

SGI Sustainable
Governance
Indicators

2014 Strategic Capacity Report

Strategic Planning, Scholarly Advice



Indicator

Strategic Planning

Question

How much influence do strategic planning units and bodies have on government decision-making?

41 OECD and EU countries are sorted according to their performance on a scale from 10 (best) to 1 (lowest). This scale is tied to four qualitative evaluation levels.

- 10-9 = Strategic planning units and bodies take a long-term view of policy challenges and viable solutions, and they exercise strong influence on government decision-making.
- 8-6 = Strategic planning units and bodies take a long-term view of policy challenges and viable solutions. Their influence on government decision-making is systematic but limited in issue scope or depth of impact.
- 5-3 = Strategic planning units and bodies take a long-term view of policy challenges and viable solutions. Occasionally, they exert some influence on government decision-making.
- 2-1 = In practice, there are no units and bodies taking a long-term view of policy challenges and viable solutions.

Denmark

Score 9

The amount of strategic thinking in Danish government administration varies across different ministries. It also depends on the decision-making style of the ministry head. Major reforms in Denmark are usually prepared through committees or commissions established to produce a report outlining issues and options. In recent years, there have been a number of major commissions appointed (Strukturkommissionen, Velfærdskommissionen, Arbejdsmarkedskommissionen, Skattekommissionen and so on) as well as a number of expert groups to prepare inputs for important policy discussions and reforms. Moreover, professionalism in ministries has increased.

More overarching strategic policy plans or documents with a strong focus on economic policy in recent times are the government's 2010 plan, the 2015 plan and now the 2020 plan. The latter is linked with the EU's Europe2020 strategy. It sets national targets for employment, R&D, climate and energy, education and social inclusion. It also identifies challenges in areas of growth, demography, productivity, competition, education, reduced use of fossil fuels and household debt.

It should be noted that government policies traditionally have been consensus-driven. This applies both in Parliament, as most governments have been minority governments, and in relation to negotiations involving organizations and the political system, most notably in relation to labor market issues.

Citation:

Niels Ejersbo og Carsten Greve, Modernisering af den offentlige sektor. Copenhagen: Børsen, 2005.
The Danish Government, Denmark's National Reform Programme. May 2011.
http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nrp/nrp_denmark_en.pdf (accessed 20 April 2013)

Finland

Score 9

Strategic planning has considerable influence on government decision-making. Strategic goals of the Government Program are recorded in specific government strategy documents. These strategy documents cover a one-year period and include a plan for pursuing priority goals, a notice of intent for upcoming key decisions and indicators for evaluating government performance. The implementation of the Government Program is assessed by a report halfway through the Cabinet's tenure, which defines how strategic goals should be attained through the rest of the Cabinet's time in office. The Prime Minister's Office assists the prime minister and the government in their work, and is also responsible for the planning of social policy legislation that does not fall within the competence of any other ministry. The government often launches policy programs to ensure the attainment of its key objectives; while the preparation and monitoring of programs are delegated to ministerial groups. During the legislative period, the government presents a long-term report on the future to parliament; this report is jointly prepared by ministerial and specialist working groups. In addition, the parliamentary Committee for the Future deals with future-related matters.

Citation:

Paula Tiitonen (2011): Revamping the Work of the Committee for the Future. Summary. Publication of the Committee for the Future 7/2011.

Latvia

Score 9

In December 2011, Latvia established a new central-government planning unit, the Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, PKC). The PKC's mandate is to develop Latvia's long-term planning documents, and to monitor day-to-day decision-making to ensure that actions and policies are effective and appropriate to attain long-term goals. The PKC also monitors ministries' progress toward meeting the government's stated goals, as outlined in the Government Declaration.

To date, the PKC has produced the National Development Plan, monitored progress toward Latvia's long-term development plan Latvia 2030, and carved out an active role in the day-to-day decision-making process. The PKC reviews all proposals that come before the cabinet, and holds weekly briefings with the prime minister on the substantive issues to be addressed in

upcoming cabinet meetings. The body has also been tasked with analyzing cross-sectoral issues, such as evaluating government management of state-owned enterprises. The PKC is included on inter-ministerial committees that deal with cross-sectoral issues such as demographics or income disparities.

In addition to the PKC's core government role, most ministries have retained some independent planning capacity, even though many units and staff positions were cut as a part of the government austerity program. Ministerial planning units engage with the PKC, inviting the PKC to participate in the early planning phase of new policies. However, the PKC is not well-staffed enough to meet line ministries' demand for engagement fully.

Citation:

The Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre, Information Available at (in Latvian): <http://www.nap.lv/par-pkc>, Last assessed: 20.05.2013

Canada

Score 8

Neither the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) nor the Privy Council Office (PCO) has an official planning unit today. The Policy Research Initiative (PRI), established in 1997 under the PCO to promote and organize horizontal research within the federal government, could potentially have developed a strategic-planning function. However, this unit has not reported through the PCO since 2007. Given the uncertainties and unpredictability of the modern world at both the national and international level, many consider long-term strategic planning suspect, or at least not a priority, and hence an inappropriate use of limited resources. Nevertheless, there are thousands of public servants employed by the PCO, the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board (close to 3,000 individuals in all) who have no specific program responsibility. Their purpose is to manage politically sensitive files and to plan. Therefore, some argue that the planning capacity of the government of Canada is as strong as that of other Western countries, and in some cases even stronger.

Lithuania

Score 8

Lithuania's strategic-planning system was introduced in 2000 and has been updated several times since. At the central level of government, the planning system involves all stages (planning, monitoring and evaluation) of managing strategic and operational performance. During the period under review, successive governments commissioned and then approved the long-term Lithuania 2030 strategy, as well as a medium-term National Progress Program linked to short-term strategic-performance plans and budget

programs. The latter system is mandatory for all appropriation managers. The planning system in general is well-institutionalized; its functioning is supported by a network of strategic-planning units within each ministry and a governmental Strategic Planning Committee that was reintroduced in 2013 by the current government. In addition, strategic issues are regularly discussed during government or ministerial meetings.

A State Progress Council composed of politicians, public and civil servants, academics, businesspeople and other representatives of Lithuanian society was established to help design the Lithuania 2030 strategy and monitor its implementation. Although these strategic and advisory bodies take a long-term approach and offer viable policy solutions, their influence on governmental decision-making in fact varies by specific issue. There is a certain gap between long-term policy commitments and the actual practices of individual public institutions. In addition, politically important decisions are sometimes made without due consideration of strategic priorities, with strategic-planning documents often playing little role in daily decision-making.

Mexico

Score 8

The Mexican president is required by law to produce a strategic plan his first year in office. The current plan was still being prepared at the end of the review period. However, in a significant break with tradition, President Peña Nieto has asked for input into his plan from all of Mexico's political parties. His strategy is to use the national plan as a substitute for a congressional majority, with the hope that it will tie all parties around a set of long-term national agreements.

At a lower level, there are quite a few planning units within the Mexican government, though they do not all have decisive input into the policymaking process. At worst, planning can create opportunities for a kind of middle class clientelism.

Planning in Mexico was at its heyday in the 1980s, with no fewer than three planning ministers moving up to become presidents of Mexico. In more general terms, a "passion for planning" was not only a phenomenon of the 1980s, but stems from the origins of the PRI regime and its corporatist structures with a mixed economy. For a couple reasons, the role of planning entities declined in the mid-1990s. It was at least partly the result of Mexico becoming a market economy and also because planning itself was a failure during this period since Mexico was too bound to international economic trends to make its own decisions. Yet planning is popular once again. A trend toward giving more importance to strategic planning can also be observed in many other Latin American countries.

New Zealand

Score 8

The core executive in New Zealand is shaped according to new public management approaches and methods. Most importantly, contracts are negotiated between ministers and chief executives in a large number of departments and ministries. With more than 30 government departments and ministries, taking a whole-of-government approach to policy development can be complex and time-consuming. Recent governments have reacted to concerns about fragmentation by recentralizing the steering capacity of the core executive. The most important government departments involved in strategic planning and policy formation are the central agencies of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC), the State Services Commission (SSC) and the Treasury. All contracts (performance agreements and departmental statements of intent) support a cooperative and whole-of-government policy approach, though evaluation of the performance assessment of chief executives has a strong focus on departmental achievements. The National Party-led government in the review period decided to seek substantial efficiency reforms without a major reorganization of public sector departments and ministries. This has led to various initiatives, such as greater rationalization and coordination with respect to back-office functions (such as IT, payroll and procurement) with a view to achieving savings which can be shifted to delivering frontline services. Since chief executives are on contract and employ staff, these changes can only occur with their support and cannot be imposed on individual departments.

Developing strategies to enhance public sector performance management has been progressing for some time. Since the government has imposed a cap on the size of the state sector, these measures are aimed at securing greater efficiency, effectiveness and performance across the sector. The most recent initiative is the Better Public Services (BPS) program which aims at building efficient and effective public services by emphasizing outputs, strengthening leadership across the system and providing better services and greater value for money.

There is only a moderate strategic planning capacity that the prime minister can make use of (a policy advisory group) vis-à-vis ministers and increasingly ad hoc groups, often including some outside expertise, to complement policy advisory work of government agencies.

Citation:

Annual Report for the Year Ended 2012 (Wellington: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet 2012).

Better Public Services: <http://www.ssc.govt.nz/better-public-services> (accessed May 9, 2013).

Performance Improvement Framework: <http://www.ssc.govt.nz/pif> (accessed May 9, 2013).

Six Dimensions of System Performance (Wellington: State Services Commission 2013).

State Services Commission: Annual Report for the Year Ended 30 June 2011 (Wellington: State Services

Commission 2011).

The Capability Toolkit – A Tool to Promote and Inform Capability Management (Wellington: The Government of New Zealand 2008).

Sweden

Score 8

The strategic capacity of government has been enhanced over the past few years. Much of that capacity is found in the Department of Finance where most of the long-term planning takes place. The main role of the Prime Minister's Office is not so much long-term planning but more coordination within government.

A case in the point is the so-called "future commission" which presented its final report in early 2013. In the final report, the commission assesses the economic and social changes that are likely to shape the Swedish society in the longer term. Exactly how the commission's findings will flow into the policy process is yet to be seen. The commission is not an institutionalized feature of the normal policy process, but was a group of experts the government appointed to look into the long-term issues. The creation of the commission does signal the government is thinking in the longer term.

In addition to these planning efforts in the government departments, the agencies are also engaged in planning. They are not operating in close proximity to the departments, however. The exception to this pattern is when a department asks one of its agencies to look into a particular issue and to prepare advice on policy-initiatives.

Citation:

Svenska framtidsutmaningar. Slutrapport från regeringens framtidskommission (2013) (Stockholm: Statsrådsberedningen) (http://www.framtidskommissionen.se/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Slutrapport_svenska_framtidsutmaningar.pdf)

United States

Score 8

The U.S. government has multiple units that analyze policy issues, and that make long-term projections as part of the assessment of current options. The Executive Office of the President has multiple staffs and analytic agencies (e.g. White House Staff, Office of Management and Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council). On the legislative side, the Congressional Budget Office analyzes the 10-year fiscal impact of all bills with budget implications. Additionally, departments and agencies have analytic units with responsibilities for planning and evaluation, staffed with appropriately trained expert personnel. Expertise about long-term considerations is available in abundance, in the agencies, Congress, and the White House. Policymakers may enact policies that incorporate a long-term

schedule of changes. But any such schedule is highly subject to change. One needs to recognize that the main barrier to coherent long-term planning is the separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches, along with frequent elections. By design, no coherent actor controls policy for a period of several years.

Australia

Score 7

The Commonwealth public service makes extensive use of committees to undertake strategic planning, and these committees' activities generally peak immediately before and after the transition to a new government, and in the pre-budget period. The public service also maintains a single department, the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, with the aim of coordinating and directing strategic planning across the government as a whole.

The Labor government elected in 2007 was, under Prime Minister Rudd, characterized by increased emphasis on strategic planning. It commissioned numerous reviews, inquiries and committees in 2008 on a range of policy domains, including pensions, taxes and climate change. It also emphasized a "whole of government" approach to policymaking and service delivery. This new approach was reflected in a detailed set of recommendations in a discussion paper, "Ahead of the Game: Blueprint for the Reform of Australian Government Administration," which was prepared by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. The paper contained 28 recommendations focused mainly around the provision of effective service delivery, strategic planning, and creating a skilled and responsive public service. However, after some initial reform activity in 2010 and 2011, there is little evidence of significant reform occurring in the review period. This shift can at least in part be attributed to a difference in priorities for Prime Minister Gillard, who replaced Rudd as Prime Minister in 2010.

Belgium

Score 7

Each minister works closely with a team of collaborators in each ministerial cabinet. Each cabinet is usually large, with as many as 30 to 40 senior staff and experts. Meetings take place often, and the team designs policies in line both with the minister's objectives and the government agreement (Belgium has coalition governments; the government agreement is articulated prior to the formation of the government. It specifies a range of action points for the entire legislature). The minister and the advisory team are then responsible for drafting bill projects which are then submitted to the government in weekly meetings.

In terms of long-term planning, the knowledge accumulated by a minister's collaborators can be lost at the end of a legislative period, as the ministerial team changes when a minister is replaced. In contrast, public administration is run by civil servants with longer tenures of office, but these groups do not generally take part in strategic ministerial decisions. Long-term planning (beyond a legislative term) is therefore made difficult by the government's organizational structure, even if a coalition system allow certain parties to stay in office for several consecutive legislative terms (for instance, the Francophone Socialist Party has continuously been part of the federal government since 1988; the two liberal parties have continuously been in government since 1999). The main rationale for relying on the minister's team instead of civil servants is that the former are the minister's close allies and are more flexible in terms of working hours and availability for emergency situations

The federal Planning Bureau (Bureau du Plan/Planbureau) does play a role in providing longer strategic planning options, but in general it is the ministerial cabinets that are the main movers of legislative efforts.

Chile

Score 7

The president has the power to ask for and ensure strategic planning, whether through formal or informal channels. Line ministries, most notably the Ministry of Finance, and the president's advisory ministry (the Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Segpres), have considerable influence in strategic planning processes. Meetings between strategic planning staff and the head of government are held frequently. However, no long-term view of policy challenges and viable solutions is necessarily presented – these are either limited in scope or depth of impact depending on the topic.

Strategic planning, planning of policy and regulatory reforms, budget planning, and ex ante evaluation of government policies and public investment programs are carried out by specialist units and departments inside the various ministries. While there is no explicit multi-year budget planning process in place in Chile, this takes place implicitly due to the fiscal rule that links (by law) overall government expenditure to forward-looking estimates of long-term government revenue, based on growth trends and copper price projections. These forecasts are provided in a transparent way by specialist budgetary commissions comprised of academic and private-sector experts (mostly professional economists).

Israel

Score 7

It was only in the 1990s when Israel's government adopted in earnest the practice of strategic planning. Previously government actions were based more on practice rather than theory, with much improvisation and policy driven by short-term incentives. As a result, the Israeli government did not develop strategic planning units early on, even though the Israel Defense Forces had already developed a planning division in the early 1970s (AGAT). When long-term planning was called for in government policy, the Ministry of Finance typically took the lead – yet other ministries resented this, and the resulting antagonism also tempered the actions of the Prime Minister's Office with regard to proposed policies.

The director general of the Prime Minister's Office oversees the body's administrative and policy work. He supervises three main planning agencies: the National Economic Council, the National Security Council, and the Policy Planning Department. In 2010 the government formed a committee to investigate its own strategic planning capacities; the results, published in late 2012, identified many structural deficiencies.

While it is unclear whether government planning agencies have access to or can advise the prime minister directly, such agencies do have access to ministries and other government departments, as well as to the director general of the Prime Minister's Office. In general, government strategic planning bodies take a long-term view when addressing policy challenges and solutions, and their influence on government decision-making, while systematic, is still limited in scope and depth.

Citation:

Arlozerov, Meirav, "A strategic planning headquarter will be established in the prime minister's office; will be in charge of reforms," TheMarker website 13.10.2012 (Hebrew)

"Policy departments - auxiliary tool for navigation," the Reut institute 11.6.2008. (Hebrew)

"A guide for government planning," The department for policy planning, September 2010 (Hebrew)

Akerman, Lior: Does Israel have a long-term strategic plan? Jerusalem Post, 23.6.2013, <http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/Does-Israel-have-a-long-term-strategic-plan-314207>

Norway

Score 7

Significant strategic planning takes place in the course of governmental decision-making. The typical procedure for major decisions entails the following steps: First, the government appoints an ad-hoc committee tasked with delivering a detailed report on a particular issue. Some of these committees are composed exclusively of experts, while others have a broader membership that includes politicians and representatives of

interested parties such as unions, business confederations and other non-governmental organizations.

For instance, a report to the Ministry of Finance would typically be drafted by high-profile academic economists along with representatives of unions, employers and the central bank. When this procedure leads to legislative action, a proposal is drafted and distributed to interested parties, who are invited to make comments and suggestions (a period of three months for comments is recommended, and six weeks is the minimum period allowed).

Only after comments have been received will the government prepare a proposal for parliament, sometimes in the form of a parliamentary bill, but occasionally only as an initial white paper. Governments deviate from this procedure only in cases of emergency, and any attempt to circumvent it would lead to public criticism.

This tradition of careful, deliberate, consensual and slow decision-making has served the country well. The procedure leading up to the 2009 pension reform offered a case in point. However, two major recent reforms have turned out to be remarkable and costly failures: health care reform (certainly) and social security reform (probably, although more time is required for a complete judgment). These failures may be attributable to a dogmatic overconfidence in the efficacy of bureaucratic centralization, and should raise serious questions about the country's strategic capacity.

There is an established procedure for the approval of the annual budget. Activity starts a year in advance, when the government holds three conferences on the budget proposal. The finance minister presents an initial proposal to parliament in the first week of October. A parliamentary committee plays an active role in the budget process, making concrete proposals for the distribution of resources. This proposal becomes the basis of parliamentary discussion. After the parliament approves a proposal for the allocation of resources, it becomes binding for subsequent, more detailed discussions that take place in various parliamentary committees. By December 15, this work is concluded, and the final budget is approved by the full parliament.

The shortcomings in governance that were revealed in the course of the July 22 terrorist attacks and their aftermath have resulted in a general downgrade in the scores associate with executive capacity.

Poland

Score 7

Since the inauguration of the first Tusk government, Poland has ambitiously attempted to improve its strategic planning, favored through EU demands and partly motivated by an aim of improving the absorption and use of EU funds. The planning capacities of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister (Kancelaria Prezesa Rady Ministrów, KPRM) have been expanded and the hitherto existing number of uncoordinated sectoral plans have been replaced with a more systematic approach in which a long-term strategy developed by the Chancellery (Poland 2030: The Third Wave of Modernity) sets the frame for a limited number of different medium-term strategies. However, the implementation of the new system has progressed slowly, partly because of unclear responsibilities and a lack of leadership.

Citation:

OECD, 2013: Public Governance Review Poland: Implementing Strategic-State Capacity. Paris, Chap. 2.

South Korea

Score 7

Strategic planning remains an important factor in Korean governance. The office of the president includes a senior secretary and two secretaries for the President for State Affairs. Given the strengthened position of the president and his comfortable majority in parliament, the political context for strategic planning improved under President Lee compared to that facing the earlier Roh administration. The Lee government was sometimes more pragmatic and sometimes more ideological than previous governments, but also more oriented to the short-term. Instead of being concerned with long-term goals, President Lee views the government as operating in a similar manner to a company, reacting pragmatically to challenges in order to remain competitive in the process of economic globalization. The new Park administration has shifted priorities to “happiness for the people” and “economic revival.”

Citation:

Office of the President, Policy Goals, <http://english.president.go.kr/government/goals/goals.php>

Office of the President, Special Policies, <http://english.president.go.kr/government/special/special.php>

Office of the President, http://english.president.go.kr/government/office_president/office_president.php

Spain

Score 7

The deep economic crisis might have had at least one salutary effect by bringing about much more awareness in Spain of the importance of “smarter” policymaking and public spending. It is now clear that the previous growth period (1995 – 2007) lacked solid foundations and was based instead on a twofold economic bubble: finance and real estate. Once these bubbles popped, the government and the public in general realized that future prosperity should be attained in a much more sustainable way and this means decision-makers must make a proper diagnosis of risks and weaknesses, identify priorities, improve policymaking mechanisms and take into account the scarce resources available. Thus, since 2010, the idea of reinforcing strategic thinking and multiannual planning has gained momentum in several key areas such as fiscal policy, employment, security or external action. Other sectoral strategies have also been published or announced regarding pensions system, human rights, or international development cooperation.

Despite austerity measures that logically tended to reduce the dimensions of the administrative structure, the central strategic planning units have been strengthened. Hence the Prime Minister’s Economic Office – which, among other functions, has been responsible for the National Reform Program under the Europe 2020 Strategy – is clearly more powerful since January 2012. A new department of national security has been created within the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO) with the task of implementing a Spanish National Security Strategy – a document originally approved in 2011, when the Spanish Socialist Workers Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE) was still in office, and slightly revised during 2013 by the Popular Party (Partido Popular, PP) government.

The renewed attention paid to structural reforms or security policy could be the basis for developing the incipient Spanish strategic thinking and for strengthening powerful coordinating bodies connected to the strategic planning units near the prime minister, such as a fully fledged National Security Council, a more authoritative Council of Ministers Committee on Economic Affairs and an effective Foreign Policy Council.

United Kingdom

Score 7

Although the United Kingdom has one of the most centralized political systems and long-established liberal democracies in the world, the resources directly available to the prime minister are not very developed. Contrary to many comparable countries and their core executives, there is no prime

ministerial department to provide strategic planning or advice. However, the Cabinet Office provides an important coordinating role across government and its head, the cabinet secretary, attends cabinet meetings. The role previously also included heading the civil service, but the job was split early in the current government, enabling the cabinet secretary to concentrate more on strategy. The Number 10 Policy Unit – which has existed under various names since the mid-1970s – was dissolved by the coalition government in an attempt to signal a change from the New Labour governments, as they were characterized by a large number of special advisers whose much-debated authority to issue orders to civil servants had been politically contentious.

In its place, a new Policy and Implementation Unit was set up in 2011, manned exclusively by 10 senior civil servants who can also draw on the services of a Research and Analytics Unit. The strategic capacity of the new unit is unlikely to surpass that of its predecessors, which were themselves considered modest compared to those of other countries. A further complication has arisen through the demands of coalition government. The prime minister already has to consult with the deputy prime minister, and the need for compromise requires close contact with the respective parties. This is likely to further reduce the impact strategic planning units have on eventual decision-making.

Austria

Score 6

The strategic capacity of the Austrian executive is limited by the lack of clear majorities in the federal parliament and in most of the state (provincial) parliaments. With some exceptions, no party can claim to have a mandate to implement a set of policies agreed to by a majority of voters and members of parliament. Rather, coalitions must be formed, a process with clear advantages and clear disadvantages. On the one hand, executive responsibility is blurred, as the presence of too many veto players prevent the development of consistent strategic capacity. On the other, coalitions enable a more inclusive government. Political decision-making in Austria is still characterized by a tendency to prefer a maximum of consensus, even at the price of postponing necessary decisions and shying away from taboos identified with the interests of special groups (such as public service unions or organized agrarian interests). Strategic planning units and bodies consisting of public officials do exist within the ministries. The Federal Chancellery can be considered the principal strategic-planning unit, as it is responsible for coordinating the government's various activities. However, it lacks the specialized personnel that would enable it to work as a comprehensive strategy unit, and has no power to give instructions to other ministries.

Croatia

Score 6

In Croatian public administration, the introduction of strategic management tools has just begun. (Miošić / Škrabalo 2013) At central government level, strategic planning over the last decade has been dominated by the goal of EU accession. Since 2009 all ministries have been obliged to prepare three-year strategic plans. Over the period 2006 – 2013 a Strategic Reference Framework (SRF) was the key document guiding economic policy, with key priority areas and instruments set out in regular Strategy of Government Programs (SGP). Croatia also adopted Pre-Accession Programs setting out measures for achieving the goals of the SRF and SGP. These documents and the administrative planning associated with them have been the basis of multi-annual programming for the IPA (Instrument for Pre-Accession) funds of the European Union. However, the quality of these plans has been relatively low. Despite the limited implementation of the strategic goals of the 2010 – 2012 SGP and the drastic changes in the overall financial and economic setup, the strategic priorities in the 2013 – 2015 SGP are almost identical to the priorities in the previous program. Only two out of 12 priorities have differed: one related to enhancing tourism competitiveness and the other to public and state security.

Citation:

Miošić, N., Škrabalo, M. 2013: Pretpostavka uspješne provedbe reforme državne uprave u Hrvatskoj. Analiza stajališta ključnih dionika reforme, GONG Istraživački centar, Zagreb

Estonia

Score 6

The supporting structures of the government in Estonia are mainly located in the ministries. The Government Office (GO) is quite limited in this respect, though there is a Strategy Unit within the GO, which mainly has a consulting function. Its main tasks are to support the composition of strategic development plans, to coordinate and draw up the government's action plan, and monitor the implementation of abovementioned policy documents. The human resources of the unit are very limited, however, comprising only eight staff members. The Strategy Unit reports to the secretary of state, not the prime minister, which illustrates well the bureaucratic character of the unit. Besides the Strategy Unit, there is also a Prime Minister's Bureau, comprised of experts in various policy areas who advise the prime minister. Different from the Strategy Unit, this body is closely linked to the prime minister's political party and its members change with each new prime minister. Unlike the Strategy Unit, which has a rather weak position, the Prime Minister's Bureau has a significant impact on government decisions.

Italy

Score 6

The concept of strategic planning is not particularly developed in Italian governmental and administrative culture. This is in part due to the fact that governments have been predominantly preoccupied with coalition problems, and that the administration is still very much guided by a legalistic culture. Some progress has been made, however, in the last few Councils of Ministers when relatively more detailed coalition and government programs have become significant instruments for organizing and planning government activity. Within the government office (called the Presidency of the Council of Ministers, or Presidenza del Consiglio), a special department guided by a minister without portfolio has been created to oversee the implementation of this program. This department produces an annual report on the program's implementation status. The financial aspect of strategic planning is more developed, as the Treasury has to implement rigorous budgetary stability goals, and works within a triennial perspective. Under the Monti government the presence of personnel with technical and expert backgrounds in ministerial positions has increased the long-term perspective in the formulation of policy solutions. On the other hand, however, the limited time span originally assigned to the government and the crisis situation have reduced somewhat their positive impact.

Japan

Score 6

The DPJ, voted into power in 2009, promised to implement grand government-structure reforms, calling in particular for a streamlining of executive decision-making structures through a government run by politicians rather than bureaucrats. In the event, such change could not be effectuated.

The DPJ's idea of installing a National Strategy Bureau as a kind of "control tower" charged with proposing and coordinating important budget and policy matters ultimately failed. An attempt to endow the new national strategy unit with a proper legal basis finally floundered in spring 2011. By then the national strategy unit had already been degraded to a mere consultative organ advising the prime minister on select issues, a function which it also had to share from fall 2011 onward with a newly established National Policy Conference comprised of outside experts.

The LDP-led government elected in December 2012 shifted course again, with the aim of strengthening strategic capacity in the center. It first revived the Council on Economic and Fiscal Policy, used by former Prime Minister Koizumi (2001 – 2006) as a key reform instrument. Second, it created an

Industrial Competitiveness Council, reporting to the prime minister. Third, it created a Regulatory Reform Council. Several reformers of the Koizumi era have reappeared, including former reform minister Heizo Takenaka, who serves on the Industrial Competitiveness Council. Several meetings of this council took place in early 2013, signaling a dense workload and high expectations.

However, as of the time of writing, it was premature to evaluate the prospects of the new government's policies or the performance of its recent changes.

Netherlands

Score 6

The Dutch government has four strategic planning units. All of these are formally part of a ministry, but their statutes guarantee them independent watchdog and advisory functions (Aanwijzingen voor de Planbureaus, Staatscourant 3200, 21 February 2012).

The Scientific Council for Government Policy (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, WRR) advises the government on intersectoral issues of great future importance and policies for the longer term and weak coordination of the work plans of the other strategic planning units. It is part of the prime minister's Department of General Affairs.

The Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (Centraal Planbureau, CPB) is part of the Department of Economic Affairs. It prepares standard annual economic assessments and forecasts (Centraal Economisch Plan, Macro-Economische Verkenningen), and cost-benefit analyses for large-scale infrastructural projects. It also conducts research into long-term socioeconomic issues like education, aging and pensions and globalization. In election years it assesses the macroeconomic impacts of political parties' electoral platforms.

The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (Sociaal-Cultureel Planbureau, SCP) is part of the Department of Public Health, Welfare and Sports. The SCP conducts policy-relevant scientific research on the present and future of Dutch social and cultural issues – for example, political engagement and participation of citizens, media and culture, family and youth, care, housing.

The Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving, PBL) is part of the Department of Infrastructure and Environment. It is the national institute for strategic policy analysis for the environment, nature and spatial policies.

The directors of these institutes are said to have regular access to Council of Ministers meetings, but their actual influence (or that of their institute's reports) is not known. Yet since 2009 there has been fairly strong political pressure for instrumental advice, which may be long-term, but is therefore useful for official long-term government policy.

In addition to the major strategic planning units, there are at least two important extra-governmental bodies. Firstly, the fairly influential Health Council (Gezondheidsraad, GR), is an independent scientific advisory body that alerts and advises (whether solicited or unsolicited) government and the States General on the current level of knowledge with respect to public health issues and health services research. Secondly, the Netherlands Institute for International Relations (Clingendael) conducts background research on Europe, security and conflict issues, diplomacy and the changing geopolitical landscape. It is part of the Hague Academic Coalition of eight academic institutes (including the Institute of Social Studies, Leiden University and the Carnegie Foundation) and trains Dutch and foreign diplomats and civil servants.

The prime minister is assisted in his Council of Ministers' strategic policy coordinating role that consists of a personal advisory cabinet of 10 state counsels or raadsadviseurs, assisted in turn by a larger number of junior assistants. They advise him on departmental policy proposals and serve the strategic function of secretaries of Council of Ministers' and ministerial committees. They are top-level civil servants, not political appointees. The prime minister and his counsels only have a limited span of control and scarcely have the expertise needed to judge all policy proposals in detail.

Bulgaria

Score 5

The most important systematic strategic planning process is related to the requirements of EU membership and the necessity of preparing strategy and reform programs within the EU framework. The ministry of finance is in charge of preparing the National Reform Programs foreseen within the European Union's 2020 strategy. There is not much more strategic planning capacity at the center of government (the prime minister and the Council of Ministers' staff). However, the national strategies on security, energy, governance and development of water resources, development of scientific research, Roma integration, physical education and sport, which were adopted during the 2009 – 2013 term, have provided some long-term orientation. These strategies were prepared in coordination with different ministries and on the basis of extensive discussions with the respective expert communities. They have been overseen by the respective line ministries and parliamentary committees.

France

Score 5

French governments commonly refer to ad hoc committees tasked with providing information on crucial issues. In some cases, a report is requested from a single individual. Committee members are mainly high-level civil servants, former or active politicians and academics, and often are chosen on the basis of their sympathy to the government in office at the time. This situation raises the concern that opportunism may prevail over real strategic planning. One example during the review period is the Gallois report on French business competitiveness, which was commissioned by President Hollande and published in October 2012, and which has been used to legitimize financial support granted to businesses, as well as some structural reforms, against the reluctance of leftist members of the government coalition.

Most of the time committee reports are either partially paid attention to or shelved altogether. There are no committee meetings with government authorities, except the formal handing over of the requested report. A new permanent committee, set up by President Hollande to assess budgetary issues (before the budget is submitted to Brussels), might be more influential as it has been placed under the chairmanship of the president of the Court of Accounts.

The only bodies that take a long-term view in terms of strategic planning are bureaucratic departments such as those that are part of the finance or foreign affairs ministries. The committee of economic advisors attached to the prime minister's office produces reports on its own initiative or at the office's request. Its impact on actual policymaking is limited, however. President Hollande has redefined the tasks of the former council of strategic analysis (Commissariat General à la Prospective) to strengthen its role in prospective political planning.

Greece

Score 5

Strategic planning units at the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and the Ministry of Finance are usually staffed by academics who are affiliated with the incumbent government and work on fixed-term contracts. At the PMO there is a Directorate of Strategic Planning, whereas at the Ministry of Finance there is a Council of Economic Advisors. In 2011 – 2013 such units were preoccupied not with long-term planning and programming but with the task of monitoring the implementation of the austerity measures and structural reforms agreed between the government and the EC–ECB–IMF Troika.

In 2012 a Government Council on Reform was created in order to pursue long-term goals related to public sector reform, but it has remained inoperative, as relevant functions are still in the hands of the Minister of Public Administration.

Before the crisis there were short-lived strategic planning units in other ministries, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Administrative Reform (formerly known as the Ministry of the Presidency of Government). These units did not survive the frequent cabinet reshuffles before the crisis. These regular ministerial reshuffles resulted in a frequent change of policy styles and the removal of policy advisors along with the minister who had appointed them.

Ireland

Score 5

The approach to strategic planning in Ireland has been ad hoc and crisis driven. In keeping with a commitment to the Troika, a fiscal advisory council was formed and held its first meeting in July 2011. It monitors fiscal trends and comments on progress towards restoring financial stability. Its role is largely to comment on the government's progress in achieving the goals contained in the fiscal stability program.

The state also part-funds bodies such as the Economic and Social Research Institute and the National Economic and Social Council, which provide analysis and commentary that exert some influence on government decision-making.

Portugal

Score 5

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Troika strictly limits opportunities for strategic planning. Inevitably, while there is strategic planning in finances and in the economy more generally, it is severely limited by the terms of the MoU and negotiations with Portugal's international lenders. For example, there continue to be expert groups or offices consisting of government employees and outside experts formulating policies, like the Departamento de Prospectiva e Planeamento de Ministério do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território e Desenvolvimento Regional, Direcção Geral de Estudos, Estatística, e Planeamento (concerning employment) and the Gabinete de Estudos das Pescas. Most of the ministries have some kind of office or group for strategic planning. They occasionally exert some (limited) influence. However, under the current bailout, strategic planning is less evident than prior to the bailout. The MoU

sets out a fairly definitive set of plans for the period of 2011 – 2014, thus rendering other plans less relevant, while the need to achieve the budgetary consolidation goals has led to greater attention on reaching short-term goals rather than long-term strategic planning.

Turkey

Score 5

According to Article 166 of the Turkish constitution, the state is responsible for the planning of the country's economic, social and cultural development. Organizing these responsibilities effectively is an important goal. The under-secretariat of the State Planning Organization, founded in 1960, was upgraded in June 2011 to the Ministry of Development as part of Decree Law 641. Prior to the upgrade, the State Planning Organization was the major consulting body to the Prime Minister's Office, dealing with issues of sectoral planning and development. The ministry now advises the government over economic, social and cultural development policies with an eye to balanced and sustainable development.

The Department of Strategy Development (created by Act 5018, and succeeding in 2006 the Board of Searching, Planning and Coordinating), also associated with the Prime Minister's Office, helps formulate medium- and long-term strategy and policies, define guidelines for relevant studies and issues related to strategy implementation, monitor the implementation of legislation and coordinate subsequent activities.

All public institutions, including municipalities and special provincial administrations (Laws 5216, 5302 and 5393) but excluding regulatory and supervisory bodies, must prepare strategic plans according to Law 5018 (2003) on Public Financial Management and Control and the By-law on Principles and Procedures for Strategic Planning in Public Administrations (2006).

The basic objective of strategic planning is to establish an institutional connection between plans, programs and budgets. In this respect, performance programs and activity reports are complementary. All ministerial bodies have also designated a separate department for developing strategy and coordination activities.

However, strategic management in Turkish public administration faces several challenges, according to the Working Group Report on Strategic Management in the Public Sector (2013). Strategic planning is often reduced to just budgetary concerns and neglects administrative aspects. Strategic plans, performance programs, budgets and activity reports are prepared in ignorance of each other. The Court of Audit cannot fulfill its functions and

pursue performance audits. There is no relationship between superior political documents and lower policy materials, including municipalities. There are also no cumulative statistics on the frequency of meetings between strategic planning staff and government heads; yet in general these meetings are held once in a year, especially during budget negotiations.

Citation:

T.C. Kalkınma Bakanlığı, Kamuda Stratejik Yönetim Çalışma Grubu Raporu, Onuncu Kalkınma Planı (2014-2018), 2013. http://www.sp.gov.tr/upload/xSpKutu_phane/files/iyomu+Kamuda_Stratejik_Yonetim_Calisma_Grubu_Raporu.pdf

Czech Republic

Score 4

In the Czech Republic there is a strong skepticism toward, and almost no institutional infrastructure for, strategic planning. A medium-term perspective is provided by the government's policy manifesto, which is presented to the Chamber of Deputies for a confidence vote. In the period under review there were two such presentations of government policy manifestos. The first was submitted by the Nečas Cabinet in August 2010, and the second followed the split of the Public Affairs party (Věci veřejné, VV) and the restructuring of the government in April 2012.

Germany

Score
value_6

The coalition government in power during the period under review, which included the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) and the Free Democratic Party (FDP), showed little evidence of strategic planning. Indeed, the strategic planning performed by the parties in government was mainly concerned with how best to position themselves individually for the upcoming elections. No important organizational devices for strategic planning were introduced in the last parliamentary term. During the review period, the new head of the Federal Chancellery was again given the status of a minister without portfolio, strengthening his position vis-à-vis the minister-presidents of the federal state and the heads of the other federal ministries.

Although the Federal Chancellery is staffed by as many as 500 employees, the organizational structure of the German government is not well designed strategic planning. The government is strongly influenced by party-political considerations, and all main decisions are made by the heads of the governing parties. In addition, the principle and practice of ministerial autonomy (Ressortprinzip) contributes to the fragmentation of the governmental process and hinders the development of a coherent policy orientation. Cabinet meetings are not able to compensate for this weakness. As one permanent state secretary has lamented, policymakers are

perpetually seeking to rationalize and decrease the excessive arbitrariness in political decision-making.

Luxembourg

Score 4

Luxembourg's small size, and thus the small size of its administration, does not allow for sufficient strategic planning capacity. Some public bodies, such as the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies Luxembourg (STATEC) and the General Inspectorate of Social Security (Inspection Générale de la Sécurité Sociale, IGSS) offer simulations. The state economic and social council (Conseil économique et social) and the public research institute CEPS/INSTEAD offer more qualitative analyses. The research department of the central bank (Banque Centrale du Luxembourg) and the financial sector's general inspectorate (Commission de surveillance du secteur financier, CSSF) focus on economics and finance planning. While these institutions are state-financed, they still are not sufficiently equipped to offer long-term planning activities. Reports by the Conseil économique et social are partly written by civil servants of the respective ministry departments. Strategic planning is mostly done, if not commissioned, by institutions abroad, which offers the advantage of independence and guidance via international standards. Once a report is submitted, negotiations begin between the minister and promoters; the final compromise is a draft of the project designed abroad.

Citation:

<http://www.statistiques.public.lu/en/actors/statec/index.html>

<http://www.bcl.lu/fr/index.php>

<http://www.ces.public.lu/fr/index.html>

<http://www.ceps.lu/>

Slovakia

Score 4

The institutional capacity for strategic planning in Slovakia is weak. Capacities for planning in the ministries are limited, and there is no central policy planning unit in the Government Office. The Radičová government sought to take a long-term perspective, but its attempts at strategic planning were complicated by controversies within the governing coalition and the internal tensions within the party itself. Under the Fico government, the strengthening of the expertise of the Government Office and the creation of the Solidarity and Development Council, a new advisory body, have partly aimed to improve planning capacities.

Switzerland

Score 4

Strategic planning is not given significant weight in Switzerland, as most decisions are made on an ad-hoc basis. It is further rendered difficult by the fact that the country has a quasi-presidential political system (meaning the government cannot be voted out of office by the parliament) with a collegial government, a strong militia element, a consociational decision-making structure, a strong corporatist relationship between a weak federal state and outside interest organizations, and considerable uncertainty deriving from the system of direct democracy.

The Swiss government is not strictly speaking a parliamentary government, and does not have a policy agenda comparable to a “normal” parliamentary government. Furthermore, all seven members of the government have equal rights and powers; there is no prime minister. The president of the government is *primus inter pares*. He or she is not leader of the government in the sense of a prime minister.

Hungary

Score 3

The Orbán government has emphasized its long-term view with regard to strategic planning and has produced a large number of strategy papers, including the two Széll Kálmán Plans adopted in 2011 and 2012. However, these and other plans have suffered from the government’s short-term focus and a lack of consistency. As the Orbán government has subordinated all political actions to the goal of consolidating power, economic and fiscal priorities have frequently shifted and not much effort has been invested in building institutional capacities for strategic planning.

Iceland

Score 3

Researchers widely agree that long-term strategic planning in Iceland is often vague, with comparatively weak execution, supervision and revision of plans. When specific objectives are established through planning, there are typically insufficient incentives or institutional mechanisms in place to ensure their achievement. As a result, the government often has enough flexibility to delay implementation or change strategic plans. In one clear example, the parliament approves a strategic plan on regional policy every four years (*Stefnumótandi byggðaaáætlun*), meant to provide a guide to the next four-year period. However, this strategic plan is only a parliamentary resolution that lacks the status of a law, meaning the government has no binding

obligation to implement the plan. Over the years, only some elements of these four-year plans have been implemented.

Policymaking is in the hands of the cabinet ministers, who rely on the staff of their respective ministries for advice and policy implementation.

Citation:

Special Investigation Committee (SIC) (2010), "Report of the Special Investigation Commission (SIC)," report delivered to Althing, the Icelandic Parliament, on 12 April.

Parliamentary resolution on regional policy (Tillaga til þingsályktunar um stefnumótandi byggðaaætlun fyrir árin 2010–2013. Þskj. 43 — 42. mál).

Malta

Score 3

Each government ministry has a director and unit responsible for strategy and planning. These groups have been especially active in the Malta Planning and Environmental Authority, in the Malta Transport Authority, in the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs and in the Education Ministry. The latter is working on a blueprint which should be utilized in all ministries. The group in the Prime Minister's Office draws up the country's strategic policy and directs future government work; mostly this task sits with the permanent secretary, who develops a strategic overview with key objectives, priorities for actions and key performance indicators, timeline, budgets and targets. At the time of writing, the programming period for government projects is 2014 to 2020. In some cases, ministries employ consultants, but this is different than official strategic planning groups. These consultants typically work on current issues, although from time to time they are commissioned to produce reports or give advice which may be considered as forward planning. The Management Efficiency Unit coordinates separate ministry plans and the Malta Information Technology Agency (MITA), which reviews government IT requirements, also assists.

Romania

Score 3

In Romania, the most important strategic planning unit within the government is the Secretariat General of the Government, which is in charge of developing the Integrated Strategic Plan and overseeing its implementation. However, in practice this plan plays a minor role in policymaking: the current plan for 2010 – 2013 was formulated in 2009 and has not been updated under the current government. Overall, the lack of a long-term approach to policymaking undermines the continuity and coherence of public policies.

Slovenia

Score 3

The institutional capacity for strategic planning in Slovenia is rather weak. Capacities for planning in the ministries are limited, and there is no central policy-planning unit in the Government Office. The Pahor government showed some interest in strategic planning and set up a number of advisory bodies – e.g., the Strategic Council for Local Self-Government. The Janša government took a more short-term approach. Both governments failed to develop any long-term strategies.

Cyprus

Score 2

General strategic planning, institutionalized under the Planning Bureau and directorates of the Ministry of Finance, appears to have a limited presence in the organizational charts of other state units. The constitutionally independent Office Planning Bureau is under the authority of the Ministry of Finance, with a role that has today shifted toward managing EU funds and issues related to the Lisbon Strategy. This means that its previous planning and coordinating role has declined. Strategic planning, to the extent it exists, mostly focuses on the financial aspects of development.

Overall, it seems that strategic planning has been rather deficient, exerting little influence on policies and decisions. The current crisis is tangible evidence of this fact. During the period under review, the country's president issued numerous statements criticizing policies and plans proposed by successive finance ministers as showing insufficient strategic vision. The period also saw numerous contradictions in statements and announcements by government officials. In April 2013, a commission of judges was created to investigate responsibility for the collapse of the economy. These sources of dissonant information highlighted the limited role of strategic planning.

The government that took office in March 2012 announced the creation of a coordinating body that will supervise the implementation of policies. The Planning Bureau will be given a substantial role in this regard.

Indicator

Scholarly Advice

Question

How influential are non-governmental academic experts for government decisionmaking?

41 OECD and EU countries are sorted according to their performance on a scale from 10 (best) to 1 (lowest). This scale is tied to four qualitative evaluation levels.

- 10-9 = In almost all cases, the government transparently consults with a panel of non-governmental academic experts at an early stage of government decision-making.
- 8-6 = For major political projects, the government transparently consults with a panel of non-governmental academic experts at an early stage of government decision-making.
- 5-3 = In some cases, the government transparently consults with a panel of non-governmental academic experts at an early stage of government decision-making.
- 2-1 = The government does not consult with non-governmental academic experts, or existing consultations lack transparency entirely and/or are exclusively pro forma.

Chile

Score 8

NGOs and academic experts play an important role in government decision-making. Experts from academia, NGOs, partisan think tanks and the private sector are very influential in the preparation of government (presidential) programs and the development of policy reform proposals by presidential or ministerial technical commissions. These technical commissions, which are charged with proposing policy reforms in specific reform areas (education, pension, social and wage policies, minimum wage policy, fiscal rule, etc.) have been very influential in shaping government legislation as submitted to and voted on by Congress. Commissions are largely comprised of experts, and to a minor extent of representatives of interested parties, and cover a wide political spectrum. This kind of technical input into the policymaking process belongs to the technocratic tradition in Chilean politics. It has been followed by the Alianza coalition and the Concertación government before it. Under the current government, the main policies in the government program were elaborated and accompanied by expert commissions. Some reform initiatives in the education and environmental sectors have been accelerated or even blocked due to ideological differences within the respective expert commission. Experts (economists in particular) are very influential in drafting reform proposals submitted to the president or to ministers. As a profession, economists in particular are highly influential in the preparation of government programs and policy reform proposals, and in the execution of government policies.

Denmark

Score 8

The political administration has a certain amount of in-house expertise. For most policy areas, however, policymakers rely on advising councils or committees that include experts. For example, when policymakers are formulating health policies, they need to consult with medical experts outside of the government. In addition, the Danish Economic Council plays an important role as an independent institution, and politicians listen to its members' advice. In 2007, the government also established an Environmental Economic Council. The same four economics professors, known as the "wise men," chair the two councils. The chairmen prepares reports that are then discussed by the members representing unions, employers, the central bank and the government. The reports typically garner media attention. Unlike the American system, where a university professor can spend a few years in government administration and then return to academia, Danish academics tend to remain in academia.

Citation:

Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen, Peter Munck Christiansen og Marius Ibsen, Politik og forvaltning. 3. udgave. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag, 2011.

Website of the Danish Economic Councils: www.dors.dk/ (accessed 20 April 2013).

Norway

Score 8

There is a significant degree of academic influence on policymaking in Norway. Economic and social research helps to guide policy to a significant degree. Academics are regularly involved in government-appointed committees for the preparation of legislation. On a more informal level, various departments regularly consult academic experts. Academics are active in public debate (e.g., by writing newspaper articles) and their views often prompt replies and comments from senior politicians.

Canada

Score 7

Many government departments and agencies have multiple advisory committees, which can at times have considerable impact but rarely have a dominant influence on policy. A number of government departments and agencies appoint academic experts to advisory positions or chairs within the organization for a one-to-two-year period. Examples of this type of position – and hence of the influence of experts on policy – include the Clifford Clark Visiting Economist Chair at the Department of Finance and the Simon Reisman Visiting Fellowship within the Treasury Board Secretariat. Similar

posts exist at the Competition Bureau and the Bank of Canada, among others. In recent years, these positions have often been vacant for long periods. Government departments and agencies often commission experts to organize research projects on high-profile issues. The results of these initiatives have in the past been influential in the course of policy development, but less so in recent years given the government's reduced emphasis on evidence-based policymaking. Finally, external academic experts are frequently asked to meet with senior government officials, either on a one-on-one basis or as speakers at departmental retreats.

Estonia

Score 7

The extent and impact of academic consultation is framed by the overall pattern of government decision-making. Limited strategic capacity in the center, and passing of policy formulation initiatives to the separate ministries, makes the overall picture fragmented and uneven. The dominant pattern is that the government requests studies from research teams on an ad hoc basis. The extent to which research findings and recommendations influence reform proposals varies greatly. Final reports of the research projects are made publicly available on the websites of the governmental institutions that requested the study. Some of the most important studies are also taken to the plenary session of the national parliament. For example, the Estonian Human Development Report always deserves parliamentary hearings.

Israel

Score 7

Non-governmental academic experts held special status during the early days of Israel's statehood, and were frequently consulted by the prime minister on core issues. The government as of the time of writing consults with experts in a number of ways. Experts can sit on independent public committees that are appointed by the government (but can also be summoned by the Knesset) to examine the causes and consequences of a specific event or incident. The Trajtenberg Committee, for example, was formed after the 2011 social justice protests. Permanent committees that consult with the government on a regular basis, such as the National Economic Council headed by Eugene Kandel, are mainly (but not exclusively) staffed by academic experts. Finally, think tanks and research institutes act as a bridge between the academic world and politics, publishing opinions and position papers on current events and government issues.

Private academic experts can also be summoned by parliament committees to present opinions or to offer a different perspective on a certain issue.

Any government minister can appoint an external advisory committee to assist with specific issues, and ministers often use this consultation tool. (One significant example is the Shashinsky Committee, appointed by the finance minister to examine government fiscal policy on oil and gas.)

Israeli ministers also often consult informally with academic experts, primarily to receive guidance that is free from ministerial or political interests. Finance Minister Yair Lapid for example sought the advice of academic experts during his first few months at the ministry.

Italy

Score 7

The Monti government, as a non-party government predominantly composed of technocrats, experts and academics, has by definition given a much greater role in policymaking to academics. Moreover in a number of instances it has explicitly assigned to individual experts or to small commissions of them the role of providing further advice on particularly delicate matters (e.g., in the case of the review of state incentives to industries promoted by Monti in order to complete a deep rationalization of expenditures).

Lithuania

Score 7

Lithuanian decision-makers are usually quite attentive to the recommendations of the European Commission and other international expert institutions, but are also becoming increasingly receptive to involving non-governmental academic experts in the early stages of government policymaking. The first government in power during the period under review, under Prime Minister Andrius Kubilius, set up a number of advisory bodies composed of academic and other non-governmental experts. The succeeding government, under Social Democratic Prime Minister Algirdas Butkevičius, also created a few expert groups involving academic experts, including one responsible for reviewing the current tax system. The Butkevičius government also invited Lithuanian energy experts to offer advice, to be presented to both the government and parliament, on the nuclear-power-plant project in Visaginas. However, major policy initiatives are usually driven by intra- or interparty agreements rather than empirical evidence provided by non-governmental academic experts. In addition, the rarity of ex-ante impact assessments that involve consultation with experts and stakeholders contributes to the lack of timely advice based on evidence and analysis.

Luxembourg

Score 7

Luxembourg's main research institutions have been founded only recently: the national university was founded in 2003 and the three national research centers (CRP-Gabriel Lippmann, CRP-Henri Tudor, CRP-Santé) in 1999. For major policy reform projects, the government mostly consults highly reputed institutions abroad. Commissioning scholarly advice from institutions abroad favors independent analysis. Given the country's small size and the personal links between government and national research facilities, there are strong links between the institutes and governmental bodies which do not favor independence.

Citation:

Grubb, D. (2007), Audit du service public de l'emploi au Luxembourg: <http://www.oecd.org/fr/els/39424034.pdf>

Zanardelli, M., Brosius, J. (2009), Pratiques des entreprises du secteur privé en matière de prospection de candidats à l'embauche, in: CEPS/INSTEAD, Population & Emploi, no. 44, Luxembourg

Rössler, W. (2009), Psychiatrie Luxemburg. Stand der Umsetzung der Empfehlungen der Planungsstudie 2005: <http://www.sante.public.lu/fr/catalogue-publications/systeme-sante/politique-nationale-sante/rapport-rossler-psychiatrie-luxembourg-2009/index.html>

Rössler, W. et al. (1993), Gemeindepsychiatrie, Grundlagen und Leitlinien. Planungsstudie Luxemburg, Innsbruck

New Zealand

Score 7

The relevance, in terms of frequency and intensity of policy advice, of external academic experts on governmental policymaking depends on the subject area. Non-governmental academics with technical expertise can have a significant role in policy areas such as health, energy, social policy and tertiary education. In general, the importance of scholarly advice is increasing.

Citation:

Eichbaum, Chris und Richard Shaw: Minding the Minister? Ministerial Advisers in New Zealand Government, New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online, 2007, Vol. 2: 95-113.

Eichbaum, Chris und Richard Shaw: Revisiting Politicization: Political Advisers and Public Servants in Westminster Systems, Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions, 2008, Vol. 21, No. 3: 337-363.

Poland

Score 7

The Tusk government has strongly relied on scholarly advice. A broad range of experts from various academic institutions and nongovernmental organizations have been consulted. The Economic Council, set up in March 2010 and composed of scientists and practitioners alike, has become an important source of advice over economic policy. Jan Krzysztof Bielecki, the

council chairman, has strongly shaped the economic portion of Prime Minister Tusk's first government declaration after the 2011 elections as well as the government's investment program announced in late 2012. Compared to the first Tusk government, the setting up of expert commissions has featured less prominently. The consultation of experts has suffered from a lack of transparency, and in some cases experts have primarily acted as lobbyists.

Sweden

Score 7

The government's search for scholarly advice is less institutionalized today than it was 25 or 30 years ago when Royal Commissions would almost always include experts and scholars. With the decline in the Royal Commission institution (most commissions today are one-man task forces given 18 or 24 months to look into an issue and produce a final report), the government now seeks scholarly advice on a more ad-hoc basis.

There are some positive signs, however. The current government appears to have increased the number of boards or advisory groups where scholars (often but not always bona fide sympathizers of the ruling parties) can offer input and advice.

This issue also relates to the decreasing inclination among the government department staff to solicit advice or other contacts with external actors. Communication is today managed in detail and there are disincentives to open up to external actors at sensitive stages of the policy process. As a consequence, the openness towards scholarly advice depends much on the political salience of the issue. And when policymakers seek scholarly advice, it is in most cases ad-hoc and selective.

United Kingdom

Score 7

Non-governmental academic experts played an important role in conducting independent reviews of central government policy or strategy during the post-1997 Labour governments. They have worked on the economics of climate change (Sir Nicholas Stern), the future of the pension system (Lord Turner), a review of health trends (Sir Derek Wanless) and fuel poverty (Sir John Hills). Established academics have also served in decision-making bodies such as the Monetary Policy Committee of the Bank of England over the last 15 years and thus been given substantial influence over core decisions. Most government departments solicit external studies on policy-relevant issues. These reports are subject to normal procurement rules, typically with a restricted call for tenders.

The change in government has altered the political orientation of the experts who are being consulted, but the general practice has changed little. Similarly, the traditionally strong influence of think tanks has continued, but those of the left-leaning variety (Institute for Public Policy Research, Policy Network etc.) have been replaced by more conservative-minded ones (Bow Group, Centre for Policy Studies etc.). All these interactions are transparent, but they occur at various stages of the policy process and are often initiated by the think tanks themselves.

There are also many informal channels through which government consults, or is briefed by, individual academics who have expertise in specific areas. It is also routine for civil servants to be involved in academic events.

United States

Score 7

U.S. policymaking incorporates scholarly and expert advice in an informal and unsystematic manner. Along with university-based experts and analytic agency staffs, there are literally a few hundred think tanks – nongovernmental organizations that specialize in policy research and commentary. The Obama administration made extensive use of tapping the scholarly talent pool in its first term, less so in its second term. Most think tanks specialize in drawing on existing knowledge to produce partisan, ideologically oriented commentary and recommendations on policy issues. None of this analysis has official or authoritative status in the manner it would coming from an official expert panel. Rather, the two parties and even individual politicians make independent choices on which experts to pay attention to and cite in policy debate. The lack of formal, representative panels that make authoritative consensus assessments of research findings probably permits policy analysis to be more partisan and tendentious than it would be otherwise. The Obama administration, for example, has seized on a few studies that show large benefits of pre-school programs, even though most research shows small effects. In short, the flow of policy-relevant research is voluminous, but the policymaking process is relatively open to severely biased or unreliable analysis. The lack of officially endorsed consensus assessments may also account for the prominence of climate-change denial in U.S. politics.

Australia

Score 6

The federal government has always made extensive use of scientific and specialist scholarly advice, particularly in areas such as health and medicine, and science and technology.

Since the late 1990s, and particularly since 2007, the federal government has funded a range of specialist centers and institutes aimed at undertaking fundamental research and planning, the findings from which feed into government policy. Examples include government support for regulation and compliance centers at the Australian National University, with the Regulatory Institutions Network (RegNet), and the establishment of the Australia and New Zealand School of Government, which is a postgraduate faculty set up by the Australian and New Zealand governments, and by the state governments in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria.

Despite these formal mechanisms, academic influence on government decision-making is relatively limited, particularly in economic and social policy domains. However, there have been some indications of greater receptiveness to “evidence-based” policy formulation under the Labor government, with the previous prime minister calling it a key element of the government’s agenda for the public service.

Finland

Score 6

The government organizes the collection of scholarly advice mainly informally; for example, by consulting scientific experts on committee report drafts. Some formal bodies, such as temporary working groups, ad-hoc committees and permanent councils, also exist. In general, different permanent and non-permanent committees play an important role in structuring scholarly advice in government decision-making. An example of a permanent group that advises the government and ministries in research and technology matters is the Science and Technology Policy Council. Attempts at steering research in other terms than those pertaining to a topic alone are as a rule regarded rather unfavorably by the scientific community. Yet academics in the field of international politics used to participate in policy preparations and in networks of the foreign policy and security policy administration, and law representatives are employed often as experts in parliamentary committee hearings. In contrast, the social sciences in Finland have generally adhered to orientations that seek to uncover, explain and criticize rather than assist and support government efforts.

Germany

Score 6

In some policy fields, expert commissions advise policymakers on a regular basis. Most of their members are appointed by the government or by ministries. In addition, ad-hoc commissions are convened for specific complicated policy questions or major reforms. The German Council of

Economic Experts (Sachverständigenrat zur Begutachtung der Gesamtwirtschaftlichen Entwicklung) and the German Council of Environmental Advice (Sachverständigenrat für Umweltfragen) produce reports on current policy problems at least once a year. In addition, most ministries maintain external, academic or legal advisory bodies. In addition, ministries commission studies assessing the likely impact of existing or planned measures. These independent evaluations clearly have some impact on legislation. For example, labor-market policies in Germany have gained a strong reputation for being guided by empirical evidence and independent academic researchers' insights.

Policymaking is heavily influenced by party positions, and is less open to independent advice in cases when the issue at hand is central to a party's ideology. But for issues outside the ideological fray, independent expert advice is widely heeded.

In some cases, expert commissions are clearly used as an instrument for gaining voter support. For instance, the Ethics Commission on a Safe Energy Supply was created by Chancellor Angela Merkel on 22 March 2011 in response to the Fukushima meltdown. Its goals were to evaluate the technical and ethical aspects of nuclear energy, and to develop phase-out scenarios and proposals for the transition to renewable energy. Many observers regarded the creation of the commission as a tactical trick to give ex-post justification to a political decision that had already been made within the government. Another expert commission evaluated the impact of the state's family benefits, and came to the conclusion that most are in practice ineffective and unsuited to the problem. However, even these critical studies are made publicly accessible, and thus influence political debate within the government, the parliament and the general public.

Greece

Score 6

Non-governmental academic experts are influential in the sense that they often work as advisors to the government, to the prime minister and to ministers. Most of the ad hoc committees formed by ministers on public policy reform are staffed by academics. It is not uncommon for academics to take long leaves of absence from their university posts and follow a political career. For instance, two of Greece's recent prime ministers, Konstantinos Simitis and Lucas Papademos, were well-known academics.

In the tripartite coalition government which has been in power since June 2012, four major ministries – the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Administrative Reform, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Agricultural Development – are headed by academics. In short, in Greece

there is more than mere influence of academics in government decision-making, there is in fact an intermarriage between politics and the academia.

This interpenetration between politics (and more specifically policymaking) and academia can be explained by the lack of expertise and substantive research taking place in any institutions or businesses apart from universities, and the unattractiveness of civil service as a career path for high quality university graduates, like doctorate holders. Academics play the role of experts in all sectors of the economy and administration and also substitute for administrative elites, which are totally absent from the upper echelons of the over-politicized civil service.

Iceland

Score 6

The government occasionally consults academic experts. Traditionally, however, these have primarily been lawyers involved in preparing laws or who participate in various areas of the public administration, as well as the occasional economic or engineering expert. Moreover, experts consulted were often affiliated with the political parties of the ministers seeking their advice. Truly independent experts complained that their views were not taken seriously in the policymaking context. Thus, non-governmental academic experts cannot be considered to have had a strong influence on decision-making in the past.

However, the 2008 economic collapse changed this pattern. The need for scholarly advice on judicial, financial and economic issues, as well as on questions of public administration, increased markedly. This was particularly the case in connection with the preparation of the April 2010 parliamentary Special Investigation Committee (Rannsóknarnefnd Alþingis, SIC) report, which investigated the causes of the economic collapse. A number of experts in various fields, including law, economics, banking, finance, mass media, psychology and philosophy, contributed to the report. While no data exists on the broader use of academic advice in government decision-making in the post-crisis years, the SIC experience may have expanded the role of experts overall.

As became clear in academic debates over the new constitutional bill in 2012 – 2013, some academic experts follow the political line of the party or government that asks for their advice.

Japan

Score 6

The Japanese government is assisted by a large number of advisory councils, typically associated with particular ministries and agencies. These are usually composed of private-sector representatives, journalists, civil servants and trade unionists. It has frequently been asked whether these advisory boards truly have a decisive influence on policymaking, or whether the bureaucracy rather uses them to legitimize its policies by nudging seemingly independent bodies into making proposals that would be forthcoming in any case. The DPJ-led government that took over in 2009 was quite critical of the role of bureaucrats in policymaking. In addition, it was suspicious of the ubiquity of these advisory councils, which included a significant number of academic advisors. Many but not all councils' work was put on hold.

There are some indications that the LDP-led government that took over after the December 2012 general election wants to rely more on outside expertise and clout in order to overcome opposition against policy changes and reform. Naming Heizo Takenaka, an academic and former Prime Minister Koizumi's leading reform advocate, as a member of the new Industrial Competitiveness Council, is a clear signal of reform intentions.

Mexico

Score 6

In the Mexican political system, barriers between the government and scholars are comparatively low. It is quite common for a cabinet to include recruits from academia, and there are also substantial informal contacts between academics and public officials. By the same token, former government officials often teach at universities. The Mexican government is keen to strengthen relationships with economists, international relations professionals and other experts with technical expertise, particularly those who hold higher degrees from outside Mexico and have work experience in international or U.S. think tanks.

Some observers say, however, that the procedures of seeking academic advice are not formalized enough. There is an impression that policy advice is often obtained on an ad hoc basis.

Regarding the role of intellectuals in society, in general, they are held in high esteem and have every chance of influencing policy. Indeed, the current legislative agenda features many ideas about reform that were initially presented by public intellectuals.

Consultations with broader civil society are unlikely to achieve very much in contemporary Mexico. Lack of political will, rather than lack of discussion, has stalled progress. Important reforms have been on the agenda for many years.

What is clear is that President Pena Nieto has adopted a somewhat opaque policy style. His motto for pursuing reform is “politics, politics, politics,” thus giving preference to politics (negotiating, campaigning, ordering, overruling policy opposition etc.) over broad-based policy dialogue.

Netherlands

Score 6

The government frequently employs commissions of scientific experts on technical topics like water management, harbor and airport expansion, gas drilling on Wadden Sea islands and pollution studies.

The function of scientific advisory services in departments has been strengthened through the establishment of “knowledge chambers” and, following US and UK practice, the appointment of chief scientific officers or chief scientists as advisory experts. These experts may – depending on the nature of policy issues – flexibly mobilize the required sciences and scientists instead of relying on fixed advisory councils with fixed memberships.

Through a top-sector innovation policy which exploits procedures for funding of scientific projects (Dutch National Science Foundation or NOW and Netherlands Foundation for Applied Scientific Research or TNO) the government tries to establish government-business-academia or “triple helix” consortiums to run research projects with possible strategic impacts on government policy. For example, TNO established – with universities and companies – some 30 knowledge or innovation centers, to develop and commercialize new developments.

Although the use of scientific expertise is quite high, its actual influence on policy cannot be estimated as scholarly advice is intended to be instrumental, and therefore is not yet welcome in the early phases of policymaking. It is certainly not transparent to a wider public. Since 2011 advice has regressed from relatively “strategic and long-term” to “technical, instrumental and mid-/short-term.”

Slovakia

Score 6

The Radičová government actively sought the advice of non-government experts. Herself a university professor, Prime Minister Radičová was highly familiar with think tanks and the academic realm. The Fico government, by contrast, has taken a more “corporatist” approach toward seeking advice. Its new advisory body, the Solidarity and Development Council, predominantly consists of representatives of the social partners and other interest organizations. However, five of Fico’s 13 personal advisors have been experts from the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

South Korea

Score 6

Nongovernmental academic experts have considerable influence on government decision-making. Most observers believe that the influence of expert commissions has decreased somewhat, as President Lee has abolished many of those established by his predecessors. However, he also created many new commissions with different focuses, such as the G-20 task force assigned the job of preparing for the G-20 summit. The selection of scholars is very narrow and exclusive. The process of naming experts remains highly politicized, and expert commission reports seem to be utilized according to their political rather than their scholarly value. Beyond their work in commissions, scholars are often tapped to serve in government positions.

Citation:

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Korea, <http://www.jinsil.go.kr/English/index.asp>

Time running out on South Korea’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Stars and Strips, January 19, 2010, <http://www.stripes.com/news/time-running-out-on-south-korea-s-truth-and-reconciliation-commission-1.98156>

Truth in danger in South Korea, The Sydney Morning Herald, January 23, 2010, <http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/politics/truth-in-danger-in-south-korea-20100122-mqq5.html>

Spain

Score 6

It would be inaccurate to state that scholars and other independent experts have a dominant influence on Spanish policymaking. No practice of formal and systematic connections between external thinking and the government as a whole exists. Policymakers do not rely on specialists for advice on matters of political strategy, although university scholars or other researchers are often summoned by ministries for technical consultation on legal, economic, welfare and international issues – particularly at the beginning of any legislative process to prepare the draft bill and to assess its impact. Notwithstanding this, the role of academics in the Spanish policy process

may be considered somewhat more significant if we take into account that they are a standard source of recruitment for senior positions. Many members of the government come from the academic world (a pattern which is more obvious when the socialist party is in office, since the conservatives tend rather to select almost all ministers and top officials from among businessmen and career civil servants close to the party).

The deep political and economic crisis may have increased the tendency of the Spanish government to ask formally or informally for external advice to help in the institutional redesign or the welfare system structural adjustment in a context of high public deficit (for example, two panels of experts were created in 2012 for the reforms of the pensions system and the university system). In addition to this, some recent trends such as the emergence of several think tanks may reinforce the influence of external experts.

Switzerland

Score 6

In the Swiss political system, the drafting of bills takes place mainly in extraparlimentary and parliamentary committees. As of 2012, about 120 of these extraparlimentary committees existed, with government-selected members that included academics, representatives of interest groups and parties, individuals with particular expertise and other such experts. While there are multiple criteria for selecting members, the government seeks a balanced representation of language groups, political parties and ideologies, and other societal interests. Academics are selected on the basis of academic profile, but their allegiance to political parties or other societal interests may also be taken into account. Thus, while expert commissions and their members do have a dominant influence on governmental decision-making, the influence of academics per se is much more limited than is the influence of the politically constituted groups as a whole. In addition, the share of academics on these commissions is rather limited, amounting to about 11% of all seats. However, the combined total of academics and high-level federal and canton civil servants (who usually have academic training) accounts for 53% of all commission seats.

Strong external pressure on Swiss policy, in particular by the European Union, limits the scope of possibilities afforded to national decision-making, and hence also the potential impact of domestic experts.

Turkey

Score 6

The participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and experts in political decision-making has increased in recent years. In line with EU standards, the government in 2002 issued an emergency action plan, underlining that all regulatory reforms would be initiated in close consultation with NGOs. The government occasionally asks outside experts to prepare opinions (for example, during the constitutional reform process, several professional associations, trade unions and NGOs submitted papers to the Government Office and to parliament) or to help with surveys or reports on individual issues, but it is unclear how far such contributions have an impact on government decision-making. In the framework of its foreign policy doctrine ("Strategic Depth"), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has consulted or appointed scholars who share similar viewpoints with the incumbent government party.

There is also a trend in the executive branch that many government positions are filled by civil servants with an academic degree. In addition, pro-government think tanks and organizations, including the Abant Platform, the Foundation for Research on Policy, Economy and Society, SETA, the Institute for Strategic Thought and SEDA, provide regular reports for the government. In recent years the number of public opinion survey companies (Pollmark, GENAR, Metropoll) has grown, and the government does consider their publications when forming policy.

Austria

Score 5

Due to the fragmented structure of the Cabinet, there is no coherent pattern of using scholarly advice. The extent to which each ministry seeks systematic academic advice is up to the individual minister.

Economic and financial policy is the only area in which general scholarly advice is commonly sought and available. Two institutions, established respectively by the social partners (the Austrian Institute of Economic Research (Österreichisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung)) and through a mix of public and independent funding (the Institute for Advanced Studies (Institut für Höhere Studien)) regularly articulate specific opinions such as economic forecasts. Governments typically take these two institutions' work into account when making policy.

Belgium

Score 5

Consultation with non-governmental academic experts depends on the subject matter; their actual influence on eventual decisions is relatively limited, and certainly marginal when compared to the influence of experts who are attached full-time to ministerial cabinets. In most matters, some academic experts who are not professional politicians are hired to the minister's cabinet. The advantage of this process is that they become full-time government experts who bring experience to improve government expertise. Revolving doors also exist between the university and the government itself. The president of the Francophone Socialist Party, Paul Magnette, is a former political science professor, while the economics minister, Johan Vande Lanotte, is a professor of law.

One problem however is that since hired experts become fully tied to their minister and the minister's party, they lose some independence in the process. There is also a risk that these experts are selected precisely because they share close views with the minister. The government and/or the Parliament do consult full-time academic experts with independent views, but not in a systematic way, and not necessarily to generate genuine scientific debate. What is systematic, in Belgium's neo-corporatist context, is the summoning of representatives of "social partners" (employers' organizations and trade unions) when a strategic decision is to be made. This means that the influence of academic experts is relatively limited.

During the economic crisis, for example, the Chamber of Deputies summoned three external experts (one academic and two bankers with strong knowledge of the economy) and one expert from the Federal Planning Bureau, a state agency. Ten other people outside politics – representatives of employers and unions, members of the consumers' association, and individuals from a major Belgian company – also took part in the meeting.

As part of the bankruptcy of financial group Fortis, four experts (of which three were academics) were part of the commission to help parliamentary members lead the investigation; 50 people outside government (of which two were full-time academics, one was an OECD expert, and several experts from the National Bank, some of whom were also university professors) were summoned by the commission.

Citation:

http://www.lachambre.be/kvvcr/pdf_sections/publications/annualreport/Rapport%20annuel%202008-2009.pdf, p65 and pp102-104

Bulgaria

Score 5

In Bulgaria, there are various ways to consult stakeholders and experts, including a special online portal at the Council of Ministers and more than 70 advisory councils. The government is also beginning to use a mechanism of seeking expertise by forming public councils linked to specific ministries. After a positive experience with such a council at the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works at the beginning of 2013, such councils have been constituted for several other ministries. The lack of a specific emphasis on attracting experts from academia is a structural weakness of these consultation mechanisms.

Czech Republic

Score 5

In the Czech Republic there are several advisory bodies and a number of public research institutions which are closely linked to certain ministries and partly dependent on state funding. However, the actual influence of academic experts is limited. For instance, when the National Economic Council (NERV), an expert body advising the Office of the Government, proposed 40 concrete steps to improve the competitiveness of the Czech Republic in 2012, the recommendations were not taken up by the government. Another case in point is pension reform. An earlier attempt involved wide consultation and inputs from political parties. Discussion prior to the last reform involved a commission, the majority of whose members were linked to private pension firms. None of the commission members came from an academic or research background.

Ireland

Score value_6

Academics have always enjoyed quite a high profile in Irish journalism and have been forthcoming with commentary and advice on public policy. During the bubble period, Irish academic opinion was by no means united about the prospects for a “soft landing” for the Irish economy. Some did warn about the impending housing and banking bubbles and the need for greater fiscal prudence, but many tended to minimize the risks involved.

Since the crisis there has been a significant increase in academic commentary on economic and social policy through websites such as www.irisheconomy.ie, www.politicalreform.ie, www.politics.ie and www.publicpolicy.ie.

Academics have regularly held advisory posts in government ministries, including the prime minister's office and the department of finance. In 2009, an academic was appointed governor of the central bank, breaking with the long-established tradition that the retiring permanent secretary of the department of finance would succeed to the governorship.

Advisors meet regularly with their ministers but there is no information on the impact on policy-making of the advice proffered.

There is no established pattern of open consultations with panels of non-governmental experts and academics, although some ad hoc arrangements have been made from time to time.

Citation:

The official blog of the Political Studies Association of Ireland (PSAI) is at www.politicalreform.ie

Latvia

Score 5

The decision-making system is transparent and open to public participation from the point at which policy documents are circulated between ministries in preparation for review by the cabinet. At this stage, experts and NGOs have the opportunity to provide input on their own initiative.

During earlier policy planning stages, the system is not as transparent, but is generally open to consultation. While ministries are not required to follow a set procedure for consultation, most have developed some good practices. For example, ministries sometimes invites academics to join working groups in order to provide their expertise. The government lacks the financial capacity to commission input from the academic community on a regular basis. Expert engagement thus generally takes place on a voluntary, unremunerated basis. The government included experts in policy planning groups in 290 cases in 2011, and 380 in 2012.

The ministries of Agriculture and Environment and Regional Development have a permanent consultative mechanism supported by public funds. In 2011, 11 ministries had signed memoranda of cooperation with NGOs. In 2012, non-governmental experts were involved in 264 ministerial working groups engaged in drafting new legal legislation, up from 176 in 2011.

Citation:

State Chancellery (2012), Report, Available at (in Latvian): <http://www.mk.gov.lv/vk/gada-parskats/>, Last assessed: 20.05.2013.

Malta

Score 5

In a very few cases, standing commissions in which government officials and academics or experts convene (such as the Commission on the Family) act both as adviser to the government and proposer of policy. It is also not unusual for the government to set up interim commissions composed of academics and other experts to investigate a policy issue and make recommendations for future policy, as was the case of the Commission to Investigate the Manufacturing of Fireworks in Malta. Policy issues have at times been the focus of studies directly sourced from the faculties and institutes at the University of Malta. Tenders for contracts are also released and are often won by organizations such as Malta University Services, a business group. Information required by the government may also be contracted out on an individual basis. But the appointment of interim commissions is the most common method adopted by the government.

Generally the government likes to appoint individual “expert” consultants, the norm being that these consultants engage more in the implementing of policies as outlined by the government than in providing advice on the policy content. Another issue is that many outside experts already have close relations to the political party in government, sometimes also having contested elections on behalf of the party in government. This renders the process of consultation suspect, and certainly not transparent. One example of the flaws in this process is a reform of the bus system, implemented in 2011; the reform overall was unsuccessful and expensive, as the parameters for consultancy were entirely decided before the problem had even been first studied.

Portugal

Score 5

The government utilizes academic experts for research on a wide variety of topics and to implement strategic development. The use of academic experts is especially relevant in economic issues, but limited in its scope by the Memorandum of Understanding.

Croatia

Score 4

The 2009 Societal Consultation Codex – guidelines for the policymaking process – also mentions the consultation of academic experts. In practice, however, the involvement of academic experts in the policymaking process remains rare. Moreover, it is largely limited to the early phases of policy

formulation and does not extend to the final drafting of legislation, let alone the monitoring of implementation. From a comparative perspective, the Kosor government has relied more strongly on the expertise of leading Croatian macroeconomists than the Milanović government.

France

Score 4

In contrast to some other European countries, the French government does not rely much on academic advice, even though the President's Office and the Prime Minister's Office frequently consult economists, and that outstanding nongovernmental academics may be chosen to sit in on national reflection councils covering various policy fields (integration, education, and so on). But the influence of academics is not comparable to what can be found in many other political settings. High-level civil servants tend to consider themselves self-sufficient. Once the government has chosen a policy strategy, it tends to stick to it without significant discussion over the appropriateness or effectiveness of choices made. There is nothing comparable in France to the economic institutes in Germany, for example, the opinions of which serve to guide the government and offer a platform for public debates.

Romania

Score 4

The cooperation between the Romanian government and non-governmental academic experts is only weakly institutionalized. The Romanian Academic Society (SAR) prepares an Annual Policy Analysis and Forecast Report, the presentation of which involves a number of politicians and ministers, but it is unclear how this report feeds into policymaking. Academic experts, civil society representatives, and even Constitutional Court and Superior Council of Magistracy members are intended to have the opportunity to monitor the intricate process of constitutional reform. While it remains to be seen to what extent the final draft of the new constitution will take into account the advice of academic experts, it is encouraging that high-level political leaders (including Prime Minister Victor Ponta and the head of the parliamentary constitutional reform commission, Crin Antonescu) participated in a set of debates on constitutional reform organized by the Constitutional Forum, a civil society group coordinated by some well-known academics.

Slovenia

Score 3

In Slovenia, the Government Office and the ministries have various advisory bodies that include academic experts. The influence of independent academic experts was weaker under the Janša than under the Pahor and Bratušek governments. Prime Minister Janša regarded most scholars and think tanks as allies of the political opposition and thus was not very interested in their advice. Instead, he relied only on the advice of scholars from the private academic institutions created by his previous right-wing government in the 2004 – 2008 term. Some of those scholars were even recruited as state secretaries and high-ranking civil servants.

Cyprus

Score 2

Although there is a tradition of setting up advisory bodies that may include academics and specialists in various disciplines, their tasks and scope of work have been limited to very specific topics. These groups have primarily served to inform the public on a specific issue, or have drafted reports and issued proposals that have largely been ignored given their nonbinding character. None of these bodies has had any role in strategic planning or top-level decision-making. In some cases, the administration has sponsored research by institutes or universities. A rare example of the involvement of academics was seen in the 2012 creation of the Advisory Committee for Natural Gas, coordinated by a deputy minister to the president. However, this group's role was largely to provide advice in specific fields rather than to offer long-term strategic proposals. Generally, consultation between government and external academic experts has not been an established practice.

The new government has created an economic council headed by economics Nobel prize winner Christophoros Pissarides, a citizen of Cyprus.

Hungary

Score 2

The political polarization in Hungary has resulted in a deep conflict between the government and non-governmental academic experts. The government under Prime Minister Orbán has shown no interest in independent advice. During the country's time holding the EU Presidency, in the first half of 2011, the government excluded non-governmental experts from all EU-related activities, although most of them had already participated in preparations and had good contacts abroad. Some eminent experts close to the Orbán government at the beginning of its term have since turned against the

government. Two cases in point are Tamás Mellár, former president of Central Statistical Office, and Frigyes Solymosi, a leading member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

This report is part of the Sustainable Governance Indicators 2014 project.

© 2014 Bertelsmann Stiftung

Contact:

Bertelsmann Stiftung
Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256
33311 Gütersloh

Dr. Daniel Schraad-Tischler
daniel.schraad-tischler@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Najim Azahaf
najim.azahaf@bertelsmann-stiftung.de