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Abstract

Oregon is presented with the challenge of globalization; an ever-changing shared-power world that is becoming increasingly more complex, interconnected and interdependent. With this challenge comes opportunity—opportunity which demands creating new knowledge to become a catalyst for innovation and learning by collaborating with partners across sectors and geographic boundaries to rise up to meet the challenge of globalization. Within the government, business, academic, military, non-profit and civic sectors in Oregon there are many relationships that already exist with Vietnam. What does not exist is a way to leverage the strengths of these diverse relationships to mutually benefit Oregon and Vietnam through strategic collaboration. There are many forms of collaborative approaches being used to attempt to leverage relationships across sectors to create mutual economic and social benefit. One of the most promising approaches is networked governance. This research explores one approach to networked governance, a Managed Network, specifically, the Public Value Network (PVN) framework established by Edward DeSeve.

The research question addressed is “Can the Public Value Network approach be used to rapidly design and launch a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam?” The research question focuses on the initial phase of creating a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network.

There is rapidly expanding literature on collaborative governance and networks. The literature supports that although networks are proliferating public institutions with mixed results, they hold promise for addressing increasingly complex and “wicked” challenges. The literature reveals that a “state” to “country” PVN is possibly unique.
The methodology is an exploratory case study which draws on both theory and practice to test the literature against creating the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI). Specifically, the case study examines the efficacy of the DeSeve PVN framework as a model to rapidly establish a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network. The case study explores the benefits and limitations of the PVN approach.

Analysis found that while there is potential benefit of the PVN approach to governing networks, it was insufficient alone to create a network. Analysis also showed that for rapidly designing a cross-sector, “state” to “country” PVN, established relationships of trust was equally important to leadership. Furthermore, the literature validates that trust, an integral component of leadership, is essential to building an effective network. This finding on trust and leadership in the literature is also supported by empirical evidence from the case study.

A significant limitation of the PVN approach was a lack of a “state” to “country” dimension. Several areas were identified as opportunities for additional research including exploring the addition of a new Typology to the DeSeve PVN model to address the cultural dimensions of a “state” to “country” network. Conclusions and recommendations include the need for the network to create new knowledge to become a catalyst for innovation and learning, identifying ways to sustain the network, and that VOI has the potential to bridge the gap between theory and praxis to more fully explore application of the EMERGE framework.

**Keywords:** Globalization, shared-power, innovation, learning, collaboration, public value network, cross-sector, “state” to “country”, boundaries, mutual benefit, knowledge creation, trust, EMERGE framework.
Introduction

Challenge and Opportunity

Oregon is presented with the challenge of globalization; an ever-changing world that is becoming increasingly more complex, interconnected and interdependent. With this challenge comes opportunity—opportunity which demands creating new knowledge to become a catalyst for innovation and learning by collaborating with partners across sectors and geographic boundaries to rise up to meet the challenge of globalization. Vietnam has great potential to be such a partner. With 90 million people, Vietnam has one of the world’s most dynamic economies and is an emerging leader on the world stage. At the same time, Vietnam is experiencing profound transformation—challenges to its centralized system of governance and the necessity to balance rapid economic growth with environmental sustainability and meeting the basic livability needs of its citizens. In turn, while Oregon struggles with a recovering economy and seeks job creation and economic development, it excels in urban planning, sustainability and innovative governance practices.

Within the government, business, academic, military, non-profit and civic sectors in Oregon there are many relationships that already exist with Vietnam. What does not exist is a way to leverage the strengths of these diverse relationships to mutually benefit Oregon and Vietnam through strategic collaboration. With the continuing deepening and evolving economic, political and cultural relationships, there is significant potential return on investment for both Oregon and Vietnam through the creation of a cross-sector strategic initiative. The Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) is a concept that can build on the strengths of existing relationships to create a sustainable collaborative network to accelerate
innovation, expand the capacity for trade and economic development and foster learning opportunities.

**Background and Setting**

There are fundamental cultural differences between Vietnam and the United States that provide important context for the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) and the potential for shared learning opportunities. Vietnam is intentional, deliberate and thoughtful in its approach to policy development and governance. Decisions are based on what is in the best interest of the society as a whole and care is taken to build and maintain relationships for the long-term.

In contrast, the culture in the United States is based on economic freedom, competition to be the best with value placed on individual rights and equality. The role of the government is questioned; there is a healthy tension between citizens and the government in the policy making process. The priority for the United States is on making decisions that lead to short-term gain, not necessarily with an eye toward building and maintaining relationships for the long-term.

These fundamental differences are supported by Hofstede’s Dimensions of Culture (The Hofstede Centre; Jandt, 2006). In his 6-D Model, a key cultural indicator is long-term orientation, defined as “the extent to which a society shows a pragmatic future-oriented perspective rather than a conventional historical short-term point of view” (The Hofstede Centre). Long-term orientation is a high value for Vietnam and a low value for the United States. Another cultural indicator that is an important cultural distinction between the United States and Vietnam is power distance. This indicator acknowledges the fact that all individuals in societies are not equal and “the fact that a society’s inequality is endorsed by
the followers as much as by the leaders” (The Hofstede Centre). Power distance is defined as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organisations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally” (The Hofstede Centre). Vietnam scores high which means that people accept a hierarchical order where everybody has a place; the United States scores low, meaning this is a less accepted value. The difference in Hofstede’s power distance dynamic indicates that hierarchical order has greater acceptance in Vietnam than it does in the United States.

Finally, a cultural indicator that Vietnam and the United States share is uncertainty avoidance, defined as “The extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid these” (The Hofstede Centre). Both Vietnam and the United States are on the low end of acceptance of this value. The relevance is that low acceptance is an indicator that both countries may tolerate higher levels of innovation, a primary objective of creating the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI).

The EMERGE framework, an innovative new governance approach offers a polity lens to assess the differences between policy and governance dynamics in the United States and Vietnam. EMERGE Public Leadership for Sustainable Development is a conceptual framework with tools and case studies co-produced by the Ho Chi Minh National Academy for Politics and Public Administration in Vietnam, and the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University, to prepare public officials to lead for the public good in a world characterized by dynamic challenges that require innovative thinking and wise judgement (as cited by Davis and Ingle, 2013). In addition to
the EMERGE framework, Dr. Huan Dang also discusses these polity characteristics in his working paper (Dang, 2011).

**One-Party Polity vs. Multi-Party Polity**

Vietnam has a one-party system controlled by the Communist Party, while the multi-party system in the United States relies on independent Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches which provide checks and balances in governance and the policy making process. Vietnam's one-party system aligns with the culture and values of Vietnam. In his polity comparison, Dr. Huan discusses the need for a political system to reflect the values of the people. He states that “equality of distribution is a basic value of the people in Vietnam” (Dang, 2011, p. 13).

This is reinforced by Hofstede's assessment that Vietnam is a culture that is characterized by high power distance, where people accept a hierarchical order and low individualism (The Hofstede Centre). In Vietnam, the government is responsible for taking care of the people and has “strong autonomy over the society in order to maintain order, social coherence and prosperity” (Dang, 2013, p. 1).

**Collective vs. Individual Culture**

Individualism is characterized as a preference for a loosely-knit social framework where the focus is on the individual and their immediate family. Conversely, collectivism is a preference for a tightly-knit framework in society in which the priority is the group or society as a whole, not the individual. Research supports that the United States is considered a highly individualistic nation while the culture in Vietnam is rooted in collectivism (Jandt, 2006; Dang, 2013; Den Hartog et al., 1999; Hui and Triandis, 1996; Hitt et al., 2002; The Hofstede Centre).
Vietnam’s 1992 Constitution reads, “…the obligations and rights of the citizens, under which all citizens are equal before the law and have equal political, economic and cultural rights. The interests of both the intellectual and the manual worker are protected. Women have rights equal to those of men in all respects. Vietnamese citizens have freedom of speech, publication, association and meeting…” (Nghia, 2000, p. 128). There are similarities in this language to the values and beliefs that serve as the foundation for individualism in the United States. It is an example of how seemingly divergent belief systems can share important commonalities. These similarities may provide a basis for Oregon and Vietnam to build meaningful long-term relationships that can mutually benefit Vietnam and the United States.

**Less-Developed vs. Highly Industrialized Economy**

It has only been in the last 30 years that Vietnam has transitioned to a market economy. In that time, pressure has grown for Vietnam to decentralize its government. Fritzen discusses trust between levels of government. Scott Fritzen (2002) offers that the perspective held by high level leaders is that on the local level people are “unable to objectively assess their own needs” (p. 15). This is counter to both the values expressed in Vietnam’s Constitution and the practice of acknowledging local autonomy in the United States. In the United States, although a natural tension exists between levels of government, there is deference to the local people that they know what is best for their community.

Fritzen examines case studies of various efforts to implement discretion on the local level with mixed results. He offers that one explanation for a lack of initiative when offered an opportunity to make decisions locally, is that there is an inherent distrust between the people and high level officials because they are conditioned to be dependent on
government to make decisions. Meetings are used to disseminate information, rather than foster a genuine dialogue to ask for their opinion. Fritzen poses that this dynamic can change when there is progressive leadership on the local level, offering promise for establishing a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam.

These fundamental cultural differences between Vietnam and the United States provide context for the prospect of creating shared value for mutual benefit.

**Evolution of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative**

The author participated as a member of a leadership team assembled at Portland State University (PSU) to explore whether there is shared value and the potential for mutual benefit in creating a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam. The author began with a traditional approach to coalition building: assessing the need; creating a strategic plan; and identifying stakeholders and available resources (Bryson, 2004). This approach was not adequate for the creation of VOI, particularly to identify a shared value proposition for the collaborative network. The author determined that while the traditional approach to coalition building is relevant to problems that are easily identifiable with a sense of urgency to find a solution, it was inadequate to address a cross-sector, “state” to “country” challenge that is visionary in nature with no burning platform. Creating a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam represented a highly complex challenge without a motivating crisis to initiate action.

The author recognized that an alternative approach was needed to move forward with the creation of VOI. A preliminary literature review indicated that a possible option for creating VOI could be a managed network, specifically a Public Value Network. A stakeholder coalition, or alliance, as it is identified by Edward DeSeve is one type of PVN
(DeSeve, 2007). From there the research question evolved into, “Can the Public Value Network approach be used to rapidly design and launch a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam?” Specifically, the case study explores whether the Public Value Network (PVN) approach can be used to create a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network.

The evolution of the title, “Vietnam-Oregon Initiative” illustrates a microcosm of the highly complex challenge presented in creating a cross-sector, “state” to “country” collaborative network. The idea began with the concept of “VOI-LA”, the Vietnam-Oregon Innovation and Leadership Alliance. Two critical discussions ensued surrounding the concepts embodied in the acronym. The first centered on the “L” for Leadership and “I” for Innovation and whether the acronym should stand for “Innovative Leadership” rather than “Innovation and Leadership”. The distinction can be drawn from Horth and Buchner’s (2009) description of “Innovative Leadership”—bringing “new thinking and different actions to how you lead,” and “Leadership for Innovation”—creating a climate where people “apply innovative thinking to solve problems and it is about “growing a culture of innovation” (p. 7). Horth and Buchner’s perspective acknowledges that collectively, “we”, Oregon and Vietnam, need to find new ways of thinking.

The second critical discussion involved the use of the word “Alliance”. This word has a different connotation in Vietnam than it does in Oregon because of the association of “Alliance” with military force. A review of literature reinforced that careful use of language to make sense of people’s experience in moving toward a common purpose, is an essential trait of visionary leadership—words have meaning and are an important consideration in forming successful collaborations (Crosby and Bryson, 2005).
Digging deeper into the meaning and essence of VOI-LA, the concept of a “Vietnam-Oregon Bridge for Learning and Innovation Toward a Shared Bright Future” emerged within the PSU leadership team. The word “bridge” means connection and relationship; learning means sharing experiences, knowledge, understanding and working with each other; innovation is the outcome of the process; and the goal is a common bright future for both Vietnam and Oregon. The literature on boundary spanning supports the concept of a “bridge” that links innovation and transformative solutions, an opportunity for new learning and development (Meehan and Reinelt, 2012; Yip et al., 2009). To reflect our strategic intent, using the title “Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI)” embraces this concept and honors the cultural heritage and aspirations of both Oregon and Vietnam. In the Vietnamese language, “với” has special meaning, “together”. The research supports the value of bridging diverse cultures while respecting their roots in particular places and traditions (Crosby, 2010).

Like its title and acronym, the creation of VOI evolved over time. In the initial zest to pursue traditional methods of assessing the need, creating a strategic plan, and identifying stakeholders and resources, there was healthy tension to find the right balance between the role of the PSU leadership team to establish a structure and create a vision for VOI, and ensuring that stakeholders were invested and had ownership of a co-produced network. The process was iterative utilizing regular meetings and communication among the PSU leadership team, and pursuing qualitative research to collect data through interviews and using a questionnaire developed to inform the strategy for creating and launching VOI; both were happening simultaneously. Although the pace left little time for reflection, key adaptations were made along the way. Without an immediate crisis to fuel the creation of
VOI, the most difficult challenge was identifying a common purpose that embodied shared value for the mutual benefit of Vietnam and Oregon. The question the PSU leadership team grappled with most during the creation of VOI was the value proposition.

The exercise of creating a value proposition required visionary leadership, inspiring others to envision a shared future of opportunities that lead to mutual benefit (Kouzes and Posner, 2007). As sponsors and champions, the PSU leadership team translated abstract ideas into a path forward to an attractive future. It was a grasstops approach to developing a provisional value proposition that would then be refined to gain broad-based grassroots support among stakeholders (Crosby et al., 2010). Although the PSU leadership team could not provide a definitive vision statement, their role was to structure the right kind of conversation that enabled people to cross boundaries that they would otherwise have not (Bryson and Crosby, 2007; Skidmore, 2004).

The PSU leadership team developed a provisional value proposition from their experience with leaders across sectors in Oregon and Vietnam. The value proposition was then continually tested and adapted by meeting with potential network participants in Oregon and Vietnam, and listening to their needs and insights about the concept of VOI. The culmination of these conversations lead to the following provisional value statement: “The Vietnam-Oregon Initiative is a unique cross-sector ‘state’ to ‘country’ relationship that will build on and leverage existing relationships for the mutual benefits of trade enhancement, educational exchange and innovation in governance.” This provisional value statement was the starting point for the conversation with potential network members at the launch of VOI in Oregon on May 5, 2014.
Innes and Booher support that value propositions are important elements to help leaders and participants develop shared understanding and commitment to new direction that resonate across boundaries (as cited by Crosby, 2010). The conversations to develop the provisional value proposition for VOI and coming together during the launch meeting are examples of boundary experiences; the value proposition is an important boundary object. The value proposition will likely continue to evolve over time and serve as the basis for future conversations on a shared vision for VOI moving forward (Crosby, 2010; Benington and Moore, 2011; Skidmore, 2004).

**Literature Review**

For this research, the author sought to examine the efficacy of the DeSeve Public Value Network (PVN) framework as an approach to rapidly establish a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network. This was accomplished through a review of the literature which identified nine Critical Elements that indicate the success of a PVN (DeSeve, 2007, p. 212) and eight types of PVNs (DeSeve, 2007, p. 213) as applied through an exploratory case study to answer the specific research question, “Can the Public Value Network approach be used to rapidly design and launch a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam?” To assess the DeSeve PVN framework and inform the qualitative research, the author conducted a comprehensive review on the topics of networked governance, leadership, public value creation, boundary spanning and trust.

**Networked Governance**

The author begins the literature review with the topic of networked governance. The literature surrounding networked governance is rapidly expanding. Koliba et al. (2011) offer that “globalization has inextricably linked nations, institutions, organizations,
and individuals” (p. xxv). The literature revealed that networks are proliferating public institutions with mixed results; the efficacy of networks is difficult to quantify and evaluate (Head, 2008; Koliba, 2011; McGuire and Agranoff, 2011; Mulgan, 2004; Provan and Milward, 2001). Koliba et al. (2011) defines governance networks as, “interorganizational networks comprised of multiple actors, often spanning sectors and scale, working together to influence the creation, implementation, and monitoring of public policies” (p. xxv). The author reviewed the literature on the evolution of public administration paradigms into networked governance (Koliba et al., 2011, p. 191):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Administration Paradigm</th>
<th>Dominant Administrative Structure</th>
<th>Central Administrative Dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical public administration</td>
<td>Public bureaucracies</td>
<td>Command and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public management</td>
<td>Public bureaucracies or private firms</td>
<td>Competition; concession and compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative public management</td>
<td>Partnerships with private firms, non-profits, and citizens</td>
<td>Collaboration and cooperation; concession and compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance network administration</td>
<td>Mixed-form governance networks</td>
<td>Command and control; competition; concession and compromise; collaboration and cooperation; coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Networked governance, an emergent innovative paradigm, is a hybrid between markets and hierarchies, allowing for all forms of administrative dynamics including: command and control; competition; concession and compromise; collaboration and cooperation; and coordination. The literature abundantly supports that networked
governance is the most relevant approach to address highly complex challenges that involve multiple sectors, diverse geographic areas, and mixed administrative authorities with vertical, horizontal and diagonal relational ties (Benington and Moore, 2011; Head, 2008; Koliba, 2011; Morgan et al., 2008; Never, 2007; Rusko, 2010). Based on the literature review, the author concluded that a collaborative networked governance approach held the most promise to address the highly complex challenge to create a network between Oregon and Vietnam.

Further review of the literature uncovered a type of networked governance, a Managed Network approach. For the purposes of narrowing the scope of Managed Networks to focus on those that provide public value and recognize that they often include entities both inside and outside of government, Edward DeSeve created the Public Value Network (PVN) framework. DeSeve (2007) defines a Managed Network as, “An integrated system of relationships that is managed across formal and informal organizational boundaries with recognized organizational principles and a clear definition of success” (p. 211). To explicitly recognize the role of the private sector in a PVN, DeSeve (2007) defines a PVN as, “An integrated system of relationships that is managed across formal and informal organizational boundaries and sectors with recognized organizational principles and a clear definition of success in terms of Public Value realized” (p. 211). The PVN approach is considered to be a conceptual framework because it identifies a set of variables and the relationships among them. It is not as defined as a theory which provides a more logically coherent set of relationships, or a model that is representative of a specific situation and much narrower in scope (Koliba et al., 2011).
While the vast majority of the literature supports that networks are more effective than hierarchies in sharing learning and adapting to change, in contrast, Mulgan (2004) is skeptical stating that networks “have led to greater not lesser concentrations of power and have reinforced some hierarchies...concentration of control over resources that others need; money, knowledge, votes, even processing power” (p. 52). Mulgan (2004) goes on to posit that networks “remain poor at mobilising resources, sustaining themselves through hard times, generating surpluses, organizing commitments, or playing games of power” (p. 53).

The literature recognizes that the public sector is faced with the challenge of an ever-changing world that is becoming increasingly more complex, interconnected and interdependent; there are expanding networks of actors who represent cross-sector interests and span economic, social and geographic boundaries. These actors often have competing interests and desired outcomes. The result is increasingly complex and “wicked” problems, adaptive challenges that do not have clearly defined answers (Benington and Moore, 2011; Bryson and Crosby, 2007; Crosby, 2010; Davis and Ingle, 2013; DeSeve, 2007; Luke, 1998; Morgan et al., 2008; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Weber and Khademian, 2008).

There has been an emergence of innovative governance models, described as governance networks, to find new approaches to address complex “wicked” challenges. The literature review offers that one of these innovative new approaches is the EMERGE framework. Magis and Duc describe EMERGE Public Leadership for Sustainable Development as a “conceptual framework with tools and case studies co-produced by the Ho Chi Minh National Academy for Politics and Public Administration in Vietnam and the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University. The object of this
endeavor is to prepare public officials to lead for the public good in a world characterized by dynamic complexity” (as cited by Davis and Ingle, 2013).

EMERGE goes beyond the concept of “wicked” problems, to establish the terminology “wicked challenges and opportunities,” to recognize dynamic challenges that require innovative thinking and wise judgement (as cited by Davis and Ingle, 2013). This is supported by Ricardo Morse, “collaborative governance is about opportunities. There are opportunities (to solve problems or otherwise create public value) that lie in working across boundaries that otherwise are not there within a single agency” (Morse, 2010, p. 434), and John Kingdon, “Leaders…..will be most effective if they understand the constraints and opportunities inherent in the multiple contexts (local to global) in which they are operating…understanding emerges from attention to sociological, political, economic, technological, and ecological conditions and trends and how they can combine to create ‘windows of opportunity’” (as cited by Crosby, 2010, p. 572). This cutting-edge concept of evolving beyond complex problems to a recognition of dynamic challenges is an area for further literature development to reflect emerging practice.

This complex nature leads to a self-organizing capacity within governance networks which is counter to the hierarchy of traditional governance systems (Meehan and Reinelt, 2012). The literature supports that in an interdependent shared-power world, complex public problems extend well beyond government agencies, and although they have a key role, governments cannot alone solve complex public problems. When disparities of power are minimal, collaborations can be most effective (Connelly, 2007; Crosby, 2010; Meynhardt, 2009; Silvia and McGuire, 2010).
The author uses R.A.W Rhodes’ definition to provide context for the use of the term “governance”. Rhodes (2007) states that she views governance as, “Interdependence between organizations. Governance is broader than government, covering non-state actors. Changing the boundaries of the state meant the boundaries between public, private and voluntary sectors became shifting and opaque...A significant degree of autonomy from the state; they are self-organizing” (p. 1246). This definition encompasses the critical cross-sector nature of the research. A challenge for leaders in all sectors is how to operate effectively within an interdependent and interconnected world that requires the skills to promote collaboration within hierarchies and networks.

**Leadership**

While the previous section of the literature review looked at networked governance, this section examines the role of leadership in networks. There is vast literature on the topic of leadership. The theory of leading in networks has been influence by theory and practice from public administration, sociology, social psychology, and political science (Connelly, 2007).

In his Public Value Network (PVN) framework, DeSeve emphasizes the Critical Element of leadership over all other eight Critical Elements, “The role of leadership is described as the Critical Element that must orchestrate all of the other elements” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 209). Heifetz suggests that, “the primary function of leadership is to recognize those adaptive situations that can produce true solutions to problems that are not just technical in nature, but which represent a real shift in how a nation or culture approaches the challenge” (as cited in DeSeve, 2007, p. 208). DeSeve describes that PVNs are often “designed to solve the most complicated problems that societies face” (DeSeve, 2007, p.
As discussed earlier in the review of networked governance, these problems are described as “wicked”—increasingly complex, interdependent and interconnected problems that do not have clearly defined answers.

Jeff Luke (1998) makes a distinction between public sector leadership, traditionally focused within government hierarchies and the need for public leadership to address interdependent and interconnected problems. Luke (1998) states, “We are now tied into multiple webs of interconnections never before witnessed in human history...This web inextricably ties together historically separate economic, social, and environmental problems. Global, regional, and local interdependencies are connecting political and economic fortunes of communities, states, and national governments more closely than ever before” (p. 5). The literature supports that scholars see leadership in the context of a global ecosystem that crosses diverse cultural systems.

DeSeve concludes that to meet these wicked challenges, “leaders need to search for alternative forms of organization” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 207), offering the PVN as an option. DeSeve focuses on two types of leadership necessary to meet interdependent and interconnected challenges, transactional and transformational. James Burns (as cited in DeSeve, 2007, p. 214) defines transactional and transformational leadership:

“*Transactional leadership:* When ‘leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another...Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers’...*Transformational leadership:* When a leader ‘looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result...is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents’...”
In essence, transactional leadership involves an exchange between the leader and follower while transformational leadership seeks to engage the values and motivations of a follower to achieve change. Research establishes that transactional and transformational leadership is not limited to a particular organization or culture; leadership transcends countries and organizations (Bass, 2000). Bass’ work is applicable to the cross-national nature of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative.

In their integrative model of trust in leadership, Burke et al. (2007) offer that while there is empirical support that transactional leadership is effective, they find that it may not be the most effective leadership style when compared to transformational as an alternative. There is also considerable research that supports transformational leadership as a paradigm that engages leaders and followers to go beyond their self-interest for the greater good of their organization, community, nation or society as a whole. Transformational leadership enables leaders to strategically adapt to changes locally, nationally and globally (Bass, 2000; Burke et al., 2007; Connelly, 2007; Crosby and Bryson, 2005; Luke, 1998; Nye, 2008; DeSeve, 2007; Yip et al., 2009).

DeSeve (2007) offers that “the search for public value encompasses those who are ‘transactional’ and those who are ‘transformational’” (p. 205). The transactional leader focuses on supplying the public with what it values while the transformational leader wishes to fundamentally change the values of a government or society. DeSeve argues that all leadership is value-centric and makes the case that “leadership shapes public values even as it seeks to produce things that the public values” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 206). DeSeve concludes that for both transactional and transformational leaders, it is essential to focus on public value.
**Public Value Creation**

The previous section examined the role of leadership in networks. This section looks at the literature on public value creation. DeSeve notes that “the quest for public value should be the central organizing principle of government” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 210) and offers that leadership in government is critical to achieving public value.

DeSeve defines public value as “Public Value constitutes the demonstrated level of social and economic outcome achieved by government that clearly fulfills the public’s demonstrated preference for a good or service efficiently and economically” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 209). DeSeve observes that these are not natural or social networks, that PVNs are “consciously constructed entities designed to function toward a common purpose” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 210).

Bryson and Crosby (2007) offer that the use of networks to provide solutions to address complex problems that require cross-sector collaboration must serve public values and yield mutual gain; the authors equate this with the “common good”. Booher and Innes pose that “a regime of mutual gain can also be described as a shared-power arrangement that generates network power” (as cited by Bryson and Crosby, 2007, p. 185). The concepts of shared-power and achieving the common good are central to the creation of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative. Increasing global interdependence of organizations and people is challenging leaders to bring diverse stakeholders together in “shared-power arrangements in which they can pool information, other resources and activities around a common purpose” (Crosby and Bryson, 2005, p. 184).

Crosby and Bryson and follow this supposition with a conclusion that to achieve the common good and mutual gain in a shared-power world, public leaders must find ways to
maximize the strengths of the different sectors, minimize their inherent failures, and find their connection to the common good. The authors offer a Leadership for the Common Good Framework as a way to pursue leadership in cross-sector, shared-power collaborative settings. Key to this framework is understanding leadership in context, how trends or shifts in political, social, technological and economic systems open up new opportunities for leadership. The research supports the importance of contextual leadership.

A review of the literature on public value and related concepts such as the public good have been debated since the ancient Greeks in 600 AD. Mark Moore’s work has been at the center of this debate since the 1990s. Essential to Moore’s framework for thinking about strategic management in the public sector is the role of government as a pro-active creator of public value, beyond a traditional provider of services.

Moore created the concept of the strategic triangle, arguing that strategies that create public value must satisfy three tests (Benington and Moore, 2011, p. 5):

1) Create publicly valuable outcomes;
2) Mobilize sufficient authorization and be politically sustainable; and
3) Have the operational and administrative support to create and deliver the desired public value outcomes.

**Figure 1.** The strategic triangle of public value
Although a review of the literature identifies that there are perspectives that are counter to Moore’s theory, a significant amount of literature since 1995 expands on Moore’s theory of public value as it relates to economic, political and social change. The literature demonstrates that these changes have contributed to the nature of complex, interdependent, wicked challenges that span sectors, cultures and geographic boundaries (Benington and Moore, 2011; Davis and Ingle, 2013; Luke, 1998; Meynhardt, 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Weber and Khademian, 2008). The literature illustrates that the continuing debate on the creation of public value spans multiple academic and scientific disciplines as well as cultures across the globe; key to this debate is interrelationships among political, governance and civic processes in the creation of public value. Benington and Moore (2011) offer:

“the academic debate about public value has moved well beyond the fields of public administration and strategic management where it originated, and is now at the centre of lively interdisciplinary debates about the purposes and roles of government within a rapidly changing ecological, political-economic and social context: about the changing relationships between state, market, civil society and the ecosphere, and about the nature of the contract being renegotiated between citizens, communities and governments” (p. 20).

John Benington adds to Moore’s theory of the strategic triangle by recognizing the advent of networked governance that requires horizontal, vertical and diagonal collaboration amongst sectors and levels. Benington also explores the concept of a “public sphere”, a concept which looks beyond answering the question of what the public most values to considering long-term public interest and future generations.
The creation of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) used the co-production approach to engage stakeholders to build external support and ownership of the initiative. Relevant to the co-produced approach to VOI, John Alford offers a perspective on public value creation as a co-production, a relational concept where value is highly dependent on creating relationships with actors who span boundaries (Benington and Moore, 2011). The literature provides a broad overview of theories of public value creation and how public value is defined.

The research reveals that what is common amongst these theories are the elements of natural tensions between the individual and society in the context of relationships that span sectors, cultures and geographic boundaries (Meynhardt, 2009; Morse, 2010; Rusko, 2010). The research also offers that in the pursuit of creating co-produced public value, network collaboration relies on building relationships rather than market competition or traditional command and control hierarchies. This requires participants to look beyond themselves to cultivate relationships and interpersonal networks; trust is essential to building effective network relationships (Ibarra and Hunter, 2007; Luke, 1998; Morse, 2010; Benington and Moore, 2011). The element of trust as it relates to building a successful network will be discussed in more detail later in the literature review.

A review of the literature on public value creation offers that while it is likely that there is immediate value created when establishing a network, there are cycles to value creation that yield short and long-term mutual benefit and that value creation should be evaluated over time to understand its depth (Wenger et al., 2011). From this review of the literature and empirical evidence, the author concludes that the rapid design of VOI has created value that should continue to be evaluated. Moore's work supports this ongoing
evaluation, offering that if the strategic triangle of public value is out of alignment, revising the value proposition is one option for achieving realignment amongst the stakeholders (Benington and Moore, 2011).

**Boundary Spanning**

While the previous section looked at public value creation, this section explores boundary spanning. The concept of boundary spanning is essential to the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI), particularly as it relates to using the Public Value Network framework to create VOI. DeSeve emphasizes the importance of working across governmental boundaries and sectors. He observes that while “leadership is often exercised through single departments, agencies, or bureaus, increasingly a network that spans intra- and intergovernmental boundaries and also reaches across sectors is necessary to meet a challenge or accomplish a mission” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 210).

DeSeve states that “the essence of PVNs (Public Value Networks)” is “the conscious search for a solution to one or more problems across multiple boundaries” (DeSeve 2007, p. 212). Eggers and Goldsmith note that “Rigid bureaucratic systems, with their command and control procedures, narrow work restrictions, and siloed cultures and operational models, are particularly ill-suited to responding to problems that increasingly know no organizational boundaries” (as cited in DeSeve, 2007, p. 208). The boundary-crossing nature of public problems and collaborative governance approach to solve public problems and create public value is further supported in the literature (Morse, 2010). Geoff Mulgan first wrote about the concept of the growing connectedness of the world in 1997. In 2004, Mulgan revisited this concept stating:
“The world has continued becoming more connected: the boundaries between international and domestic policy have blurred irrevocably; and the gap between the scale and nature of the problems and the capacities of institutions to deal with them has grown. Within business, governments and civil society the importance of networks in helping with coordination, learning and the creation of value has become more commonplace” (Mulgan, 2004, p. 52).

Interconnected and interdependent problems are “adaptive challenges that require a networked approach to leadership so that people can cooperate across traditional boundaries that exist within organizations and across boundaries” (Meehan and Reinelt, 2012, p. 3). The literature supports that governance spans multiple levels from local to global across sector and cultural boundaries. Boundaries are important; leaders need to know which boundaries need to be protected, which to bridge and which to breach (Crosby, 2010). Leaders need to understand the context of and acknowledge the importance of local politics and economies. The research indicates that effective leadership occurs when individuals and groups collaborate across sector and geographic boundaries to achieve shared outcomes that go beyond what they could achieve on their own.

Yip et al. (2009) articulate the concept presented by the research that the whole is greater than its sum, “leadership is more than the sum of its parts; it is more than groups working in independent isolation, within their own boundaries – it is the nexus of groups working collaboratively across boundaries that produces direction, alignment, and commitment” (p. 20). This concept is referred to as emergence; in a dynamic system the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, solutions cannot be imposed and leaders must
allow the path forward to reveal itself (Connelly, 2007; Davis and Ingle, 2013; Huxham, 2003; Silvia and McGuire, 2010; Snowden and Boone, 2007).

Chris Silva and Michael McGuire (2010) illustrate the concept of emergence within the context of networked governance; a network involves multiple actors with multiple linkages collaborating across boundaries to contribute to the common good. Networks are integrated structures that require leadership to bring the parts together toward the whole of resolution to a problem. Silva and McGuire propose that the needs to lead a network and a single-agency are different. Van Wart organizes leadership into three domains: task-oriented, people-oriented and organization oriented (as cited by Silvia and McGuire, 2010). Silvia and McGuire tested a hypothesis that there are significant differences in the usage of Van Wart’s three domains across network and single-agency contexts in their review of integrative leadership behaviors.

They found that integrative leadership is based on sharing information rather than exercising authority; their most significant finding was that the prevalence of people-oriented and organization-oriented behaviors far outweigh task-oriented behaviors. People and organization-oriented behaviors are most consistent with transformational leadership including traits such as motivating, building teams, articulating organization vision and mission, and partnering. Important to the empirical evidence gathered in the creation and launch of VOI, Silvia and McGuire (2010) found that frequency in use of the leadership behavior of creating trust had statistical significance, particularly in the context of a network setting.
Trust

The element of trust as it relates to leadership was briefly referenced in previous sections of the literature review. This section examines the literature on trust in greater detail. Trust as it relates to leadership is an emergent theme in the literature. In a review of the literature, empirical data supports that trust is an essential, if not defining element in leading collaborative efforts. The findings support that trust is important and forms the basis for participant actions and network outcomes; past relationships influence present collaborative efforts and together they shape the future. In a network collaboration trust is needed among all participants to establish and maintain commitment; leadership and trust are inextricably linked (Batt and Purchase, 2004; Connelly, 2007; Den Hartog et al., 1999; Ibarra and Hunter, 2007; Skidmore, 2004).

The literature offers that trust is the key to building relationship capital, individual trustworthiness and demonstrating trust in others. Relationship capital is essential to network collaborations; it is critical when inevitable conflicts arise within a network based on competing perspectives, interests and values and is also key during the formation of a network (Morse, 2010). The literature concludes that trust and leadership are inextricably tied. This conclusion is validated by the empirical evidence gathered in the case study on creating and launching the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI).

The literature review revealed that while there is a large amount of research on trust for cooperation and achieving results within the disciplines of organizational sociology, contract theory, and business administration, there is a serious gap in public administration theory (Edelenbos and Klijn, 2007; Provan and Kenis, 2007). However, Jurian Edelenbos and Erik-Hans Klijn (2007) provide an empirical and theoretical
exploration of the value of trust in cross-sector, shared-power, complex and interdependent relationships. Specifically, they looked at public-private partnerships that are based on the idea of creating mutual added value. Edelenbos and Klijn (2007) conclude that the value of trust is that it makes actions of participants more predictable and enhances the capacity for information exchange and innovation. Trust has value for interorganizational cooperation and mutual commitment, solidifying cooperation (especially within the developing phase of the partnership), and enhancing the performance of cooperation and desired outcomes.

Erik-Hans Klijn followed the 2007 research with a study on the impact of trust on outcomes of governance networks. He found that trust matters to achieve better perceived outcomes and that network management strategies are important to both a high level of trust and desired outcomes within the network. Although Klijn offers that the importance of trust in governance networks within the discipline of public administration is an area for further qualitative and empirical research, his study reinforces the 2007 theoretical link between trust and promoting learning, sharing knowledge and innovation (Klijn et al., 2010). This link is particularly important to the value proposition for VOI, “The Vietnam-Oregon Initiative is a unique cross-sector ‘state’ to ‘country’ relationship that will build on and leverage existing relationships for the mutual benefits of trade enhancement, educational exchange and innovation in governance”.

Kieth Provan and Patrick Kenis (2007) also provide insight into the role of trust in network governance. They make a distinction between three types of networks: Participant-governed, this form is governed by network members themselves; lead organization, where one organization has sufficient resources and legitimacy to play a lead
role; and network administrative organization (NAO) where a separate administrative entity is established to govern the network and its activities. Provan and Kenis argue that trust is a critical component in evaluating network effectiveness. They offer the concept of trust density, meaning that many people in the network trust each other, establishing a web of trust-based ties. They conclude that for the network to succeed the type of network governance must be consistent with the level of trust density across the network as a whole. When trust density is high the shared governance model will be most effective, while lead organization and NAO forms can be effective when there is low-density trust (Provan and Kenis, 2007).

A review of the literature supports that trust is important in cross-cultural relationships within networks such as the type of network created by VOI (Batt and Purchase, 2004; Hitt et al., 2002; Luo, 2002). This is relevant to achieving successful outcomes with VOI. There is recognition that organizations that operate in a network have a competitive advantage in international markets. Hitt et al. (2002) look at trust in the context of social capital, “relationships between individuals and organizations that facilitate action and create value” (p. 354). If trust exists partners have confidence that they will work cooperatively toward common goals for mutual benefit. Social capital implies strong trust. Trust is most critical to performance in the early stages of the organization. Early trust is either based on a prior relationship between the parties or the partner’s reputation and integrity working with other partners; this is a form of social capital (Hitt et al., 2002). The importance of trust in the early stages of forming an organization is supported by the empirical evidence gathered during the creation of VOI.
Yadong Luo (2002) contributes research that validates a contingency view of the trust-performance link in international strategic alliances (ISAs), typically private sector or public-private arrangements. The contingency view is based mainly on the dynamic nature of trust and that ISAs are long-term ongoing collaborations. Luo’s study examines the circumstances under which the positive link between trust and ISA performance becomes stronger or weaker, helping to understand where or when trust becomes critical. The study found that “the positive relationship between trust and performance (sales per asset and return on investment) will be stronger when market uncertainty is higher, resource interdependency is stronger, risk sharing is more commensurate, or reciprocal commitment is greater” (p. 689). Other key findings include: a positive link between trust and profitability is strongest in young alliances; interpersonal and interorganizational trust are distinct yet both are important and contribute more to performance in younger ISAs, an uncertain market, and high reciprocal commitment; and geographic distance does not negatively impact developing trust, although it does impede trust building (Luo, 2002).

With respect to leadership in cross-cultural relationships there is conflicting literature. Connelly (2007) notes that the study of cross-national issues related to culture and leadership found that “no conclusive evidence has emerged to suggest that systematic differences or similarities can be found among different cultures in relationship to leadership patterns” (p. 1246). However, a study conducted on global leadership traits concluded that attributes associated with transformational leadership are universally endorsed, including being trustworthy (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Trust as it relates to cross-cultural leadership is an area for further research, particularly in the context of a Public Value Network.
“State” to “Country” Public Value Network

The final section of the literature review examines a “state” to “country” Public Value Network (PVN). There is a paucity of information on the subject. A review of the literature reveals that a “state” to “country” PVN is possibly unique. Chris Huxham (2003) offers that:

“A characteristic of research in inter-organizational collaboration is the wide variety of disciplines, research paradigms, theoretical perspectives and sectoral focuses from which the subject is tackled. Even the most basic terminology is subject to varied interpretations and there seems to be little agreement over usage of terms such as ‘partnership’, ‘alliance’, ‘collaboration’, ‘network’ or ‘inter-organizational relations’. A further characteristic of the field is that there appears to be little mutual recognition of research across disciplines and paradigms, so there tends to be little overlap in the articles that are cited in reference lists” (p. 402).

A review of the literature yielded examples of formal and informal inter-organization collaborations ranging from private sector international alliances that were primarily economically and market-driven, to memorandum of understanding arrangements between states and provinces in other countries for purposes such as exchanging knowledge, promoting trade and developing goodwill. Although to varying degrees these collaborations shared traits in common with the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) such as interconnected and interdependent relationships spanning multiple sector, cultural and international boundaries, shared-power dynamics, economic and social dimensions, established trust, challenges that demand adaptive leadership styles, co-produced value creation, and a desire for learning, sharing knowledge and innovation—
no one framework met all of the criteria needed to create VOI (Batt, 2004; Brown, 2013; Clarke, 2011; Hitt et al., 2002). The research indicates that VOI appears to be a unique “state” to “country”, cross-sector collaborative network.

Methodology & Data Collection

Overview

The methodology for this research is an exploratory case study that draws on both theory and practice to test the literature against creating the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI). The research question is “Can the Public Value Network approach be used to rapidly design and launch a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam?” Specifically, the case study explores whether the Public Value Network (PVN) approach can be used to create a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network. The case study explores the benefits and limitations of the PVN approach. The case study was completed over a six month period of time and focuses on the short-term creation of the VOI.

The purpose of this research is to evaluate how the literature applies to the exploratory case study: how the creation of the network changed and evolved in the first six months; what worked and what didn’t with the PVN approach to creating a network; where there are gaps between the PVN approach and what is needed to create a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network; and areas for additional research.

Research Method

A case study is a qualitative research method using interviews and gathering data to document research and observations that is then interpreted by the researcher rather than counted (Stoecker, 2013). The case study was completed over a six month period of time
and focuses on the short-term creation of VOI culminating in its launch in Oregon on May 5, 2014. The literature review was accompanied by data collection, evaluation and analysis.

For this case study the author sought to examine the efficacy of the DeSeve PVN framework as a model to rapidly establish a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network. This was accomplished through a review of the literature which identified nine Critical Elements that indicate the success of a PVN (DeSeve, 2007, p. 212) and eight types of PVNs (DeSeve, 2007, p. 213). The Critical Elements are not listed in order of importance or weighted, with the exception of noting that according to DeSeve (2007), “The role of leadership is described as the Critical Element that must orchestrate all of the other elements “(p. 209).

The following charts identify the eight Typologies (DeSeve, 2007, p. 212) and nine Critical Elements (DeSeve, 2007, p. 213):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Value Network (PVN) Typologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Communities of Shared Mission (COCM): “A networked collection of actors from the public, private, nonprofit, and/or civic sectors working to achieve a common purpose.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Communities of Shared Practice (COSP): Groups of individuals organized around common interests or expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Issue Response Networks (IRN): An example is the Laboratory Response Network of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention whose mission is to “respond quickly to acts of chemical or biological terrorism, emerging infectious diseases, and other public health threats and emergencies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Strategic Alliances: “Strategic alliances can have a variety of mandates. They can be designed to work at the operational (program delivery) level; to conduct a major research program that requires the resources, information, and expertise of more than one group; and/or to function at the advocacy (public relations) level...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Joined-Up Government: “…ensure that relevant citizen’s services are better coordinated (joined up). Somebody with a problem should not have to visit or telephone several government offices to find a solution...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Service Integration: “Promote coordinated responses to persons most at risk.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) Customer/Vendor: An example is the United Space Alliance (USA) whose mission is to manage and conduct “space operations work involving the operation and maintenance of multi-purpose space systems.”

8) Intraorganizational: Involves the use of Managed Networks within an organization, but including suppliers as a Critical Element in planning and execution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Value Network (PVN) Critical Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)   Networked Structure: Nodes and links that are joined together to represent the physical elements of the PVN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)   Commitment to a Common Purpose: Reason for the PVN to exist; caring or commitment to achieving positive results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)   Trust among the Participants: Based on either professional or “social” relationships, the participants believe that they can rely on the information or effort of others in the network to achieve the common purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4)   Governance:  
  - *Boundary and Exclusivity*- Some definition of who is and who is not a member.  
  - *Rules*- Some limits on community member behavior, with a threat of ejection for misbehavior.  
  - *Self-determination*- The freedom to decide how the PVN will be operated and who will be admitted to membership.  
  - *Network Management*- Resolution of disputes, allocation of resources, quality control, and organizational maintenance. |
| 5)   Access to Authority: The availability of definitive standard-setting procedures that are broadly accepted. |
| 6)   Leadership: Individuals or groups willing to serve as a “champion” for the PVN and guide its work toward results. |
| 7)   Distributive Accountability/Responsibility: Sharing the governance and some decision making across members of the PVN and thus the responsibility for achieving desired results. |
| 8)   Information Sharing: Easy access for members, privacy protection, and restricted access for non-members if appropriate. |
| 9)   Access to Resources: Availability of financial, technical, human, and other resources needed to meet the objectives of the PVN. |
A leadership team at Portland State University (PSU), within the Center or Public Service, was assembled in December of 2013 to explore the concept of creating VOI. The leadership team identified a list of potential Oregon and Vietnam participants in the network.

Sample

Potential network participants were identified based on existing relationships. Possible participants included a broad array of representatives across government, business, academic, military, non-profit and civic sectors in Oregon and Vietnam.

Data Collection

The Portland State University (PSU) leadership team began informal conversations in January of 2014 to assess the level of potential network participant interest in creating a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam. The concept of a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam was refined through these informal conversations.

The literature on PVNs included a summary of three case studies and a tool used to evaluate their success (DeSeve, 2007, p. 214). Based on limited information about the tool, the author created a questionnaire to evaluate the application of the nine Critical Elements to the creation of a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam (Appendix A).

The questionnaire was presented through individual and small group interviews with potential network participants in both Oregon and Vietnam, representing government, business, academic and military sectors to gather data on the relevance of the nine Critical Elements to the creation of a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam. In Oregon half a dozen interviews were held between January and April of 2014.
In February of 2014, members of the PSU leadership team traveled to Vietnam. During their visit they interviewed over 20 high level leaders.

The questionnaire was also used by the author in January and March to assess how the nine Critical Elements were informing the creation of VOI. The PSU leadership team met on a regular basis to continue to assess and refine the basis for creating and launching the network. The data gathered through the interviews and questionnaire was used to assess the viability of moving forward with a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam.

On May 5, 2014, PSU along with Oregon Congressman Earl Blumenauer convened a meeting of potential network participants in Oregon to launch what is now known as the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative. Potential network members represented government, business, academic and military sectors (Appendix B). Data was gathered during the convening of Oregon participants and analyzed. Building on the assessment in January and March, the author used the data to assess progress toward the existence of DeSeve’s nine Critical Elements. This author’s research question was specific to the creation and launch of VOI; the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations are based on the data gathered over a six month period between December 2013 and May 2014.

**Limitations of the Research**

Seven significant limitations of the research were identified:

1) **Oregon Focus**

With the exception of conversations with leaders in Vietnam in February of 2014 to administer the DeSeve questionnaire and assess the level of interest in pursuing a collaborative network, the practice of the study and the May 5, 2014 Vietnam-Oregon
Initiative (VOI) launch was limited to Oregon participants. Long-term success of the initiative will require full participation with Vietnam.

2) Geographic Distance

The “state” to “country” nature of the network, coupled with the critical importance of face to face interaction presents a logistical challenge. Advancements in real-time communications technology can help to mitigate this limitation but will not be a replacement for the mutual benefit gained from educational and professional exchanges between network members in Oregon and Vietnam. A review of the literature supports the need for two-way information exchange and offering opportunities to develop cross-sector and cross-cultural competencies in networks that span international boundaries. Crosby (2010) offers that “The complexity of the world points to the need for leaders to be continual learners, about themselves, about new information and communications technologies, about the systems in which particular public problems are embedded, and about the sectors, cultures, and parts of the world with which they are unfamiliar” (p. 573).

3) Initial Leadership Team PSU Centric

PSU served as the initial convener for VOI. Although the literature supports that as an academic institution, PSU played an important role by having access to expertise outside of government agencies and the neutrality to propose evidence-based ideas (Crosby et al., 2010). Careful attention was paid to ensure that other academic institutions in Oregon were invited to participate so that they would be equally invested in the shared vision and outcomes of VOI.
4) No Initial Survey of Potential Oregon Participants

Ideally, the assessment of potential participants to invite to join the network would have included a survey to fully explore and map existing relationships between Oregon and Vietnam across the government, business, academic, military, non-profit and civic sectors to ensure that no potential participants were overlooked. The lack of an initial survey may be mitigated by a request made of participants at the VOI launch meeting to identify additional potential participants and a commitment to encouraging continued engagement and growing the network.

5) Lack of Non-profit and Civic Sector Participants

Although non-profit and civic sectors were not represented in the initial gathering of network participants in Oregon, feedback, specifically from the interviews with potential Vietnam participants, did not indicate a desire to include non-profit and civic sector participants, at least in the initial stages of developing the network. It is unclear whether this will be a limitation on the future success of the initiative.

6) Rapid Design and Launch of VOI

Due to nature of the project there was a limited time frame to complete the research. As the concept of VOI evolved, simultaneously so did the literature review, questionnaire and interviews which informed the initial design of the network. There was a continual tension to find the right balance between theory and practice.

7) Limitation of DeSeve Questionnaire and Assessment Tool

There was little information in the literature about the tool DeSeve used to evaluate a PVN. The author contacted Edward DeSeve by email to gain additional information about his survey and assessment tool but did not receive a response.
Analysis & Case Study Findings

Case Study Findings

Summary of Case Study Findings

The following summarizes the findings when DeSeve's Nine Critical Elements of a Public Value Network (PVN) were applied at the beginning, middle and end of the case study between December of 2013 and May of 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DeSeve Nine Critical Elements</th>
<th>December 2013</th>
<th>February 2014</th>
<th>May 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Commitment to a Common Vision</td>
<td>Beginning to develop provisional value proposition.</td>
<td>Provisional value proposition identified.</td>
<td>Provisional value proposition validated in Oregon with plans to validate in Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Trust among the Participants</td>
<td>High level of interpersonal and professional trust is foundation for developing network.</td>
<td>High level of interpersonal and professional trust exists and is validated separately in Oregon and Vietnam.</td>
<td>High level of interpersonal and professional trust exists between Oregon and Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Governance</td>
<td>No formal governance structure.</td>
<td>No formal governance structure.</td>
<td>Commitment from Oregon participants to form executive steering committee to develop governance structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Distributive Accountability</td>
<td>PSU leadership team.</td>
<td>Conceptual discussions with potential participants in Oregon and Vietnam.</td>
<td>Commitment from Oregon participants to form executive steering committee to develop governance structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Information Sharing</td>
<td>PSU leadership team.</td>
<td>Informal two-way conversations between PSU leadership team and potential participants in Oregon and Vietnam.</td>
<td>Formal conversation amongst Oregon participants and validation of preliminary value proposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Access to Resources</td>
<td>PSU leadership team.</td>
<td>Informal commitment from potential participants in Oregon and Vietnam to contribute resources.</td>
<td>Commitment from Oregon participants to form executive steering committee to identify resources for the network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PVN Assessment Tool**

VOI encompasses three Typologies identified by DeSeve—Communities of Shared Mission, Communities of Shared Practice and Strategic Alliance. Using DeSeve’s tool to assess the success of a PVN, a post-launch assessment of VOI shows the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of PVN</th>
<th>Communities of Shared Mission, Communities of Shared Practice; and Strategic Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tightness</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear purpose</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary and exclusivity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed accountability/responsibility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*provisional

It is unclear whether VOI would be considered successful using DeSeve’s assessment tool. In the three case studies DeSeve used to illustrate successful PVNs, the only four elements that the studies shared in common were clear purpose (Yes), leadership (Effective), distributed accountability/responsibility (Yes), and network management (Yes or Shared). At the time of launching VOI, the assessment shows that there is a provisional clear purpose. Although a value proposition was validated in Oregon, it has not yet been fully vetted with Vietnam. There is effective leadership and identified champions, and a rudimentary level of network management for VOI. Although there was a commitment made during the VOI launch meeting to form an executive steering committee to build a more formalized governance structure to look at accountability/responsibility and ongoing resources to support the initiative, organizing is just in the beginning phase.
Convening Coalitions Tool

DeSeve puts forward his nine Critical Elements as a “roadmap” for “creating a Managed Network to produce public value” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 209). The author found that while there is potential value in the approach for governing a network, it was not sufficient to convene stakeholders to build the network. To supplement DeSeve’s approach, the author used the Convening Coalitions Tool, part of the EMERGE framework. The tool “assists the Leadership Team to develop and facilitate a network of people and organizations, i.e. stakeholders, outside the leadership team to assist with implementing the leadership solution” (Convening Coalitions Tool, p. 1). Unlike the traditional approach to convening stakeholders to address an immediate crisis, the Convening Coalition Tool lends itself to challenges of a visionary nature. It is a three step approach to convening a coalition:

1. Identification

   In December 2013, the PSU leadership team identified stakeholders across sectors in Oregon and Vietnam. Between December of 2013 and April of 2014 data gathered through interviews and the DeSeve questionnaire in Oregon and Vietnam informed the list of participants who were invited to a meeting to launch VOI in Oregon on May 5, 2014. Specifically, the data gathered encouraged a focus on inviting participants who had an existing connection with Vietnam and would potentially be interested in the concept of VOI because of this existing relationship, not initially for economic gain.

2. Build Capacity

   From December 2013 to April 2014 the PSU leadership team met with stakeholders individually and in groups in Oregon and Vietnam, to listen to their thoughts and vision on
what value VOI could provide to them and their organization, and incorporated that into an evolving value proposition for VOI. The literature supports that this was critical in the early phase of creating the network: visionary leaders gather information, promote problem frames that can appeal to stakeholders to set direction; and create a vision of a better future (Crosby and Bryson, 2005).

Also important in the early phase was the personal leadership of sponsors and champions to send a signal to stakeholders that the change effort can be successful and sustained. Sponsors and champions are critical to collaboration; sponsors typically hold formal leadership positions and contribute authority and resources, while champions rely on informal authority to bring energy and networking skills to the collaboration (Crosby and Bryson, 2005). Each stakeholder was considered a potential member of the future leadership team to serve as a champion for VOI. Because the stakeholders were individuals who had an existing connection with and interest in Vietnam, less focus was given to motivating stakeholders to participate in VOI.

3. Stakeholder Groups Convened

On May 5, 2014, along with Oregon Congressman Earl Blumenauer, the PSU leadership team convened stakeholders in Oregon to validate the value proposition. The May 5th launch meeting was used to identify a self-identified executive leadership team to continue to build capacity for VOI moving forward and convene stakeholders in Vietnam.

The Convening Coalitions Tool was adapted for VOI. The PSU leadership team acted as a collective leader rather than the leader-follower model. This style of collective leadership is intended to be a model for VOI, a central concept for leading in a network mindset where “Adaptive change requires...moving from working alone to working in
highly connected ways...leaders who are willing to share ideas, information and contacts with one another and who are able to weave networks that are more agile at forming and re-forming themselves in response to changing environments” (Meehan and Reinelt, 2012, p. 7).

*Convening Coalition Tool As Applied to VOI*

The PSU Leadership Team is at the Center, reaching out to cross-sector stakeholders in Vietnam and Oregon. By serving as a collective leader, the team provided an environment to allow momentum to gather for VOI (DePree, 1989). Figure 2 illustrates the initial application of the Convening Coalitions Tool to facilitate a dialogue and develop a provisional value proposition for VOI.

**Figure 2.**

![Diagram of Oregon and Vietnam](image)

*Future Vision for VOI*

Figure 3 illustrates a vision for the future state of VOI. This is adapted from John Benington’s theory that recognizes the multi-dimensional value creation of networked
governance—horizontal, vertical and diagonal amongst sectors, cultures and geographic boundaries to achieve mutual benefit within Oregon and Vietnam in a unique “state” to “country” network (Benington and Moore, 2011):

Figure 3.

Analysis
The launch of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) on May 5, 2014 in Oregon marked the end of the creation phase of the network. The launch meeting was intentionally designed for leaders to engage in a discussion to facilitate shared understanding and commit to agreed-upon actions. It was a boundary experience; the activity of convening created a sense of community that transcended organizational, cultural and sector boundaries (Crosby et al., 2010). The agenda for the launch meeting (Appendix C) was intentionally designed to build trust by learning about each other, openly and honestly sharing information, and specifically important to VOI, understanding the cultural context
of the network. The literature supports that these steps are critical to cultivating and maintaining commitment from all participants (Connelly, 2007).

The focus of the research question is “Can the Public Value Network approach be used to rapidly design and launch a Vietnam-Oregon Initiative?” Specifically, the case study explores whether the Public Value Network (PVN) approach can be used to create a cross-sector, “state” to “country” network.

DeSeve acknowledges that “governing by network represents a fundamental transformation in how governments fulfill policy goals and deliver services” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 208). He offers his Typology as a framework and nine Critical Elements as a “roadmap” for governing a networked state to explore the creation of a Managed Network to produce public value (DeSeve, 2007). From the analysis of interviews and responses to the questionnaire, there was a high level of alignment with DeSeve’s nine Critical Elements for creating a successful PVN. One area of alignment that VOI may want to revisit is the lack of participation from the non-profit and civic sectors. Although it came up peripherally in the interviews, there was not urgency in Oregon or Vietnam to seek additional participation from these sectors.

The lack of non-profit and civic representation in VOI raises questions around the efficacy of using the PVN approach to create VOI. Each of DeSeve’s Typologies that are relevant to the creation of VOI (Communities of Shared Mission, Communities of Shared Practice, and Strategic Alliances) envision some level of participation from the non-profit or civic sectors (DeSeve, 2007). DeSeve states that, “Qwest for public value should be the central organizing principle of the government” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 210). An outstanding
question is whether the lack of direct engagement by the public or non-profit organizations will affect the measure of public value VOI can offer.

Even if government serves as a representative of the collective public voice, it is unclear whether other sectors can be held to the same standard for seeking public value. DeSeve notes that, “Further research is needed to determine if the Typology presented here is both comprehensive and valuable and if the Critical Elements described are essential to each type of network” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 217). The author suggests that while there is not enough evidence to establish whether VOI will be sustainable and successful in the long-term, VOI was created without a significant level of engagement from the public or non-profit sectors. This may provide evidence to support an additional Typology for a PVN.

Another premise discussed by DeSeve that is challenged by the creation and successful launch of VOI is DeSeve’s view that “Managed Networks are not designed to replace hierarchies. Rather they are to assist hierarchies in linking resources with other entities in solving a problem, delivering a service, communicating information, or setting standards” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 217). The author questions whether DeSeve puts form, the structure of the network before function, in the case of VOI, the vision. VOI was created and launched without a formal governance structure and the network may have the potential to achieve much more than the narrow scope of possibilities identified by DeSeve.

His rationale of the complementary nature of hierarchies and networks is illustrated in Figure 4 by the work of David Snowden and Mary Boone whose focus is developing a framework for how leaders make decisions grounded in the complexity and context of the situation (Snowden and Boone, 2007). Figure 4 image (Ingle and Shinn, 2014):
The world is changing rapidly, becoming more complex; VOI is an opportunity for Vietnam and Oregon to find new ways to deal with challenges. Snowden and Boone offer that understanding complexity can “help current and future leaders make sense of advanced technology, globalization, intricate markets, cultural change and much more” (Snowden and Boone, 2007). Snowden and Boone’s work depicts that where complex situations exist, there is a nexus between loose hierarchies and strong networks. From an organizational perspective, this is also where emergent practice can be achieved. The literature supports that the nature of the emerging complex global challenges that lie ahead for VOI require the network to go beyond good practice or even best practice to become an early adopter for emerging practice—innovation in governance, trade, education and sustainable development (Yip et al., 2009).

As defined by DeSeve, a Public Value Network is “an integrated system of relationships that is managed across formal and informal organizational boundaries and sectors with recognized organizational principles and a clear definition of success in terms
of Public Value realized” (DeSeve, 2007, p. 211). While the majority of the nine Critical Elements that DeSeve identifies for success are present, if all of the criteria are not met, it is unclear whether VOI can be considered a PVN.

It is important to note that DeSeve does not include all nine Critical Elements in the tool to evaluate the success of a PVN. Missing from the criteria are: networked structure; trust; rules; information sharing; and access to resources. From the literature review and empirical evidence gathered in the case study, the most critical of the elements missing to evaluate VOI as a PVN is trust. The author proposes that trust was as essential a Critical Element as leadership to creating and launching VOI. The lack of attention to trust uncovers a potential weakness in DeSeve’s methodology as it relates to cross-cultural PVNs, particularly assessing the importance of existing levels of trust within a PVN.

The questionnaire developed by the author asked the question, “Does a level of trust exist between Vietnam and Oregon to create the initiative? The data based on conversations with potential network participants in Vietnam indicated that it was not culturally appropriate to ask whether trust exists because that assumes there is not trust to begin with. The individuals on the PSU leadership team who administered the questionnaire reframed the DeSeve question to focus on identifying strong relationships. Perhaps the DeSeve element should be reframed to seek to identify where strong relationships exist, as strong relationships assume that trust exists and are a measure of trust. At a minimum the DeSeve frame did not sufficiently fit the needed cross-cultural or “state” to “country” application for VOI.

One of the themes that emerged from the qualitative research was to focus and strategically build on strengths. The greatest strength that was consistently identified
in both Oregon and Vietnam was the established trusting relationships. These relationships add legitimacy to VOI. The results of the data both in Oregon and Vietnam affirmed that existing relationships between Oregon and Vietnam are exceedingly strong. The author credits this in large part to the leadership team at PSU.

Since 2003, the Center for Public Service at PSU has been actively engaged in developing a relationship with Vietnam. PSU is building long-term partnerships with Vietnam through the Ho Chi Minh National Academy for Politics and Public Administration, Intel Vietnam Scholars Program, U.S. State Department and cultural exchange and learning initiatives between PSU and high level political leaders in Vietnam. PSU’s team is led by Dr. Marcus Ingle who has spent over 50 years working in and cultivating relationships in Vietnam and Dr. Huan Dang. Over the last five years Dr. Huan Dang, a native of Vietnam, completed his PhD at Portland State University. Dr. Ingle and Dr. Huan have a high level of trust and credibility in Vietnam and bring institutional history, knowledge and strong long-term relationships based on trust to VOI.

In Oregon, the importance of a high level of trust was emphasized by the contributions of Phil Keisling, the Director of the Center for Public Service at PSU. Mr. Keisling has a distinguished track record in the private sector and serving in the public sector both as a state legislator and former Secretary of State. Mr. Keisling’s established trusted relationships were essential to bringing high level leaders in Oregon across government, business, academic and military sectors together to launch VOI. Barringer and Harrison offer that “Current connections through systems other than the proposed collaborative group provide a foundation for the communication,
trust, and sharing that will be crucial to building a successful collaboration” (as cited by Connelly, 2007, p. 1251). The literature review on the value of trust is supported by empirical evidence, data collected from interviews and the questionnaire both in Oregon and Vietnam, which provided key guidance for the creation and launch of VOI.

Other common themes that emerged in the data collected through interviews and the questionnaire were: a desire to continue professional and cultural exchanges; an interest in enhancing trade; opportunities to share and create knowledge; innovative governance practices; and a “green focus” with an emphasis on sustainability and urban planning.

The empirical evidence and review of the literature support that the visionary leadership of the PSU team was vital to the creation and launch of VOI. As visionary leaders, they recognized that VOI is broader than PSU and that the value of the network increases with participation. PSU served as the convener for VOI, to connect network members with access to existing trust-based relationships with high level decision makers in Vietnam and Oregon, to lend legitimacy to VOI for the common good of the collective network. The literature supports that as an academic institution, PSU played an important role by having access to expertise outside of government agencies and the neutrality to propose evidence-based ideas (Crosby et al., 2010).

**Additional Research**

The findings and analysis identify three opportunities for additional research:

1. **Additional Public Value Network (PVN) Typologies**

   There are multiple potential weaknesses in the application of existing PVN Typologies to the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI). One is the role of urgency in the
successful creation of a PVN. When there is no immediate crisis, it is unclear whether the PVN approach is effective for rapidly designing a network. A new Typology should also be explored to address absent cultural and “state” to “country” dimensions. Key to this research is whether the role of trust has greater significance in the context of cultural competency as it exists within a “state” to “country” network.

Finally, a PVN has constraints based on its tie to hierarchical bureaucracies that are policy driven and funded by public resources that mandate outcomes based on providing goods and services for the common good. Not all actors within a cross-sector PVN have the same level of accountability to the public. Further research should explore whether there is a new network governance typology other than a PVN that is more suited to further goals of shared learning, innovation and knowledge creation.

2. **Unique Nature of a “State” to “Country” Network**

   While the literature revealed that a “state” to “country” network is possibly unique, further research should continue to explore whether the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) is a unique network. If VOI is a unique “state” to “country” network, the value of expanding the model beyond Oregon and Vietnam should be assessed.

3. **Meaning of Public Value as it Relates to Cultural Dimensions**

   Additional research is needed to explore whether there are fundamental differences between democratic and socialist republic governance models and core cultural dimensions that could limit the success of VOI. This research should also examine the meaning of “public value” between democratic and socialist republic regimes.
Conclusions & Recommendations

Conclusions

In evaluating the research question “Can the Public Value Network approach be used to rapidly design and launch a collaborative network between Oregon and Vietnam?” The first conclusion is that the DeSeve Public Value Network (PVN) approach provides promise to rapidly design and launch a network. While it is unclear whether the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) meets the criteria for success established by DeSeve, the author offers that enough of DeSeve’s nine Critical Elements were met to conclude that the design and launch of VOI was a success. It is too soon to tell whether the practice of the network will be successful and sustainable in the long-term.

DeSeve’s states that, “The role of leadership is described as the Critical Element that must orchestrate all of the other elements “(DeSeve, 2007, p. 209). Although it is clear from the literature review that leadership is essential to establishing a successful network, a second conclusion is that in the context of the network that was launched between Oregon and Vietnam, the analysis proves that established relationships of trust was equally critical to rapidly designing and launching VOI. It is unclear how the framework as a whole influenced the short-term success of VOI. DeSeve’s PVN framework is strongest in the areas of using the nine Critical Elements as a tool for assessing the progress of establishing the network. Although the PVN approach alone was not sufficient to convene stakeholders and needed to be supplemented with the Convening Coalitions Tool, it may have greater application to govern the network in the long-term.

The final conclusion is that the DeSeve PVN approach has limitations. The most significant limitation of the DeSeve approach is lack of a cultural or “state” to “country”
dimension. The PVN approach would be healthier if it took into consideration cultural dimensions, and the role that existing relationships of trust play in effective leadership.

**Recommendations**

**Sustaining the Network**

For VOI, the creation and launch are just the beginning of the journey, not the destination. Moving forward the newly created self-identified executive steering committee must establish a governance structure, ways to share information and a plan to secure resources to support the network. Stemming from the common boundary experience of the launch meeting that cultivated a shared vision and commitment to the network, the self-identified executive steering committee will be an important new boundary group to help lead and govern VOI (Crosby, 2010).

Although it will likely look different than the meeting that was convened in Oregon to launch VOI, the literature and empirical data support that for the network to be successful in the long-term, outreach needs to happen with the Vietnam side of the network to validate the provisional value proposition and establish a core team of Vietnamese champions to ensure that the network continues to move forward. This will require regular updates and communication between Oregon and Vietnam network members. While this will be a logistical challenge because of the distance between Oregon and Vietnam, there are innovative technology options available that the network can explore.

However, technology should not be substituted for continued professional and personal exchanges between Vietnam and Oregon. The data in the case study and literature confirms that continuing to build and cultivate relationships through these face-to-face exchanges is essential to the long-term success of VOI (Crosby, 2010). In addition to
exchanges of high level officials, data in the questionnaire and VOI launch meeting validated that continued investment should be made in student internship exchanges between Vietnam and Oregon. The network should explore formalizing a relationship with the alumni of these exchanges to serve as a resource and support the long-term sustainability of the initiative.

**Create New Knowledge to Become a Catalyst for Innovation and Learning**

Problems cannot be solved or meet the global challenges of an ever-changing world that is becoming increasingly more complex, interconnected and interdependent with old knowledge (Weber and Kademian, 2008). VOI must focus on the need to create new knowledge and become a catalyst for innovation and learning. An initial review of the literature on learning organizations, innovation and knowledge revealed that there is a high level of potential for VOI to mutually benefit Oregon and Vietnam. The literature shows a key link between innovation and networks of learning. By producing knowledge creation, which can potentially result in knowledge capital, it can yield many benefits that range from: personal to collective gains; tangible and intangible assets; and support for innovation and shared learning (Wenger et al., 2011).

The literature also identified that from a knowledge-based view that assumes an important role of organizations is to create, store and apply knowledge, collaboration is seen as the primary mechanism for organizations to be integrators of knowledge so that they can share this specialized and unique knowledge (Connelly, 2007). Additional literature review on knowledge creation and sustaining networks and coalitions is needed to inform the future of VOI.
**VOI as Praxis for EMERGE Framework**

VOI has the potential to bridge the gap between theory and practice to more fully explore application of the EMERGE framework. The EMERGE Leadership Opportunity Selection Tool may be a useful exercise for core Oregon and Vietnam network members to take the next step toward creating a shared vision for the initiative. Moving beyond the provisional value proposition to co-creating a shared vision is essential so that all network members in Oregon and Vietnam feel ownership of the vision.

The literature supports that members must feel ownership so that they are motivated to realize the vision. This is based on Fredrick Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (Rainey, 2009). The basis for the shared vision should validate and build on the provisional value proposition so that the network can become a catalyst for innovation, learning and knowledge creation.
Appendices

Appendix A: DeSeve Public Value Questionnaire

*Note: the original questionnaire utilized by DeSeve to evaluate his case studies (DeSeve, 2007) was not available, the following questionnaire was developed to fit the needs of assessing the creation of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative.

DeSeve Public Value Network Questionnaire:
Assessing the Creation of a Vietnam-Oregon Initiative

February, 2014

Introduction:
The world is changing rapidly, becoming more complex; Vietnam and Oregon must find new ways to deal with challenges confronting our citizens and communities. To meet these challenges, there is a compelling need for innovation, leadership development and cross-cultural learning between Vietnam and Oregon. A Vietnam-Oregon Initiative (VOI) is a concept that can build on the strengths of existing relationships to create a collaborative network to accelerate innovation, expand the capacity for trade and economic development and foster learning opportunities.

In Vietnam, these challenges include:
- A slowdown in economic growth;
- Urban livability is decreasing from issues such as traffic, pollution and the unavailability of food; and
- Vietnam is losing its competitive position to China and other Asian countries.

In Oregon, challenges include:
- A need for job creation and economic development;
- Non-recognition that to enhance and sustain the quality of life in Oregon, there needs to be an honest assessment of how we as a collective can innovate to do things better; and
- Limited understanding of how Oregon can benefit from other cultures.
A VOI shared vision for the future would meet these challenges.

In Vietnam:
- Select cities would learn from urban planning and sustainability practices in Oregon to implement changes in their communities.
- Vietnam would have a policy paradigm shift toward giving more priority to social and environmental factors vs. economic benefit.
- New initiatives in government and business that reflect innovations in learning from Oregon.

In Oregon:
- Job growth through trade with Vietnam in prioritized sectors.
- Collective decision-making in organizations based on experience gained by working with and learning from Vietnam.
- Individuals influencing organizations based on their experience with the network and cross-cultural learning from Vietnam.

The pathway to meet these challenges and achieve our shared vision is to align Vietnam and Oregon by building the VOI network. VOI can benefit all who are part of the network by establishing a long-term partnership to co-create solutions based on innovation, learning and leadership.

Edward DeSeve has identified nine Critical Elements to establishing a successful Public Value Network (PVN). The following questionnaire poses questions to assess the relevance of the DeSeve model to creating a Vietnam-Oregon Initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DeSeve Nine Critical Elements</th>
<th>Name of Organization or Individual</th>
<th>Follow-up/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Networked Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) What sectors (i.e. government, business, academic, non-profit, civic) should be a part of the network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) What specific agencies, organizations or individuals should be a part of the network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are there sectors, agencies, organizations or individuals who should not be included in the network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Would you, your agency or organization participate in the network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Commitment to a Common Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Is there a common vision for the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Is there a pressing challenge that you or your organization is concerned about that you would be willing to volunteer your time and social network to address?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) What is your vision for the Initiative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) How can you personally and professionally benefit from the network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) How can your agency or organization benefit from the network?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Trust among the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Does a level of trust exist between Vietnam and Oregon to create the Initiative? If yes, how was trust created?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) What is the level of trust between your agency or organization and Vietnam-Oregon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the level of trust in the relationship vary depending on the sector? If so, how does it vary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Is trust based on a personal or professional relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) What can be done to improve the level of trust in the relationship between Vietnam and Oregon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Is there a governance structure for the network?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Should the network structure be formal or informal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) What are your ideas for how the network should be operated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Who should determine membership in the network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Access to Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Is formal approval needed to create the Initiative? If so, where would the approval come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) What can bring in the legitimacy for the existence of this network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Is approval needed for you, your agency or organization to participate in the network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Is there a decision-making process for the network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) How do you envision the decision-making process for the network?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Leadership</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Are there champions for the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) What do you think are important qualities in a leader to be a champion for the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Will you be a champion for the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Are there individuals, agencies or organizations that you would recommend to be a champion for the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Distributive Accountability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) How should responsibility for governing the network be shared between Vietnam and Oregon?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) How will outcomes and goals be identified for the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Who will be responsible for achieving identified outcomes and goals for the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) How will the success of the Initiative be measured?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Information Sharing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Is information about creating the Initiative being shared between Vietnam and Oregon?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) What do you think is the easiest way to share information?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Is there a need for privacy protection for the information being shared between Vietnam and Oregon? If so, what types of information should be protected?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Access to Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) What resources (financial, technical, human, etc.) exist to support the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) What resources are needed to support the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) What resources can you, your agency or organization contribute to supporting the Initiative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: May 5, 2014 VOI Oregon Launch—Invited Participants

### List of Invited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Allen</td>
<td>PSU, Institute for Sustainable Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Blumenauer</td>
<td>U.S. Representative, Oregon District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkeen Boerger</td>
<td>CerSource Technology Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bradford</td>
<td>Columbia Sportswear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Brown</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Coba</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Crosby</td>
<td>Oregon National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huan Dang</td>
<td>PSU, Center for Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Dusschee</td>
<td>PSU, Graduate Business Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Eiland</td>
<td>Intel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Evans</td>
<td>Schwabe Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Everett</td>
<td>PSU, Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Fischer</td>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Fegue</td>
<td>PSU, Executive MPA Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gallup</td>
<td>PSU, Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Godlin</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Hales</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Hales</td>
<td>PSU, First Stop Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Hokanson</td>
<td>Adjutant General, State of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Hornowitz</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Horack</td>
<td>Urban Greenspaces Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hughes</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Inneson</td>
<td>NW Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Ingle</td>
<td>PSU, Center for Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoZEll Johnson</td>
<td>Intel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Keising</td>
<td>PSU, Center for Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Kulongsaki</td>
<td>Oregon Former Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Marshall</td>
<td>PSU, Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McArthur</td>
<td>Association of Oregon Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Mickelson</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Mulvihill</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Niekison</td>
<td>Growth-Link Overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Owens</td>
<td>Cogan Owens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Pierce</td>
<td>CerSource Technology Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Pozzi</td>
<td>Congressman Earl Blumenauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Predon</td>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Reardon</td>
<td>Eastern International University Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Reddick</td>
<td>V3 Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ripper</td>
<td>Oregon Health Sciences University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Robertson</td>
<td>Runckel &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Runckel</td>
<td>Russell Development Company, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Russell</td>
<td>Scanlan Kemper Bard Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dob Scalfus</td>
<td>Saboosasaang Business Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samun Smith</td>
<td>SERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongjong Su</td>
<td>PSU, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Tammen</td>
<td>PSU, Mark Hatfield School of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Trummer</td>
<td>Business Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Tymchuk</td>
<td>Oregon Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Va</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Weller</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Wiegel</td>
<td>PSU, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Woodling</td>
<td>Veritas Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wyatt</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Yoshikawa</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: May 5, 2014 VOI Oregon Launch—Meeting Agenda

Inaugural Meeting of the Vietnam-Oregon Initiative

Monday, May 5, 2014

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Urban Center Building - 7th Floor Board Room
Portland State University
510 SW Mill St, Portland, OR 97201

AGENDA

1:30 p.m.  Convene Meeting & Introductions

Phil Keisling, Director
Center for Public Service,
Portland State University

1) Congressman Earl Blumenauer
Congressman Blumenauer,
U.S. Representative, Oregon
District 3

2) Refine and Shape the Value Proposition
Facilitated by Dr. Marcus Ingle, Dr. Huan Dang
and Andrea Fogue

- What are your current organizational engagements or opportunities related to Vietnam?

- Validating the value proposition: Where is there excitement around deepening the relationships that we already have to take full advantage of our mutual opportunities? What possibilities can we collectively imagine and work towards?

- What do we need to do to now to move this Vietnam-Oregon Initiative forward?

3) What Next?

Participant Roundtable

2:55 p.m.  Closing Comments

Phil Keisling
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