Serge Bastien, and consultations with André Gladu, Michel Cailloux and Jean-Pierre Gauthier allowed us to identify a problem and some research themes. In the month of June 1999, a project was presented to the CCMD that basically accepted the research proposal and contributed part of its financing. Project development then continued during the summer of 1999.

In September 1999, the ENAP and the CCMD agreed to maintain their collaboration at several levels, among which was research, and in October 1999, this project was accepted as an opportunity to collaborate.

In October 1999, René Lapierre is being given by the QCSFO the mandate to co-manage the project together with Jacques Bourgault; the QCSFO reviews the project, defines research areas and accepts the intervention protocol. In November 1999, it qualifies 14 projects among the 31 submitted by its members from 18 departments. The original sample consists of fourteen cases selected by the Quebec Council on the basis of the following criteria: project relevance, duration, progression diversity, diversity in terms of departments and regions, and diversity as to nature: horizontality of design, in operations and support for action. A common grid is then applied to all of them. The Council also designated the group coordinator who selected members on the basis of their diversity and their involvement in the project. The responsible scholar selected his colleagues on the basis of their past and present interest in the issue and of their geographical location. The Leadership Network accepts to take part in the project and to make a financial contribution. In the middle on November 1999, relevant agreements are being signed by institutions and the project can then begin.

In December 1999, Jacques Bourgault writes detailed specifications with René Lapierre, elaborates a conceptual framework for analysis and undertakes to interest 14 scholars in selected cases, while René Lapierre organizes all 14 research grounds. Scholars come from 8 regions in Quebec and from 7 universities, among which 6 are from the UQ and 5 have relations with ENAP. Projects apply to 7 sub-regions in Quebec (Abitibi, Saguenay, lower St. Lawrence district, Quebec, Trois-Rivières, Sherbrooke and Montreal) while some apply to the whole province. At least 16 federal departments and one agency are directly involved.

Research starts in January and lasts until the beginning of March 2000. Reports prepared according to specs are completed toward mid-February and mid-March 2000. Only one of the 14 projects had to be abandoned due to availability problems with participating civil servants during the timeframe selected.

As planned, a pooling seminar was organized by René Lapierre and participants met in Montreal on March 17, 2000. A total of 29 persons were present, among which representatives from the CCMD, the Leadership Network, the QCSFO, 10 scholars and 12 civil servants involved in the projects under study. Deliberations are being recorded in order to allow the production of a summary.

Project openings continue to be:

- a continuous learning opportunity for civil servants;
- an opportunity for reflection and learning by organizations involved in the cases or their study;
- an opportunity to exhibit the administration and work of civil servants;
- an opportunity to update the knowledge of scholars;
- an opportunity to create contacts and develop a relationship between scholars and civil servants;
- the production of a report on CCMD efforts;
- the development of research useful to the CCMD, the Leadership Network, the QCSFO and the ENAP;
- the production of a work by scholars.

Authors wish to thank for their essential support the CCMD, the QCSFO, the Leadership Network, the ENAP, every department and agency involved, as well as every civil servant who attended meetings, supplied information and revised texts. Without the efforts of all these people, results of such a quality would have been impossible, especially in such a limited time span.

Very special thanks go to scholars and civil servants who so generously accepted to work on such a curious project surrounded with such particular constraints.

Authors wish to thank Evelyne Morrisseau who acted as research assistant and especially Carole Garand who, in her role as executive assistant, was involved in the production of this report and in the the problem-free conclusion of the project.

Introduction

Frontiers between public organizations appear more and more formalistic and a symbol due to interdependency, intersectoriality and especially interdisciplinarity. Nevertheless, organizations always structure themselves based on their fields of preoccupation classified according to the law, and communication processes of those organizations remain mostly vertical and hierarchical. As a result, public employees and managers are being accused of using the *silo approach* to design and manage policies and programs, whereas the reality is more complex, diversified and based on an interdependency of problematics.

Managers with silo vision are accused of seeing other organizations or even their colleagues of the same organization as enemies or competitors, while in some cases they could create with them collaborations, partnerships or alliances in order to produce and deliver public goods that are better adapted to the needs of citizens, of a superior quality and at a lower cost. They could do so through *horizontal management.* Several fields are objectively horizontal, but they are still managed *as silos* due, in particular, to organizational cultures and the constraints of traditional forms of management.

Horizontality – A Definition

Horizontality essentially exists when one or several managers of one or several organizations address a question no longer based exclusively on preoccupations for which they are responsible, but on a wider approach aiming at including interests, resources and constraints of other stakeholders of this field. They can be, for example, people designing an intervention in a field or a region, others pooling their resources, others jointly managing the complementarity of their actions or finally, managers choosing simply to share expertise, information or an opportunity.

Horizontal management takes different shapes all under the same name but with constantly evolving forms. It is called sometimes interdepartmental actions, alliances, joint ventures, co-actions but especially partnerships, a term often used by the Government of Canada and the Treasury Board Secretariat.

In its most authentic expression, horizontal management implies that anyone or any organization, upon reflecting on a case, formally asks itself who else has interests in such a case and tries to associate that organization or that person with its development in an overall perspective. This approach differs radically from the traditional silo approach where the interest tracking drill was used to identify threats, obstacles, opponents even enemies: horizontal management differs from the traditional approach since it considers "others" no longer as potential enemies but as partners. This approach will obviously amaze by its candor and innocence due to its actors who give priority to general interest over particular recognition.

Partnership is one type of horizontal management: actors identify, individually and vertically, their interests in a deal and the possibility to take part on a contract basis in a common project as partners; the expected benefits of each partner and its contributions are then carefully

evaluated in order to typify the behaviour of each of them.

This experience can involve only managers of a given department, or a given level of government, or it can include specialized pressure groups or citizens mobilized around an issue. Horizontal management is intended to be very broad in order to encompass segments of a single department or of the commercial corporation as we saw in several cases that we studied. Some people differentiated between horizontal management and the partnership that would include groups from the commercial corporation and that would have a more contractualized and legalized basis; our experience does not allow us to concur with that definition since several forms of involvement by the commercial corporation did not have a contractualized basis at first although various types of formalization appeared during the life cycle and development of some long-term projects. Therefore, formalized partnership appears as one of the possible manifestations of horizontal management. In fact, projects can be supported by approaches involving several degrees of formalization ranging from the designation of a "note taker" that changes for each meeting up to a permanent secretariat within an organization newly created for the sole purpose of completing this project.

2.   An Increasingly Obvious Need

Although the term "horizontal management" sounds modern, the reality of the preoccupations with which it deals is far from new: interdepartmental issues, and consultation and co-ordination committees have been in existence for a long time.

Transition to a joint-action process, the size of consortiums and the involvement of diverse partners are typical of this new concept application.

Of course, this need is being perceived more clearly than ever; the benefits of synergies are better recognized, the multidimensional side of thematics is admitted, together with the intersectoriality of actions. Issues being the object of public debates involve increasingly diversified actors; the actions of some stakeholders influence the agendas of others; and finally, the new public finance management framework and citizen expectations invite us to replace competitions and redundancies with complementarity and synergy.

3.   A Reversal of Acquired Logics

Horizontal management models deal with organizational cultures and agent behaviours, whether from the private, public or non-profit sector: one must cooperate rather than fight and once in a while allow the other to receive recognition or symbols of power (jurisdiction, budget, employees, media or political recognition) that would have been coveted some time ago.

In the past, organizational reflexes led us to try to overcome difficulties by modifying structures (reorganizations), employees (find more confrontational people) or power areas (acquire more qualifications). These approaches all share the monopolistic vision of action and

lead to a sterile and costly reinforcement of confrontations. In such a context, horizontal management reverses the logics of bureaucratic empires isolated from customer service. It appears as a durable alternative to flowcharts and conflicting cultures; it provides the organization with positive, economic and constructive mechanisms allowing to solve problems. Finally, the new public management somewhat encourages such a reversal of logics acquired through decentralization and partnership approaches.

4. *An Emerging and Diversified Practice*

Horizontal management seems to be taking an unlimited number of forms: whenever organizations pool information, analyses, powers or resources, or they decide or act together, we have horizontal management.

Studied cases belonged to one of three categories based on their intended goal: in four cases, exclusive departmental resources were pooled to save means and increase impacts; in four cases, resources were pooled in order to better reach their clientele; in five cases, resources were pooled with those of other groups of the society in order to improve the quality and impact of their action.

The analysis of the 13 cases under study demonstrates that several typologies could be responsible as shown in the list below:

4.1 Typological Formulas

4.1.1 Based on Mandate:

- Design (First Nations, Development Montreal, PSL)
- Support (LSSS, LSSS, continuous training)
- Operations (Marine Park, Model Forest, Québec maritime, Visibility, Museomobiles, Youth Café, Team Canada)

4.1.2 Based on the Extent of Formalization:

- working group
- joint group
- joint committee made up of civilians and public servants
- interdepartmental committee without a secretariat
- interdepartmental committee with a permanent secretariat
- interdepartmental committee with full-time coordinator but without secretariat
- responsible administrative team

4.1.3 Based on Who Participates:

- call to the civil partnership: rather general but especially PSL, Marine Park, Québec

> maritime;
- targeted group: PN, Museumobiles, Forest
- targeted customers: PN, Museumobiles, Youth Café, Forest
- Federal departments only: LSSS, Development, Visibility

4.1.4   Based on Project Objective:

- develop a policy (PN)
- harness the resources of a region (Marine Park, Québec maritime, model Forest)
- protect a resource (LSSS, Marine Park)
- put in common administrative or technical means (Visibility, Team Canada, Montreal Economic Development)
- access citizens (Youth Café)
- facilitate access for citizens (Museumobiles)

4.1.5   Based on the Policy Management Step:

- design/elaborate (PN, model Forest)
- decide (Montreal Economic Development, Québec Maritime)
- implement (Marine Park, Visibility)
- manage (Youth Café, Museumobiles, Team Canada, LSSS)

4.2   Samples of Horizontality Project

4.2.1   That Benefit the Civil Partnership:

- financial association to help elements of the society
- technical association to help elements of the civil partnership

4.2.2   Mutual Benefit:

- technical or financial associations with the civil partnership to promote mutual help

4.2.3   Between Departments:

- simple departmental agreements
- sharing of information and reflections between departments
- sharing of support services
- sharing of production services
- sharing of dissemination services
- sharing of access services
- single-window concept
- regional consensus of departments to general purposes
- action-based consensus of departments to specific purposes

4.2.4   Associations, Government and Civil Partnership Having a Global Purpose

- integration into a Plan of diversified action from all horizons

4.2.5   Government Encouraging Civil Partnerships

- groupings of civil partners

4.2.6   Between Governments

- agreements between two or more government levels in order to design or offer a service

5.   *Benefits*

One can easily imagine the benefits of horizontal management: reduction of conflicts, therefore dormant costs; sharing of costs and expertise; economies of scale; increase in efficiency through synergy, cost sharing and complementarity; adventist confrontation of approaches and interests, objection to prejudices through the diversity of protagonists; flow increase and information crossroads; user service prioritized as a common denominator of mobilization; increased efficiency through more complete analyses and the reduction of mutual neutralization conflicts; legitimization of the public image among citizens through the reduction of redundancies and conflicts and through a better involvement of groups from the civil partnership; increased employee motivation.

6.   *Difficulties*

Horizontal management, of course, is not presented as a universal remedy to every problem experienced by organizations and we do not pretend that it can replace vertical management. Our purpose simply consists of accepting it as a complement to the limits of vertical management and especially to recognize that the added value of this complement, when properly used, far exceeds the costs of putting it into practice.

Horizontal management will encounter several stumbling blocks due to its nature, its counter-cultural character, its being new in terms of action and the opposed interests it often brings together.

As a matter of fact, how can we manage the multiple loyalty of participants? Project team members must be governed by what rules of ethics regarding information disclosure? How can we build trust within the group without losing the trust of members from the original organization? To whom do the group members report? Will this project be included in the members' performance evaluation? Who will make this evaluation? On what basis? How can we help a

unique and innovative project involving actors from the civil partnership make progress, in due conformity with national standards by which public administrations must abide?

7.   *An Empirical Research*

Our study of the horizontal management practice is based on an analysis of 13 horizontal management cases realized in Quebec during the past years by the federal administration (see case list in Appendix III).

The original sampling consists of fourteen cases selected by the Council of Senior Officials on the basis of the following criteria: sufficient duration, diversity in the completion status, diversity of departments and regions, diversity of nature: horizontality in the design, operations and support for action. A common grid is applied to them.

For each case, a researcher and an official in charge were selected. The discussion team of each case also included between four and eight persons who participated in project design or operations. In general, they came from the federal civil service but also from partnership groups that were involved in the project.

Each case was the object of some twelve hours of group discussions that took place during two to four meetings. Discussions had to allow to identify the project chronology with its triggering factors and highlights and we then had to describe difficulties and obstacles and, where applicable, how those obstacles had been overcome. Finally, the group discussed management and leadership abilities, enhancing factors and the exportability of this formula.

The civil servant in charge was organizing and conducting group meetings while the researcher noted the answers, invited the participants to examine some questions more in depth, ensured compliance with the research protocol and presented us with a summary record of each case.

Summarized Description of Studied Projects:

- **First Nations**

    The project consists in jointly elaborating an overall policy on income security for the 31 First Nations of Quebec and Labrador. The said policy must be acceptable both to the Chiefs of First Nations and to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We wish to have a policy jointly designed by basic stakeholders rather than consulting with First Nations once the policy has reached an irreversible stage. This policy takes into account interfaces with some dimensions of other policies such as health. Horizontality comes from the joint group that includes two representatives from each party; those of the First Nations represent the Commission reporting to the Assembly of Quebec Chiefs, while representatives of the INAC report to the regional office that reports to INAC headquarters. The Commission is financed by Health Canada and by the

province of Quebec (ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux).

- **Federal Visibility in Abitibi-Témiscamingue**

  Through the impetus of the Canada Information Office, this project consisted in pooling resources, energy and expertise in order to produce and broadcast a corporate message more efficiently. Eight departments were involved and the CIO contributed special funds to this operation that allowed the integrated participation of federal departments in two information fairs and that now aims at producing a regional television broadcast.

- **Federal Action Strategy of Greater Montreal**

  In 1995, Paul Martin, then Economic Development Minister, retained the idea to group within a single strategy the federal interventions of some ten departments in the Greater Montreal area in order to make them more visible, more cohesive and more efficient. An interdepartmental committee was created and held 18 meetings between 1996 and February 1998; five intervention axes are selected by this committee chaired by the federal deputy minister outside of the Capital who manages the FORD in Montreal, supports committee efforts and furthers the exchange of information between departments that remain responsible for their programs.

- **Youth Café**

  In order to prevent squandering of the federal government's youth programs, a table consisting of 13 federal departments and organizations proceeded, based on the initiative and under the management of HRDC, to set up a single window adapted to the preferences of young people. This Youth Café, a pilot project, opened its doors in Montreal in April 2000 and will also be used for conferences, information sessions, and as a location giving access to information technologies.

- **St. Lawrence Action Plan**

  The deterioration of the St. Lawrence, its shores, its fauna and its flora was the object of an ambitious concerted plan of action which Environment Canada, together with several other federal, provincial, regional partners and others from the private sector and civil partnership, implemented in the month of February 1988 in order to reduce pollution sources, restore the waterfront and enhance access to it while promoting the regeneration of the aquatic flora and fauna. The next phase consists of the appropriation of these locations by communities.

- **Team Canada Inc.**

  An integrated service table was created in 1996 in order to avoid redundancies and to meet new needs in the field of services offered by the Canadian government to further exports by companies of the Quebec area. This table involves 15 federal departments and

organizations, although Industry Canada, Agriculture Canada and Canada Economic Development (acting as coordinators) are the main promoters. From a virtual agency, the creation of a formal agency is now being contemplated.

- **Québec Maritime**

    Created in 1997 after informal experiences conducted since the end of the 1980's, the Québec Maritime group combines Parks Canada, Canada Economic Development, Quebec departments and organizations, local associations, RCM's together with companies and organizations working in the tourism sector. This group is intended to further the growth of the tourism sector in the area by developing new tourist products with a national interest and by reinforcing the presence of the Québec maritime sector in these markets. The group allows economies of scale, continuous presence during international shows, fairs and exhibitions; it also leads to strategic investments resulting from the consensus of partners rather than simple piecemeal projects that have no significant impact. This project is coordinated by an executive committee involving directors of participating regional tourism associations.

- **Health Canada Development Centre**

    In 1993, within the framework of reengineering activities, the Québec regional directorate created a self-learning centre for employees. This centre develops its expertise and its notoriety in order to offer later on, together with four other departments and organizations, career management, employability development and continuous training activities to some 20 federal departments and organizations. In 1999, it became AGORA, a meeting place allowing to create contacts and partnerships.

- **Museumobiles**

    Beginning in June 1998, eleven departments pooled their resources in order to create Museumobiles, a travelling museum aiming first of all at promoting federal programs and services to senior citizens. A departmental working group, piloted jointly by two departments (Health and Veteran Affairs), designed and organized the project that was implemented during the summer of 1999 and in which the private sector is also involved (museology company) together with non-profit organizations (senior associations).

- **Model Forest**

    The Lower St. Lawrence Model Forest, launched in June 1992, led in 1993 to a cooperative agreement under the guidance of Forestry Canada. Some forty partners such as companies, unions, departments of both levels of government and universities are among the promoters. Twelve of them play a more active role and manage capital facility interventions and operations for renewable resources, such as the experimentation of new forest management methods in inhabited locations, interventions in revitalization areas, and the sharing of capabilities. A corporation was eventually created, namely the

Corporation of the Lower St. Lawrence Model Forest.

- **Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park**

  Responding to the idea of creating a Marine Park expressed by two researchers during the 1970's and to the awareness for protecting the beluga whale, Parks Canada undertook studies in 1984. In 1990, the Canadian and Quebec governments signed an agreement leading to the creation of such a park and of a harmonization committee comprised of representatives of several departments from both governments. In 1995, a master plan was adopted and a coordination committee was created involving public partners (Quebec government, municipalities, regional county municipalities, First Nation reserves), near-public partners (regional tourism associations and related organizations), private partners (interpretation centres, museums) and non-profit partners (researchers, associations) in order to ensure compliance with the plan by integrating actions to preserve and promote park land and maritime tourist routes.

- **Locally-shared Support Services (LSSS) Shawinigan**

  During the Spring of 1994, a meeting involving ten federal departments of the Shawinigan region examined the possibility of pooling their services in order to, like the public service Council on Renewal, improve services and reduce overhead costs and corporate expenses. Four working groups were created and they presented a report to recommend initiatives allowing savings of 2.5 million dollars that were reinjected into operations in order to improve the quality of services. These initiatives allowed the pooling of specialized services in the field of human resources, equipment and premises, customer service tools, studies and expertise.

- **LSSS Estrie**

  The Conseil des organismes régionaux en Estrie (CORE), created in the 1990's includes six departments and organizations and allows the organization of single-service points, the pooling of resources and services and an exchange concerning day-to-day problems between managers who are relatively isolated from the central nervous centre of their department. In the fall of 1999, CORE repositioned itself around three targets, namely visibility in regions, interdepartmental mobility and the development of executives and managers.

8. *Observations*

A pooling seminar was held on March 17 with civil servants, scholars and sponsors. Scholars responsible for cases began by summarizing the case under study. Five discussions then followed on research thematics: difficulties, benefits, management abilities, leadership abilities, success factors, exportability. Participants could intervene at will during each of these discussions and some took the floor more than once during a single discussion. A summary was written on the basis of the consensus reached and then submitted to participants for additional comments. The

purpose of this section is to reflect the consensus that was reached during the seminar. Due to the method used for discussion (nominal group), the following ideas came from all participants and none of them in particular could, in a fair or reliable manner, be held responsible for any of these observations. In order to guarantee debate quality, participants were ensured that their comments, although they were registered, would be combined and presented in a non-nominative fashion. For those reasons, they all come with the masculine gender. Some participants could relatively disagree (not to a major extent) with some of the comments that follow.

Therefore, we wish to thank the true authors of this section, namely (according to their position in the room) Pierre Kyer, Michel Charland, Jules Léger, René Reid, Pierre Bertrand, André Gagné, Éric Noël Bouchard, Éric Montpetit, Christian Rouillard, Luc Bernier, Daniel Maltais, Gilles Corriveau, Sylvie Lefebvre, Ronald Beaudoin, Louise Kane, Francine Préfontaine, Guy Crépault, Mario Roy, Monique Papineau-Couture, Serge Tessier and Serge Bastien. Patrick Boisvert of the CCMD acted as observer.

8.1   *Difficulties to be Overcome*

The earliest difficulty encountered resulted from *truly understanding and accepting the procedure* within participating organizations, since some of them, some of their directors can be content with "pretending" to participate because they feel pressure from upper levels or from fashionable currents. They do not want to be seen as old fashioned, carried by change or closed to innovation. Horizontal management forces us to give up our interventions guided by the sole limited interests of the source organization. We are therefore confronted with the fragilization of participants who can be led to take positions that are more beneficial to the project than to their organization. In addition, a given group can serve as a vehicle for several different understandings of a partnership and expectations will then vary accordingly. The past can also affect the present when past frustrations eat up the mutual trust that now prevails. However, trust will eventually be restored through practice.

Then comes the *real involvement of member organizations* of this project: politically speaking, the horizontal involvement must be identical to what is seen in the field. Members are sometimes interested to various degrees and some do not translate their words into action, while some try to limit their financial contribution and others omit to designate participants to some sensitive meetings. The group must clarify its rules of operation from the very beginning, if possible, or as soon as a problem appears.

Once the project is in motion, the *traditional organization culture is challenged* by the formula; this model goes against the culture: an executive is punished for having played the game by allowing a budget deficit leading to savings of ten times that amount in other departments (he should have negotiated his strategy in order to get transfers); "the true life remains vertical and this kind of business is considered marginal!"; the actors' contribution to this formula is not yet valued by the organization and one must be convinced in order to participate; organizations are still sending a double message in that regard: "Go ahead, but stop bothering us with that!". Time and any success will take care of everything.

Another difficulty can result from *participants themselves,* while some of them remain too close to their organization and interests. Insecurity appears if we fear that part of an organization will disappear or if conflicts happen within transversal issues and vertical organizations. Problems occur when participants lack expertise, influence or relationships in their environment.

Group interaction is another challenge. All members must be given significant responsibilities. We must avoid too fast a rotation (variation) of members. Group momentum must be maintained as well as the intensity of the external support to the group. All members must agree from the very beginning on a common plan to communicate the appreciation of contributions, actions and results.

National standards constitute another difficulty that can hinder the project throughout its execution: the budgetary formula must adapt to the organizational formula that was selected; standards of the Canadian government (bilingualism, legality, expenses, publicity, administrative procedures) differ from those of other levels of government, from methods of private partners and from NPO's. Finally, when the horizontal project takes the form of a small virtual organization and includes members from different horizons such as citizens, representatives from pressure groups and other levels of government, the project team sometimes finds it difficult to understand and accept complicated processes as well as having to suffer those long delays resulting from its belonging to a wider system within the Capital. Out of the 13 projects that were studied, only four involved exclusively agents from the federal level and they were all created in order to lighten the system!

We finally come to the difficulty of *project duration perspectives*: one must contemplate project continuity or development within the framework of a more stable and formalized formula. If it has been working experimentally, punctually or informally, could it also work according to a more permanent formula? The commitment of participants must be supported during those shady times of questioning and transitions when we speculate and negotiate on coming structures, future budgets, business plans, recovery costs, etc.

8.2   Success Factors

Five different reasons can make the difference between project success and failure. First of all, the *nature of the project* can play a key role. Some projects are more developmental in nature due to being in the centre of a national crisis (ice storm crisis) or to being associated with a noble cause (protection of animal species, development of a region) or because they meet a well-defined social and political demand (depollution of the St. Lawrence).

The *framework of the mandate given to the project* seems to be fundamental: a clear contract is required between partners, suppliers, users or correspondents, and sufficient means are required in terms of financial resources, political and administrative support, human resources and time. Precise, visible and concrete results must be contemplated and the timeframe must be clearly defined. It is also very important for the project to be part of an initiative that enjoys the support of a high moral authority such as the QCSFO.

The *management of expectations* is also important. If immediate consequences are not seen or felt, some impatience or cynicism might be demonstrated. One must therefore ensure and

diffuse a realistic dosage of expectations while taking into account the livelihood of the model and vertical interests. Expectations should focus on the problem to be solved and not on the symptom or its symbols: participation must not degenerate into demagogy where anything is done under that pretext. People who succeed in such projects are realistic. They accept a marriage of reason from which they expect interesting results even if they realize that their interests are not totally identical. Expectations are all the more important when participants know how terrible the consequences will be in case of failure.

Participants often make the difference between success and failure. Their implication must be authentic and their characteristics must be those of "good" participants (cf. infra). Such formulas require ingenious people who will do whatever the legal system allows them to do. This is working thanks to employees who take risks and who go forward even when things are not totally clear and comforting. When participants have much expertise in their field, they are less defensive and more prone to change. They must know how to strike a balance between enthusiasm and patience.

The table *conduct* is crucial. It must begin with a definition of dominating values common to all group members. One must clarify the functions and role of coordinators or moderators, especially if there are many. One must define a procedure where minorities are perfectly comfortable to present their "real" point of view: this is a special group where the full contribution of everyone is a factor of success. One must avoid creating subcommittees that will sectorize/verticalize problems even more and take the accountability from group members who do not belong to any subcommittee. Everybody must be forced to take over all aspects of a problem. Besides, too great a number of committees and an excessively formalistic operation would create delays and slow down momentum. The group must have an accelerated action schedule and avoid getting bogged down in details during group discussions. The moderator must ensure a strategic management of sensitive issues: in one case, he avoided discussing the finances issue that would have caused the project to fail. This issue was covered later on when the group was ready. The group capacity for self-criticism and collective learning is also important. No witch's brew or management model could automatically lead to success because each situation requires some adaptation.

Success often depends on how important a problem is perceived and on its sufficiently critical character. The number and complexity of interest owners does not seem to be an important factor due to the diversity of situations.

8.3   Management Skills

For the purpose of this exercise and in order to avoid repetitions in the sections that follow, management skills have been divided into three groups: those related to analysis, those related to organization and those applying to relationships.

Management abilities in terms of *strategic analysis* have been described as 1) having the "feel" of the macro analysis of environments and their evolution and 2) as having an interest in continuously repeating its analyses. Such a manager has a strategic vision of his environment, a project, and he knows how to get everyone to adhere. He is indisputably open-minded. He thinks about the long term. He does not underestimate impending difficulties and knows how to address them in advance. He has an obvious political skill (in the tactical sense) to help case files progress within his department.

One could not minimize the *organizational capacities* of this manager. First of all, he has the mentality of a public entrepreneur. He knows how to prioritize results. He is comfortable when managing ambiguity; he accepts risks and is comfortable with it. He adapts to evolving changes in his environment and works in an organized fashion within a constantly-evolving organization. He manages the sharing of responsibilities of his group. He facilitates the work of others.

In terms of *relationships*, this manager is most respectful of his partners. Open-minded, he combats prejudice and received ideas; he is capable of gaining support from outcasts to make the group interested in all its members; he enjoys a great deal of credibility among members and in his environment due to the positive relationship he has with people. He is a good negotiator, more reasonable than ferocious because he knows that short-term victories build systems that do not last. He shows much transparency with group members. He can reveal his limits to anyone.

8.4   Leadership Abilities

This horizontal manager bases his leadership on influence and expertise, because he will seldom enjoy authority in the traditional sense of this word. In terms of *being*, this leader incarnates and embodies project benefits, he energizes the project and does group maintenance. He has a modest ego, a *good team spirit* and a great listening capacity, even for what is left unsaid. He is highly responsive and knows how to make words more coherent. He is frank and *does not play games*.

He knows how to *create a collective vision*, to come up with gathering objectives from which everyone benefits. He knows how to communicate this vision and to *mobilize* people around it. He knows how to recognize and reveal the power of the concept that he manages and how to use it in order to mobilize people. He *incarnates* the project without taking the full benefit of it, and as a leader, he lends himself as a target to critics but knows how to place emphasis on his collaborators when he is being praised.

His sense of humour is *gathering* and generates pleasure within the project. He does not take himself seriously and knows how to create a user-friendly climate at work. He builds personal relationships with members rather than acting with them on a "role-to-role" basis. He never hesitates to make decisions of overall interest that will bring him no personal credit.

Because of his good *judgement,* he avoids agonizing questions when the group is not ready to live through them. He works by consensus and generates discussions where everyone feels free to positively express his deepest thoughts and his limits.

8.5   Ideal Members

The ideal members of horizontal management project teams could very well live comfortably within organizations that work strictly on vertical projects… provided that their projects are innovative and motivating and that they restrict their propensity to question well-established processes. On the contrary, agents of vertical organizations who feel secure with the help of a clear definition of their lines of authority, field of jurisdiction and tasks to perform, risk to suffer frustration within the framework of horizontal management projects. On the other hand, several of the characteristics mentioned above are the prerogative of employees working in vertical organizations… incidentally, are horizontal team members not the result of vertical organizations? However, not all the employees of vertical organizations can perform well in horizontal projects.

Members must first of all prove their aptitude for *team work*. These people are *flexible* and open to change.

They feel a need for *self-fulfillment* through professional work filled with challenges and achievements considered as being useful (Maslow model).

They know how to *join a common project* because their commitment is real. These members are capable of *being frank and of carrying out positive exchanges* concerning controversial issues. They have ambition for mutual aid and are aware of the impact of their actions and attitudes on others. They are *curious about others* and behave patiently and openly with them. They personally adjust to the level of others' progress.

They do not suffer from *personal insecurity* and are courageous enough to get involved when converting their words into action: they commit themselves before the group/project and do not fear to face the music later on within their home organization.

8.6   *Implementation Dynamics*

The project will be executed even better if everything remains simple. Therefore, the ideal solution consists in having few people around the table and few managers demanding periodical accounts.

Each person involved in the project must adequately measure the organizational colour he wishes to preserve. He must also ensure its transcendence when adding it to the group. He must be simultaneously conscious and distant in order to play with others. He must manage some perspective and break with the culture of his home organization.

The leader must create and maintain a corporate memory because people representing their organization are sometimes replaced as their career evolves. We do not always want to start over and the group should not suffer any delay every time the representative is replaced.

People sitting at the issue table must feel that they have some real power, otherwise they soon run out of steam. This power and its achievements must be identified and constantly remembered.

These groups must be supported, more than usually, since they are simultaneously on the fringe of structures and lines of authority: meetings must have agendas/minutes/rooms/ punctuality/follow-ups. Otherwise, the group will soon disintegrate.

The more this formula is seen as being efficient by others (executives, central jurisdiction, the environment), the more they will support it. Incidentally, in order to get any support, the rewarding aspects of the formula must be sold properly and nothing can be taken for granted in that respect.

Members must be capable of making a mutual adjustment based on the nature of the project and the context and of accepting that adjustments to objective changes of other partners or stakeholders in the area affect project objectives and, to a certain extent, their degree of effect.

8.7   Group Animation and Maintenance

Such a group being innovative, non-standard and fragile, group animation and maintenance efforts play an important role in its success.

Several types of group management have been observed from the lesser formal to the best organized ones: ad hoc secretary/rotating secretary/secretary changing each time/persons jointly responsible/pivot support/coordinator/structured incumbent. Each type of management implies different costs: for example, better organized modes imply a salary to a full-time person in charge, maybe to an assistant, but in all cases to a relatively sophisticated secretariat. On the other hand, less organized management methods demand greater operational involvement by members (to compensate for the lack of a secretariat) and everybody must be vigilant with regard to management, team and project issues in order to compensate for the lack of formal leadership. In such a case, the quality of life of the group will have a deciding effect on the project capacity to succeed: expectations that are usually entertained with regard to the traditional leader now apply to the group capacity to manage itself.

The horizontal management group is a "high maintenance" group (for its members and their original organizations), because it is not supported naturally, but it is rather "opposed" by traditional bodies which it confronts (don't we pretend to be thus completing projects which vertical structures, to which we are speaking, could not successfully complete?). We must therefore invest in order to create and preserve a community spirit within the group. The "high maintenance" of a group implies special investments by its formal and natural leaders in order to maintain both its dynamism and cohesion: dynamism refers to enthusiasm and motivation, while coherence applies to stringency and to targeting reflection and action. This "high maintenance" becomes possible when giving more importance to mutual watch by members in order to detect group members showing relationship-related maladjustments, a decreasing motivation and discomfort regarding the development of their work agenda. "Maintenance" then translates into actions leading to the voicing of difficulties, to group sharing and to the consolidation of the group agenda. Finally, the purpose of this "maintenance" is to improve group cohesion by celebrating and organizing common activities that are both professional and social, and the elaboration of common points to combat.

The overall challenge consists of maintaining the momentum both within and around the group since it can wear out and fall into sullenness. However, unfortunate experiences of the past, combined with failures due to precipitation, can help people become more patient.

Special resources are required to preserve the group and it is up to the leader to find or create them.

The person in charge of the group must constantly mobilize and remobilize its members, their source organizations and the environments surrounding the project. For example, member mobilization is made possible through documentation, by viewing the positive impacts of their project, that of source organizations and of surrounding locations, by reminding them of the concrete benefits they will enjoy when seeing project objectives become a reality and by continually communicating project results and positive impacts already observed with each and everyone. A public reminder of supports to vertical structures is also part of the maintenance rules.

The moderator must systematically organize celebration-events around important moments in the group and project lifetime, and this is even more important since the group enjoys no natural or traditional organizational support.

8.8   Accountability

Accountability implies reporting on the use of resources, on attained results and on compliance with constraints. It can take several forms depending on project nature, object and organization: it can be done individually (performance evaluation), through the corporation (loyalty to the source organization), on a functional basis (loyalty to the project group), politically (accountability of political leaders or their representatives), hierarchically (by giving reports to the immediate supervisor) and centrally (by conforming to operating rules governing the delegation of authority in central organizations: TB, PSC, [MTPESG], etc.).

In some cases, organizations really react to these projects: "My project was part of my key commitments based on which I was evaluated". In other cases, they are still very far from classical organizations… except when they lead to complications in the classical way of operation. To those who regret this irrefutable fact, we say: "Talk to people around you and lobby if you want it to be recognized!"

Accountability implies a characterized and quantified description of results and a certain measure of performed actions, results and observed impacts. Therefore, participants of a horizontal management project sometimes pursue different, although similar objectives; the performance and evaluation follow-up form must account for this diversity of objectives of actors involved in the project.

It seems that evaluation forms given to private contractors are often too costly compared to total project cost. They are sometimes improperly synchronized with project progression and rather artificial since they are ordered in advance and designed by a cell that is located too far from the project.

We must accept that project objectives might change while the project is under way, especially when such a project is being carried out for the first time or it takes place in an evolving and diversified environment over which we have no control.

Accountability continues to be a problem if the source organization and the horizontal group keep on seeing members as "representatives-agents" of vertical organizations. We must not underestimate vertical resistance as problems avoided at the group table will reappear later when each vertical entity will have to validate the project.

An accountability problem happens when group members cease to belong to their source organization in order to belong to the group. By identifying themselves as being too close to the group, they lose track of the power of logics, of constraints and of the reality of the power relationship within their source organization; and for that reason, they give erroneous opinions to the horizontal group which then selects action strategies that are doomed to failure. By identifying themselves as being too close to the horizontal group, they modify the image projected within their source organization: they used to belong to "them", but they now belong to the "others" and they lose all collaboration assets with their colleagues as well as any credibility and conviction before them. As members of the horizontal group, they feel entrusted with a mission

of trust with regard to their source organization that they must convince to collaborate however they can. They feel like traitors or incompetent if vertical resistances cause substantial modifications to the project. Here is why they simultaneously tend to identify themselves with the horizontal group and to depart from it while trying to use organizational life opportunities within the vertical organization in order to hook up the horizontal project to it without ever confronting face to face the resistances of their source organization. Rather than denying his identity, the participant is interested in laying out all constraints on the table and in discussing them openly with others in order to find a solution.

8.9   *Types of Horizontal Management*

Typologies can be very simple: small short-term projects without many partners, or large and complex long-term projects involving several partners with very diversified characteristics and even with rather opposing interests.

There are two types of horizontal management: one based on activities and one based on customers. Others add a type based on projects and another based on purpose.

According to a member, there would be two types of horizontal management: one based on activities and one based on customers. Others add a type based on projects and another based on purpose.

There are projects to design policies and programs, others to support operations, and finally, others to perform operational activities.

One can find experiences that apply to each of the seven main steps of public management: 1) pooling of information; 2) common definition of a problem; 3) common elaboration of solutions; 4) decision-making; 5) joint implementation; 6) common management; 7) common evaluation.

Three types of resources are pooled for a horizontal project, namely information, means of action and the decision-making authority; **information** is being pooled during each of the main seven steps of public management; contribution to **resources and means** was observed during all of those steps, except for decision-making; **joint decision** allowed to collectively define a problem and its properties, to qualify solution options and to collectively make strategic and operational decisions.

One cannot make too much typology based on the organizational support, because there are no typical models: it is more of an emerging phenomenon with a variable geometry support than a very typed structure. Several types of partnerships have been observed that are not the only expression of horizontal management.

Some people could also make typologies based on associates: same level of government; only governments but from several levels; with participation from outside of the government: NPO's and private.

8.10   *A Natural Life Cycle for Structures?*

Structures are created to respond to a need. The need, marked in time, characterizes the structure based on constraints that exist at the time of their creation. The objective of structures is stability, permanency and rigidity. However, needs evolve and one must therefore answer changing needs, punctual needs and face unavoidable difficulties resulting from created structures. Since all

structures come with their problems, horizontal management sometimes allows one to overcome or compensate for the structural approach.

In some cases (except for punctual interventions), horizontal projects seem to be designed to undergo progressive degrees of formalization, and then fixed forms if projects are working (networks of interest, community, committee, secretariat, structure). This begins with the consensus structure and then continues with the operation structure that is being created. As soon as formalization appears, a new need for horizontality is generated. Besides, other horizontal projects themselves could have been pooled.

Horizontal silos can come after vertical silos. These horizontal silos imply major drawbacks when their members stop thinking in "corporate terms" or in terms of overall result in order to concentrate on their horizontal contents only. Their evaluation leads to a dialectical question: are we heading toward an eventual horizontal drift after the vertical drift? Since horizontal projects try to answer new needs that sometimes refine or replace previous needs and since such projects simultaneously try to spread in time and to acquire structured supports and formal mandates that become restricting for vertical organizations, they must ask themselves to what extent their fate has nothing to do with that of vertical structures.

From then on, we must distinguish two types of horizontal projects, namely punctual and non formalized projects with a slightly codified mandate as opposed to those intended to become more permanent and formal "structures".

8.11   *Exportability*

The exportability of this formula is less a matter of subject or field of application than conditions conducive to circumstances or to the development stage of a problematics: executives must be really willing and team members must enjoy a political opportunity with enough autonomy.

Technically speaking, provided that we have enough means and the proper organizational cocktail, this horizontal management formula could be used to a certain extent anytime we wish to reduce inconsistencies and to serve people better. This is not a cure-all. An adequate context and factors conducive to the success of this formula are required. Besides, this formula is being cheerfully applied in the private sector (joint ventures, partnerships, alliances, capital equity participation, array groups, project teams, job shops, etc.), with less decisional influence being given to customers.

We can notice that the formula, or its spirit, is already used everywhere… for example, in networks, in interface management and on the Internet.

Since vertical structures and sectoriality will always exist and since issues are increasingly thematic, horizontal management will be called upon to make organizational systems more coherent. Their limitations with regard to new challenges will make horizontal management more and more popular. Citizens want more for their money and they wish for efficient collaborations between partners rather than unproductive conflicts and competitions.

Horizontal management is not an end in itself or an objective, but rather it is an effective means in some circumstances. It will never replace hierarchical structures. Besides, when horizontal management formulas run into difficulties, it is the hierarchical structure system that

/ 19

comes to its rescue (money, recognition, professional or hierarchical authority).

8.12   Conclusion

Thanks to this formula, financial risks (cost sharing), technical risks (information sharing), risks of operational failures (pooling of expertise), political risks (pooling of interests, volition and energies) are decreased without being eliminated. Rather than letting the confrontation energy from each involved group or organization increase simultaneously, this formula enhances the synergy of interested stakeholders and this turns conflicts not toward the annihilation of the opponent but rather toward the discussion on concrete material and technical problems… in such a way that actors accept such a survival quality dynamics for all of them.

This organizational formula is located somewhere between matrix management and project management. It is a means adapted to the evolution of the society. It is a new way to manage risks and conflicts.

This recipe cannot be too formalized, because it must adapt to a large number of special circumstances. It is a fragile formula based in most part on voluntary action: if an important partner is sulking, everything stops; it is more a state of mind that has its rules. In addition, the excessive formalization of a formula would bring it back at the structure level with its disadvantages such as the loss of flexibility and capacity to adjust.

Through its framework and rhythm, horizontal management proves the existence of public entrepreneurship.

Horizontal management has important side-effects such as the pride of civil servants, the collapse of professional isolation within silos, the circulation of good true stories, access to tacit knowledge, learning about what people really do in the field, the achievement of true interventions on things, and not the "production of shuffled paper", a continuous learning procedure through action: "I am improving myself through others, these are mutual coaching sessions."

Here is a formula that, finally, is not so new. It has been in existence for a long time in Canada within several interdepartmental committees. However, most of these committees were far from the field, as opposed to cases that were the object of this study. In France, this formula was often used with mission administrations, and regional committees, but especially, when designing the prefectorial system where each department had access to all government services in the same location and under the same regional authority.

9.   *Overall conclusion*

Does horizontal management improve project management? In order to answer that question, one must ask if these projects would have been possible without the horizontal management approach. Analysis has shown that only some of the projects such as the Greater Montreal Action Strategy (GMAS) or Youth Café (YC) could have existed without the horizontal management framework. Horizontal management allowed them to progress faster (GMAS) or made them more complete and less conflicting (YC). In order to allow the management structure to survive, conflicts between partners must be solved as they appear so that there will be fewer conflicts during project operation.

Difficulties have been more recurrent: the weight of former conflicts to taint the credibility of partners, the quality of the implication by upper management levels, the counter-cultural character of this formula that tends to deny the concept of a bureaucratic empire, the difficulty of reconciling the management of immediate difficulties with that of strategical matters, the double moral and administrative accountability of project team members, their organizational insecurity, the difficulties of managing a virtual group and the reconciliation of project unity with national standards from the public sector which pretend to frame it.

Successes are facilitated by noble or urgent causes, by the mobilizing character but especially by the clarity of a project, the clear vision of interests among participants, the management of reasonable expectations among team members and in project environments, the level and quality perceived by participants, the maintenance and mobilization of group members who must feel part of a mission and the importance felt by management with regard to a project as seen through several organizational signs.

Most of the time, such projects have no traditional structure allowing to designate them, recognize them, identify them, and especially supervise them. In this context, management skills of those in charge of the project are very important. These managers excel at strategic analysis, and have excellent relational and troubleshooting capacities, they dispose of excellent solution finding techniques, resources and influence; they are preoccupied with the organizational quality and have an innate sense for organizing work in complex models. They show constant flexibility and absolute transparency.

Those leaders personally personify the project and its values. They know how to create and project a collective vision that is rich and fruitful. Being humble, they have a great listening capacity. They feel empathy and know how to mobilize participants based on their experience. They have a good team spirit and act as gatherers. Those people have very sure judgement and they know how to manage challenges by constantly speaking truth to all group members in a manner likely to cause some conflict… which they promise to make fruitful.

Such groups need more animation and maintenance than all the others. They are non-standard and fragile groups that enjoy no organizational support and are often perceived as being pretentious and aggressive, suspected of acting beyond traditional standards and managing difficult missions for being innovative or conflicting. It is therefore advisable to pay special attention to the animation of this "high maintenance" group, to the organization, to the follow-up of meetings, to the organizational memory and to maintaining the momentum and mobilization, as much by holding formal meetings as by increasing the number of actions to celebrate.

We will recall that these groups risk crumbling, diverting their mandate, lasting artificially, and for all these reasons, it is recommended to give them clear mandates with precise results, to entrust team members with real powers and support, and to plan from the very beginning for a conclusion date for the management formula.

Horizontal management completes but does not replace hierarchical models. It becomes day after day more essential to organizations that must learn to live with it optimally. It can become popular provided that it meets real needs (and not the desire to be fashionable), a convinced perception of interests, a favourable context, realistic material means and true support of directions (that is turned into practice).

This research has been a horizontal venture in several respects: an alliance between the professional world, universities, and civil society, a partnership between several organizations of the federal government, the use of several universities in cases from all regions of Quebec. We will remember that the mobilizing quality of this project and the quality of its team members and scholars allowed us within a short time to give careful consideration to an emerging phenomenon.

Appendix I

Group Working Methods

1.   Each group exclusively consists of a coordinator, civil servants who have helped to prepare or manage the case under study and the scholar who is to write the case report.

2.   Only group members take part in meetings.

3.   The coordinator chairs meetings and ensures the production and distribution of factual and historical documents.

4.   Three meetings of three hours each are recommended. However, a group could, provided it is adequately prepared, cover the whole grid in two meetings.

5.   A short case file is distributed by the coordinator to group members before the first meeting.

6.   The scholar records and sorts answers and writes a report.

7.   The report will have approximately 12 pages with 1 ½ line spacing, including at least two pages for the background section. The report can end with more general remarks made by the scholar regarding the contribution of this experience to the state of the art.

8.   Provided all questions on the grid have been covered, groups can add any observation or item of analysis that they consider relevant for their case.

9.   The report is produced by the scholar in academic freedom and under his or her responsibility. Production costs (typewriting, photocopies, messaging) shall be covered by the Council of Senior Officials.

10.   Travelling expenses and any eventual long distance call made by scholars will be paid by the Council of Senior Officials as per the policy of the Treasury Board of Canada.

11.   Meetings will be held in December 1999, in the month of January and during the first two weeks of February 2000.

12.   For consistency control and later comparison purposes, the report from each group will be written after each meeting and then transmitted to Jacques Bourgault, the person in charge of reports, after each group meeting.

13.   The group does not have to approve each report or step or part thereof; rapporteurs are

encouraged to take into account remarks made by members during meetings and which are not used to approve reports produced by the rapporteur.

14.   The group's final report shall be produced by the end of February 2000.

Appendix II

Case Study and Writing Protocol

Part 1

Getting acquainted with problematics and horizontal management issues.

Part 2

2.1   During the first meeting, the group shares its knowledge on project genesis, its rather distant history by insisting on challenges and interests for the diversity of concerned actors.

2.2   The group then describes what event, element or moment triggered the decision to create a horizontal management opportunity in that case.

2.3   The group describes the main steps taken to prepare, implement and carry out the project.

Part 3

3.1   During the second meeting, the group describes any resistance and difficulties it has encountered: what they were, what caused them and how they appeared.

3.2   The group also describes how these difficulties and obstacles were overcome (or why they were not overcome).

3.3   The group describes management skills or other skills (being, knowing, reacting) needed from individuals and participants (namely in terms of leadership and relief preparation).

3.4   The group describes supports that should be provided by the organization in order to maximize chances of success. We will try to propose at least precise lists of contributions.

Part 4

4.1   During the third meeting, the group identifies the real value added by horizontal management in this case: What criteria must be used? What measuring tools allow us to evaluate the degree of success? What is the value of those tools?

4.2   The group identifies what must be learned at the operational level in order to repeat the horizontality experience in this field or in a similar field.

4.3   The group tries to find out if horizontality can apply to all fields, in order to identify fields to which it would not apply and why.

4.4   The group identifies the impacts of horizontality on the accountability of individuals.

Appendix III: Working Groups: Scholars and Participating Coordinators

No.	Departments	Research Projects on Horizontality	Region	Coordinators	Scholars
-1-	INAC	Quebec and Labrador First Nations Health & Social Service Commission	Quebec	Alain Léveillée	Jacques Bourgault UQAM/ENAP
-2-	HRDC	Promotion of federal visibility	Abitibi/ Témiscaminque.	Mrs. Landry	Serge Tessier UQAT
-3-	FORD	Greater Montreal Strategy	Montreal	Jules Léger	Daniel Maltais ENAP
-4-	HRDC	Youth Café	Montreal	Lizette Perreault	Éric Montpetit ENAP
-5-	Environment Canada	St. Lawrence Action Plan 2000	Trois-Rivières	Madeleine Papineau	Gilles Corriveau UQTR
-6-	Industry Canada	Team Canada Inc.	Montreal	Michel Chartrand	Luc Bernier ENAP
-7-	Parks Canada	Le Québec maritime	Rimouski	Pierre Bertrand	André Gagné UQAR
-8-	Health Canada	Employee Development Centre	Quebec	Pierrette Chagnon	Éric Noël Bouchard ENAP
-9-	Veterans Affairs	Museumobiles Project	Montreal	Francine Préfontaine	Christian Rouillard ENAP
-10-	Canadian Forestry Service	Lower St. Lawrence Model Forests	Rimouski	Jacques Robert	André Gagné UQAR
-11-	Parks Canada	Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park	Saguenay	René Reid	André Briand UQAC
-12-	Customs & Revenue Agency	Locally-shared Support Services	Mauricie	Guy Boisvert	Richard Pépin UQTR
-13-	HRDC	Locally-shared Support Services	Estrie	Guy Crépeau	Mario Roy Univ de Sherbrooke

Bibliography

Managing Horizontality / Cross Issues

Aucoin, Peter. 1995. *The New Public Management: Canada in Comparative Perspective.* Montréal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP), chapter 7.

Bourgault, Jacques. 1997. "L'intégration horizontale au sommet." *Optimum,* Vol. 27, No. 4: p. 14-26.

Canada. 1996. DM Task Force Report. *Horizontal Policy Issues.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, December.

Canada. 1999. *Gestion horizontale: questions, aperçus et exemples*, reference document, draft for discussion, Canadian Centre for Management Development, November, 24 pages.

Clark, I.D., J. Davis, B. Dewar, L. Goulet, M. Keating, and J. O'Hara. 1996,. *Strategic Leadership for Public Service Renewal*. Coll. "The Dewar Series: Perspectives on Public Management". Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 97 p.

Hanson J., and C. Meyer. 1994. "Horizontal Management: Dismantling Organizational Barriers to Growth." *Mercer Management Journal,* No. 3: p. 25-44.

Hoegg, Bob. 1999. "Doing it Horizontally: Regional Federal Councils." *Canadian Government Executive,* No. 3.

The Council for Canadian Unity. 1999. *Social Union Framework Agreement.* (web page : The Council for Canadian Unity). (online), February 4. http://www.ccu-cuc.ca/fran/bibliotheque/archives.

Ostroff, Frank. 1999. *The Horizontal Organization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Peters, B. Guy. 1998. *Managing Horizontal Government: The Politics of Coordination*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 75, 69, p.

Rogers, D. L., and D. A. Whetten. 1982. *Interorganizational Coordination: Theory, Research and Implementation.* Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Savoie, Donald J. 1999. Governing from the centre: the concentration of power in Canadian politics. Downsview: University of Toronto Press, 440 p.

The Horizontal Culture / The Corporate Culture
- collective liability

Agranoff, Robert. 1998. "Partnerships in public management: Rural enterprise alliances". *International Journal of Public Administration (IJP),* Vol. 21, No. 11: p. 1533-1575.

Alexander, E. R. 1995. *How Organizations Act Together: Interorganizational Coordination in Theory and Practice.* London: Gordon and Breach Publishers.

Anderson, John L.1998. "The pursuit of Significance: Strategies for Managerial Success in Public Organizations." *Review of Public Personnel Administration (RPP),* Vol. 18, No. 3, Summer: p. 71-74.

Burman, Allan V. 1998. "Sizing up procurement shops." *Government Executive (GOV),* Vol. 30, No. 6, June: p. 76.

Glidewell, John C., ed. 1986. *Corporate cultures: research implications for human resource development.* Alexandria, Va: America Society for Training and Development, 113 p.

Goal/QPC. 1988. *The Memory Jogger: A Pocket Guide of Tools for Continuous Improvement.* Metuen, Mass.: Goal/QPC.

King, Cheryl Simrell, Kathryn M. Feltey; and Bridget O'Neill Susel. 1998. "The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration". *Public Administration Review (PAR),* Vol. 58, No. 4, July/August: p. 317-326.

Lawler, E.E. 1992. *The Ultimate Advantage: Creating the High Involvement Organization.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Light, Paul C. 1999. "Does management matter?." *Government Executive (GOV),* Vol. 31, No. 2, February, p. 6.

Meyer, Dale. 1997. "Communicated Knowledge as a Learning Foundation". *International Journal of Organizational Analysis,* January: p. 25-58.

Oden, Howard W. 1997. *Managing corporate culture, innovation and intrapreneurship.* Westport: Quorum Books, 279 p.

Parker, Glenn M. 1994.*Cross-Functional Teams: Working with Allies, Enemies, and Other Strangers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rubin, Barry M., and Richard Rubin. 1999. "Successful Collaborative Management and Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector." *Public Productivity & Management Review,* Vol. 22, No. 4, June: p. 517-536.

Shalala, Donna E. 1998. "Are large public organizations manageable?" *Public Administration Review (PAR),* Vol. 58, No. 4, July/August: p. 284-289.

Stalk, G, P. Evans, and L. E. Shulman. 1995. "Competing on Capabilities: The New Rules of Corporate Strategy." Harvard Business Review, March-April: p. 57-69.

Stone, Bruce. 1995. "Administrative Accountability in the Westminster Democracies: Towards a Conceptual Framework." *Governance,* Vol. 8, No. 4, October: p. 505-526.

Thomas, John Clayton. 1999. "Bringing the public into public administration." *Public Administration Review (PAR),* Vol. 59, No. 1, January/February: p. 83-88.

Weber, Edward P. 1998. "Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference." *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* Vol. 18, No. 2, Spring: p. 88-93.

Wiener, Celine. 1991. *L'Évolution des rapports entre l'administration et les usagers: étude comparative.* Paris: Économica, 294 p.

Government Reorganization / Corporate Services
- **team management / project management / concerted action / administration without frontiers**

Beaudoin, Pierre. 1984. *La gestion par projet.* Montreal: Agence d'Arc, xvi, 251 p.

Benghozi, Pierre-Jean. 1990. *Innovation et gestion de projets.* Coll. "Cadres et dirigeants. Série 'Des idées pour gérer'". Paris: Eyrolles, xiv, 153 p.

Bettez, Denise. 1997. *La gestion des équipes de travail autonomes dans le secteur public.* (S.1.): Chicoutimi, 1 v.

Bouloc, Pierre. 1973. *Stratégies pour réussir la direction par objectifs. Préf. De Guy Postel.* Paris: Éditions d'Organisation, 290 p.

Cleland, David I. 1996. *Strategic management of teams.* New York, N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, xi, 292 p.

Daniels, W.R. 1986. *Group Power I: A Manager's Guide to Using Task Force Meetings.* San Diego: Pfeiffer.

Geisler, Eliezer. 1997. *Managing the aftermath of radical corporate change: reengineering, restructuring and reinvention.* Westport: Quorum Books, 228 p.

Harrison, Peter. 1999. *Future leaders in the Public Service of Canada: Some Thoughts.* Keynote address, The Leadership Network, Government of Canada, Guelph University, April 6.

Joly, Michel, and Jean-Louis G. Muller. 1994. *De la gestion de projet au management par projet*. Coll. "Gestion de projet". Paris-La Défense: AFNOR: 216 p.

Korine, Harry. 1999. "The new team organization: Learning to manage arbitrariness." *European Management Journal (EMJ),* Vol. 17, No. 1, February: p. 1-7.

McIntyre, Marie G. 1998. *The management team handbook.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 256 p.

Peters, B. Guy. 1993. *The Public Service, the Changing State and Governance*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 56, 50 p.

Petit, Michel. 1999. *Management d'équipe.* Paris: Dunod, xiii, 203 p.

United Kingdom. 1999. *Modernizing Government,* Report presented to the Parliament by the Prime Minister and the Minister on behalf of the Cabinet Office, March.

Sims, Ronald R. 1998. *Accountability and radical change in public organizations*. Westport, Ct: Quorum Books.

Wellins, Richard S., Dick Schaaf, and Kathy Harper Shomo. 1997. *Succeeding with teams.* Minneapolis: Lakewood, 126 p.

Policy Formulation and Development

Canadian Centre for Management Development. 1996. *Rethinking Policy: Strengthening Policy Capacity: Conference Proceedings*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 42, 36, p.

El-Ahraf, Amer, Mohammad H. Qayoumi, and Ron Dowd. 1999. *The impact of public policy on environmental quality and health: the case of land use management and planning.* Westport CT: Quorum Books, 181 p.

Peters, B. Guy. 1996. *The Policy Capacity of Government*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 62, 58, p.

Social and Management Sciences
- interfaces / cross-sectoral / interdisciplinary

Bassett, Glenn A. 1993. *The evolution and future of high performance management systems.* Westport CT.: Quorum Books, xvii, 208 p.

Belhumeur, Robert. 1998. "The path of partnership". *Optimum,* Vol. 28, No. 1: p. 43-47.

Bovens, Mark, Peter Plug. 1999. *Responsabilité aux différents niveaux de gouvernement: globalisation et décentralisation.* International Institute of Administrative Sciences, Sunningdale, UK, 12-15 July.

Canada, Auditor general. "Collaborative Arrangements: Issues for the Federal Government". *Report of the Auditor General to the House of Commons.* Ottawa, chapter 5, April.

Eimicke, William B. 1998. "Benchmarking for Best Practices in the Public Sector/ Achieving Improved Performances in Public Organizations: A Guide for Managers/Organizational Performance and Measurement in the Public Sector: Toward Service, Effort and Accomplishment Reported." *American Review of Public Administration (MPA),* Vol. 28, No. 1, March: p. 90-95.

Kernaghan, Kenneth. 1998. "Partnership and Public Administration: Conceptual and Practical Considerations." *Canadian Public Administration,* Vol. 36, No. 1, Spring: p. 57-76.

Langford, John. 1999. *Les aspirants à la gestion des partenariats publics-privés.* Notes for the joint governmental conference, Ottawa, April 23.

Lewin, K. 1947. "Group Decision and Social Change". In T. Newcomb and E. Hartely (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Riggs, Fred W. 1998. "Public administration theory - A futurist vision." *International Journal of Public Administration,* Vol. 21, No. 12: p. 1667-1757.

Terry, Larry D. 1988. "Administrative leadership, neo-managerialism, and the public management movement." *Public Administration Review (PAR),* Vol. 58, No. 3, May/June: p. 194-200.

Integration of New Organizational Models: from the Weber model to today

Erin Research Inc. 1998. *Citizens First - Summary.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, p. 6.

Gagnon, Yves-Chantal, Jocelyne Dragon. 1998. "The impact of technology on organizational performance." *Optimum,* Vol. 28, No. 1: p. 19-31.

Galbraith, J.R. 1977. *Organization Design.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Gilmour, Robert S., and Laura S. Jensen. 1998. "Reinventing government accountability: Public functions, privatization, and the meaning of 'state action'." *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 58, No. 3, May/June: p. 247-258.

Mackenzie, K.D. 1989. "The Process Approach to Organizational Design." *Human System*

Management, No. 8: p. 31-43.

Pasmore, W.A. 1988. *Designing Effective Organizations -The Sociothechnical Systems Perspective.* New York: Wiley.

Peters, Guy B. 1995. *The Changing State and Governance.* Sainte-Foy: Laval University Press, Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 306 p.

Sarbaugh-Thompson, Marjorie. 1998. "Change from below: Integrating bottom-up entrepreneurship into a program development framework." *American Review of Public Administration (MPA),* Vol. 28, No. 1, March: p. 3-25.

Schulz, Martin. 1998. "Limits to Bureaucratic Growth: The density dependence of organizational rule births." *Administrative Science Quartely (ASQ),* Vol. 43, No. 4, December: p. 845-876.

Weinberg, G.M. 1982. *Rethinking Systems Analysis and Design.* Boston: Little, Brown.

The Need to Adapt of Public Organizations Confronted with Changes in Society

Massé, Marcel, 1993. John L. Manion Lecture: *The Changing Roles of Government and Public Service*. Coll. "Partners in the Management of Canada". Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 19 p.

The Growth of Bureaucratic Empires: Quality of Services to the Population

Blythe, Marie D., and Brian D. Marson. *Good Practices in Citizen-Centred Service.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, March, 197 p.

Boyne, George A. 1998. "Public services under new labour: Back to bureaucracy?" *Public Money & Management (PMM),* Vol. 18, No. 3, July/September: p. 43-50.

Canadian Centre for Management Development. 1999. *Making Citizen-Centered Service Delivery a Reality.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 17 p.

Canadian Centre for Management Development. 1999. *Citizen-Centred Service: Responding to the Needs of Canadians/Handbook*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Management Development, 23 p.

Disend, Jeffrey E. 1991. *How to provide excellent service in any organization: a blueprint for making all the theories work.* Radnor, Pa: Chilton, 342 p.

Godfrey, Paul C., and Grant C. Madsen. 1998. "Bureaucracy in the postmodern world: Problems and solutions." *International Journal of Public Administration,* Vol. 21, No. 5: p. 691-721.

Kernaghan, Kenneth, and John Langford. 1990. *The Responsible Public Servant.* Halifax: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Melkers, Julia, and John Clayton Thomas. 1998. "What do administrators think citizens think? Administrator predictions as an adjunct to citizen surveys." *Public Administration Review (PAR),* Vol. 58, No. 4, July/August: p. 327-334.

Rowe, Mike. 1999. *Responsabilité et démocratie: réponse à l'autorité politique et aux besoins des citoyens.* Sunningdale (RU): International Institute of Administrative Sciences, The Civil Service, July.