

**SGI** Sustainable  
Governance  
Indicators

# 2015 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, including Strukturkommissionen, Velfærdskommissionen, Arbejdsmarkedskommissionen, and Skattekommissionen, and currently a pension commission and a commission on unemployment insurance. In addition, it is quite common to appoint expert groups to prepare inputs for important policy discussions and reforms. The members can be experts, representatives of organizations or civil servants. Moreover, professionalism in ministries has increased.

More overarching strategic policy plans or documents with a strong focus on economic policy in recent years have been the government's 2010 plan, 2015 plan and now 2020 plan. The latter is linked with the EU's Europe 2020 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.

An important part of the government's National Reform Program for 2014 is modernization of the public sector, including digitization by 2020. Every company received a digital mailbox in November 2013. In November 2014, every citizen will get a digital mailbox.

It should be noted that government policies traditionally have been consensus-driven. This applies both to 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](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nrp/nrp_denmark_en.pdf) (accessed 20 April 2013).

The National Reform Programme Denmark 2014.

[http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2014/nrp2014\\_denmark\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2014/nrp2014_denmark_en.pdf)

## Finland

Score 9

Strategic planning has considerable influence on government decision-making. The 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 its key objectives are met. Meanwhile, the preparation and monitoring of programs is delegated to ministerial groups. In addition, the Committee for the Future deals with future-related matters.

Citation:

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

## 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.

## Latvia

### Score 8

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 a long-term strategic approach to public policymaking, while also monitoring decision-making to ensure that public policies are effective. 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 the Latvia 2030 framework and established an active role for itself in decision-making. The PKC reviews all proposals discussed by the cabinet and provides weekly briefings for the prime minister on substantive issues pending discussion by the cabinet. The PKC has also been tasked with analyzing cross-sectoral issues, such as evaluating public 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 and despite a reduction in departmental units and staff numbers, most ministries have retained some independent planning capacity. Ministerial planning units engage with the PKC, engaging the PKC early in policy development. However, the PKC is not well-staffed and cannot engage in the policy development processes of all line ministries. The PKC has become mired in the details of policy planning, effectively duplicating the work of ministries and has failed to provide the cross-sectoral, meta-approach expected of it. This is a result of a persistent inability, of the PKC, to retain highly qualified analysts.

#### Citation:

The Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre, Information Available at (in Latvian): <http://www.nap.lv/par-pkc>, Last assessed: 31.10.2014

## 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. The main strategic documents include the long-term Lithuania 2030 strategy and the medium-term National Progress Program, which is

in turn linked to short-term strategic-performance plans and budget programs. 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 meetings of government members or ministerial representatives. 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. Its composition was updated after the new government was appointed, and meetings are held on a regular basis.

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 the long-term policy aims contained in various strategic documents and the actual practices of individual public-sector organizations. 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. 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 of 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, as Mexico was too bound to international economic trends to make its own decisions. However, as in several other countries in Latin America, planning has become more popular once again. The major challenge to planning in Mexico and Latin America consists in creating sufficiently tight links between the agencies responsible for the planning and the implementing agencies. In this regard, it could be argued that conditions for planning were reasonably favorable in the recent past, because no major policy transformations were underway. By contrast, the implementation of several highly significant recent reforms will put Mexico’s planning skills to the test.

## 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 a large number of government departments and 28 ministers, most of them responsible for a number of portfolios, 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 2013 (Wellington: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet 2013).

Better Public Services: <http://www.ssc.govt.nz/better-public-services> (accessed October 9, 2014).

Performance Improvement Framework: <http://www.ssc.govt.nz/pif> (accessed October 9, 2014).

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

State Services Commission: Annual Report for the Year Ended 30 June 2013 (Wellington: State Services Commission 2013).

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.

The previous government invested considerable energy to increase the coordination among government departments and to provide better steering of the executive agencies.

Historically, policy planning has been achieved to a large extent by the use of Royal Commissions. Most of these Commissions were composed of elected officials and stakeholders. During the past decade or so, the quality of these Commissions – particularly with regard to the quality of the studies they deliver and their capacity to generate consensus among major political actors and stakeholders as to policy goals and means – has deteriorated. Many Commissions today have very few members and are often dominated by civil servants. This had a negative impact on the Commissions' final reports and the quality of the advice they produce.

Citation:

Svenska framtidsutmaningar. Slutrapport från regeringens framtidskommission (2013) (Stockholm: Statsrådsberedningen) (<http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/21/33/06/9cde7be8.pdf>)

## United Kingdom

**Score 8** 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. A substantial effort has been made since 2010 to modernize the civil service, with a cabinet-level minister taking the lead, resulting in a civil-service reform plan launched in 2012. Establishing policymaking as a profession is one of the stated goals, a task that will have potentially long-term consequences for steering capability and strategic capacity.

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. Previously, this body had been staffed by a large number of special advisers whose much-debated authority to issue orders to civil servants had been politically contentious. In 2012, the prime minister (PM) and deputy prime minister (DPM) established a dedicated Implementation Unit (IU) within the Cabinet Office, charged with driving implementation in areas deemed by the two top ministers to be of high priority. The IU's function is both to challenge and support line ministries, while providing evidence-based advice to the PM and DPM. It also oversees departmental business plans. One consequence of the coalition government is that the prime minister has had to consult with the deputy prime minister, and the need for compromise has thus required close contact between the two parties.

Citation:

[https://civilservicelearning.civilservice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/twelve\\_actions\\_report\\_web\\_accessible.pdf](https://civilservicelearning.civilservice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/twelve_actions_report_web_accessible.pdf)

Institute for Government (2014) Whitehall Monitor 2014 A data-driven analysis of the size, shape and performance of Whitehall <http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/IFG%20-%20Whitehall%20Monitor%202014.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. On the legislative side, the Congressional Budget Office analyzes the 10-year fiscal impact of all bills with budget implications. 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 has been little reform. 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. The Abbott government, elected in September 2013, rationalized the number of government departments and agencies shortly after coming into office and in May 2014 announced plans to abolish 230 bureaucratic programs and 70 government bodies and reduce the number of public service employees by 16,500 over three years. The implications for strategic planning are unclear, but are unlikely to be positive.

The main weakness of the country's strategic planning is the absence of a vision for Australia's economic development. After the resources boom the country is looking for policy options, but the government has not developed any.

Citation:  
<http://www.blackincbooks.com/books/dog-days>

## 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. 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 with the minister. 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. 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, policy planning 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

Israel's government adopted the practice of strategic planning only in the 1990s. Previously government actions were based on practical experience 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 a planning division was developed in the Israeli Defense Forces in the early 1970s.

Today, 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 internal 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. 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:

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>

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)

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

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

## 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.

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 associated with executive capacity. However, these shortcomings have subsequently been mostly rectified.

## Poland

### Score 7

Since the inauguration of the first Tusk government, Poland has ambitiously sought to improve its strategic-planning capacity, given impetus by EU demands and partly motivated by the objective of improving its 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 previously uncoordinated assortment of 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) establishes a framework for a limited number of medium-term strategies.

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 South 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 the previous Lee Myung-bak administration compared to its predecessor Roh's administration. The Lee administration was sometimes more pragmatic and sometimes more ideological than previous administrations, but also more oriented toward the short term. Instead of being concerned with long-term goals, Lee viewed 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. Park Geun-hye's administration, in contrast, has shifted priorities towards achieving "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](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 developing the Spanish National Security Strategy. The renewed attention paid to structural reforms and security policy could be the basis for developing the incipient Spanish strategic-planning capacity and for strengthening coordinating bodies connected to the strategic-planning units close to the prime minister. Some of these bodies are already hold a fair degree of authority (the National Security Council or the Council of Ministers Committee on Economic Affairs). Others, such as the Foreign Policy Council, ought to be more effective and powerful (following the suggestion made by the Spanish Strategy on External Action approved at the end of 2014). In addition to the central policy-planning units, strategic advisors exist in some sectoral ministries (Economy, Defense, Foreign Affairs), but this activity is normally understaffed, and the advisors’ access to the political decision makers is limited.

## 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.

After the 2013 general elections, the two biggest parties decided to once again re-establish their coalition government despite electoral losses. As a further decline of their strength in future elections seems likely (which means that the formation of government coalitions of only two parties is becoming increasingly unlikely), the new coalition could have been an opportunity (possibly the last one for the foreseeable future) to create new (i.e., more efficient) structures in the political system that will help the country address emerging challenges. But the governing parties have to date not met expectations in this respect.

## Croatia

Score 6

The introduction of strategic-management tools has just begun in Croatia's public administration. At the 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. However, the quality of these plans has been low. In most cases, they tend to be updated incrementally.

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 unit has limited staff, although two additional employees were hired in 2014.

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.

## Ireland

### Score 6

In the past, the Irish approach to strategic planning was ad hoc and crisis driven. While this remained true in the immediate aftermath of the crisis, there is some evidence that Irish policymakers have improved their strategic-planning capacity since that time. The annual reports on the Program for Government document a more coherent strategic approach to policymaking over the past three years, with increased use of advisory bodies.

However, independent advice is not always followed. The Fiscal Advisory Council urged the government to devote the revenue gains arising from the recent improvement in the economy to a faster reduction of the budget deficit, and to avoid premature relaxation of controls on tax and spending. Similar advice was proffered by the Economic and Social Research Institute. This advice was not fully implemented in the 2015 budget.

## 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 regular reports 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 had

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 had reduced somewhat their positive impact. The current Renzi government, which features a strong personalization of leadership, does not seem particularly inclined to strengthen the role of strategic planning bodies.

## Japan

### Score 6

After the failed attempts of the 2009 - 2012 DPJ-led coalitions to reform strategic planning in institutional terms, the LDP-led government elected in December 2012 formulated the goal of strengthening strategic capacity at the center. It revived the Council on Economic and Fiscal Policy, used by former Prime Minister Koizumi (2001 – 2006) as a key reform instrument. Moreover, a Headquarters for Japan's Economic Revitalization was established within the Cabinet Secretariat. It further created an Industrial Competitiveness Council, reporting to the prime minister as well as a Regulatory Reform Council. Several reformers of the Koizumi era have reappeared, including former reform minister Heizo Takenaka at the Industrial Competitiveness Council. The Abe-led government tries to use the councils to develop new policy proposals, create a consensus among reform-minded circles (including beyond government) and take them into the public sphere. Given the slow progress of “third arrow” reforms, the eventual outcome seems not particularly compelling. Nonetheless, the councils have at least contributed in a constructive way to public discourse. For instance, it can already be considered a success that the Regulatory Reform Council in mid-2014 dared to publish suggestions on how to reform Japan Agricultural Cooperatives, the stronghold of farmers' traditional interests.

## 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. Since the reforms and reductions of the strategic advisory councils, the Scientific Council for Government Policy actually remains the only advisory council for long-term strategic policy issues.

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. 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.

Citation:

R. Hoppe, 2014. Patterns of science/policy interaction in The Netherlands, in P. Scholten & F. van Nispen, *Policy Analysis in the Netherlands*, Policy Press, Bristol (ISBN 9781447313335)

## Turkey

Score 6

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).

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. In general, these meetings are held once in a year and 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](http://www.sp.gov.tr/upload/xSpKutu)

Evrin Tan, Toward a managerial state. Turkey's decentralization reforms under the AKP government, Charles Conteh and Ahmed Shafiqul Huque (eds.), Public sector reforms in developing countries, Abington, Oxon: Routledge, 2014.

## 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 as a part of the European Union's 2020 strategy. There is not much more strategic-planning capacity at the center of government. 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 various ministries and on the basis of extensive discussions with the relevant expert communities. They are overseen by the line ministries and parliamentary committees responsible for these policy areas.

## 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, renamed France Stratégie, to strengthen its role in prospective political planning.

In spite of these various instruments, there is nothing similar in terms of comparable influence to Germany's economic institutes, for example. In addition, it is striking how the political actors over the past years have been unable to publicly propose a "vision" or at least a credible analysis of what policies could or should be introduced.

## Portugal

### Score 5

Portugal's Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Troika, covering the 2011 – 2014 period, strictly limited opportunities for strategic planning. Even during the period under consideration here (15 May 2013 – 7 November 2014), which includes some of the post-MoU period, the pressure to decrease the public deficit resulted in few changes with regard to strategic capacity. While strategic planning is pursued with regard to finances and in the economy more generally, this was severely limited by the terms of the MoU and by negotiations with Portugal's international lenders. For example, there continue to be expert groups and offices consisting of government employees and outside experts formulating policies, such as the Departamento de Prospectiva e Planeamento de Ministério do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território e Desenvolvimento Regional; the Direcção Geral de Estudos, Estatística, e Planeamento (concerning employment); and the Gabinete de Estudos das Pescas. Most ministries have some kind of office or group dedicated to

strategic planning. These occasionally exert some (limited) influence. However, under the current bailout terms, strategic planning is even less evident than prior to the bailout.

## Czech Republic

### Score 4

In the Czech Republic there is 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: one by the interim Rusnok government in August 2013, which set only short-term objectives; and by the Sobotka government in February 2014. The existing problems of and the eligibility conditions for European Structural Funds led to the adoption of several sectoral strategies, including a Strategic Framework for the development of public administration in the Czech Republic 2014-2020, a Regional Development Strategy of the Czech Republic 2014-2020 and an Educational Policy Strategy 2020.

## Germany

### Score 4

On 17 December 2013, a new German government headed by the country's two most important political parties, the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD) came into office and formed a grand coalition. The grand coalition has shown no interest in improving strategic planning in the Federal Chancellery or in the federal government. No important organizational devices for strategic planning were introduced at the beginning of the parliamentary term. The new head of the Federal Chancellery, Peter Altmaier, was again given the status of a minister without portfolio, strengthening his position vis-à-vis the minister-presidents of the federal states (Länder) and the heads of the 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 for 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.

Although there is a planning group in the Federal Chancellery, its number of staff is extremely small. It is led by Eva Christiansen, who also serves as Chancellor Merkel's media adviser. For quite some time now, strategic planning has not been afforded high-priority by the federal government.



## Greece

### Score 4

Strategic planning has long proved difficult for the central government in Athens. Government has often suffered from an “archipelago”-like quality, with conflicting political interests, clientelism, and a highly formalistic administrative culture serving to enhance segmentation.

Traditionally, strategic planning has relied on small groups inadequately integrated into the governmental process. The 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. Since 2012, the PMO has included a group of lawyers and party cadres who are close associates of the prime minister and leader of the governing center-right party New Democracy (ND). At the PMO there is a Directorate of Strategic Planning, whereas at the Ministry of Finance there is a Council of Economic Advisors. In 2013-2014, the PMO followed closely the progress made by each ministry regarding milestones such as the passage of specific reform measures that had been dictated to the Greek government in exchange for continued bailout installments.

The Troika insisted on reform to enhance central direction and oversight. In 2012, a Government Council on Reform was created in order to pursue long-term goals related to public sector reform, but it has not assumed programming and planning functions. These are still in the hands of the minister of public administration. This Council has convened several times in 2013-2014, but its function is primarily to provide the prime minister and the minister of public administration with a sounding board and above all with a wider legitimating basis for new bills of law drafted to effect reforms in the public sector.

To sum up, strategic planning is limited to the time horizon of the bailout packages and does not look beyond 2016. Long-term planning suffers as a result, but the PMO and individual ministries have benefited from learning to work with the Troika. The higher echelons of the Greek government and public administration have become more sensitive to the need for systematic planning.

## 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/fr/acteurs/autres/index.html>

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

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

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

## Malta

Score 4

Each government ministry has a director and unit responsible for strategy and planning. These groups have been especially active in the Ministry of Finance, the Malta Planning and Environmental Authority, the Malta Transport Authority, the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs, and 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. In some cases, ministries employ consultants to produce reports on current policy issues, a practice that may be regarded 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.

## 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 strengthening of the expertise of the Government Office and the creation of the Solidarity and Development Council, a new advisory body, under the second Fico government failed to improve planning capacities in any substantial way. Due to the Fico government's initial emphasis on fiscal consolidation, the role of the Institute of Financial Policy, a research institute affiliated with the Ministry of Finance, has increased. However, the Institute has taken a relatively narrow fiscal perspective and has focused on the short to medium term rather than on the long term.

## 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.

## Cyprus

**Score 3** General strategic planning, institutionalized under the Planning Bureau and directorates of the Ministry of Finance, was neglected until recently. The practice was integrated more deeply into the country’s administration as a result of the reforms imposed through the MoU of April 2013. The Planning Bureau was renamed as the Directorate General for European Programs, Coordination and Development, and given new tasks. Its new mission includes managing EU funds and issues related to the Lisbon Strategy, as well as planning, monitoring and coordinating government work. This shift will allow the body to supplement the Ministry of Finance’s primarily budgetary planning, and expands the spectrum of planning performed to include more aspects of development.

Most administrative units still fail to set action plans and identify goals. Indeed, the current crisis is tangible evidence of chronic problems in this regard. However, a new law officially makes strategic planning, coordination and performance monitoring the foundations of economic policymaking and budget design. Creating the mechanisms, procedures and services required to achieve this will take some years, however. During the period under review, contradictions between government officials’ statements and announcements indicated that planning and coordination gaps still exist. Nevertheless, the fact that small improvements in planning have produced better results than forecast is indicative of the country’s potential.

Citation:

1. The new structure of former Planning Bureau,

[http://www.dgepcd.gov.cy/dgepcd/dgepcd.nsf/index\\_en/index\\_en?OpenDocument](http://www.dgepcd.gov.cy/dgepcd/dgepcd.nsf/index_en/index_en?OpenDocument)

2. The Law on Fiscal Responsibility and Fiscal Framework, [http://www.cylaw.org/nomoi/arith/2014\\_1\\_20.pdf](http://www.cylaw.org/nomoi/arith/2014_1_20.pdf) (in Greek)

## Hungary

Score 3

Political action often outpaces strategic planning In Hungary. In its early years, the second Orbán government produced a large number of strategy papers. However, these plans suffered from a short-term focus and a lack of consistency, and were often later abandoned. As the Orbán governments have subordinated all political actions to the goal of consolidating their power, economic and fiscal priorities have frequently shifted, and not much effort has been invested in building institutional capacities for strategic planning. After the 2014 local elections, Prime Minister Orbán promised to elaborate a long-term development strategy for the country. The lack of such a strategy featured prominently in the 2014 Annual Report of the Hungarian European Business Council (HEBC), an association made up of Hungary's major exporting companies. According to this report, "If the government were to sum up and publish its ideas for the future of Hungary in a country strategy it would receive a unanimous welcome from the business world. (...) A country strategy would largely contribute to predictability and increased competitiveness."

Citation:

HEBC, Hungarian European Business Council (2014) Annual Report: Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, Budapest, [http://www.hebc.hu/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/hebc\\_report\\_2014\\_Sustainable-and-inclusive-growth.pdf](http://www.hebc.hu/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/hebc_report_2014_Sustainable-and-inclusive-growth.pdf)

## Iceland

Score 3

Long-term strategic planning in Iceland is often vague, with comparatively weak execution, supervision and revision of plans. When specific objectives are established in the policy planning phase, a lack of sufficient incentives or institutional mechanisms typically limit their realization. As a result, government can delay or change implementation of strategic plans. For example, the parliament approves a strategic regional policy every four years (Stefnumótandi byggðaaætlun), but – as this plan has the status of a parliamentary resolution rather than law – the government has no binding obligation to implement the plan. Consequently, only certain aspects of these four year plans have ever been implemented.

Policymaking is monitored by cabinet ministers, who rely on their respective ministerial staff for advice and assistance.

Under the new government, traditional non-partisan channels within public administration have been replaced with politically appointed advisers.

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).

## Romania

**Score 3** The most important strategic-planning unit within Romania's government is the Secretariat General of the Government, which is in charge of developing the Integrated Strategic Plan and overseeing its implementation. However, this plan in practice plays only a minor role in policymaking. 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. Absorbed by crisis management, the Bratušek government took a primarily short-term approach. The incoming Cerar government announced that would expand planning capacities.

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

Technocratic institutions and practices 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.) tend to have a great degree of influence 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. As a political practice, this can be described as institutionalized, as both the former and the current coalition followed this tradition. Under the current government, the main policies of 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 commissions dealing with the issue. 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/](http://www.dors.dk/) (accessed 20 April 2013).

Det Økonomiske Råd 1962-2012 - Et jubilæumsskrift, De Økonomiske Råd, København.

## 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.

## United Kingdom

**Score 8** 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.

When the coalition government took power, the change altered the political orientation of the experts consulted. However, a further shift in practice was due to the commitment to what is known as open policymaking (OPM), under which policymakers are called on to actively seek broader inputs into the policy process. 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. What appears to have changed is the underlying approach to OPM, with a stronger emphasis on not just using the evidence base, but also on identifying new and better policy concepts and solutions.

There are also many informal channels through which government consults or is briefed by individual academics who have expertise in specific areas. These channels are often more influential than more formal consultation processes. One recent example was the review of the balance of competences between the EU and the national level, in which several government departments made very extensive attempts to engage with academics. It is also routine for civil servants to be involved in academic events.

## 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, such as the annual Estonian Human Development Report, are also presented at the parliament's plenary sessions.

## Israel

**Score 7** The government has several interfaces with experts and representatives of academia. Experts can sit on independent public committees to examine the causes and consequences of a specific event or incident (such as the Trajtenberg Committee that was formed following the 2011 social justice protests). They can also serve in permanent committees that consult with the government on a regular basis (such as the National Economic Council in the Prime Minister's Office) or be summoned by parliamentary committees to present opinions or to offer a different perspective on a particular issue. Finally, think tanks and research institutes act as brokers between the academic world and politics, advocating and offering information on current events and policy issues.

Ministers often appoint an external advisory committee to assist with specific issues. One significant example is the Shashinsky Committee, appointed by the Minister of Finance to examine government fiscal policy on oil and gas. Israeli ministers also often consult informally with academic experts, primarily to receive guidance that is distant from political interests.

## 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 current government under Social Democratic Prime Minister Algirdas Butkevičius has retained some of the advisory bodies set up under the previous government, and has also created some new expert groups involving academic experts. However, major policy initiatives are usually

driven by intra- or interparty agreements rather than by empirical evidence provided by non-governmental academic experts. In many cases, expert recommendations are not followed when the main political parties are unable to come to a political consensus, as was recently the case following a review of the tax system by a working group involving academic experts. In addition, the rarity of ex ante impact assessments involving 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. The House of Innovation already provides space for 500 scientists and researchers from CRP-Henri Tudor, Luxinnovation and the Dr. Widong Centre in Esch-Beval.

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>  
 Rössler, W. (2009), Psychiatrie Luxemburg. Stand der Umsetzung der Empfehlungen der Planungsstudie 2005, <http://www.sante.public.lu/publications/systeme-sante/politique-nationale-sante/rapport-rossler-psychiatrie-luxembourg-2009/rapport-rossler-psychiatrie-luxembourg-2009.pdf>  
 Rössler, W. et al. (1993), Gemeindepshychiatrie, Grundlagen und Leitlinien. Planungsstudie Luxemburg, Innsbruck  
 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

## 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 relied strongly on scholarly advice. Thus far, there is no sign that Prime Minister Kopacz has a different approach. A broad range of experts from various academic institutions and non-governmental organizations have been consulted. The Economic Council, established in March 2010 and composed of scientists and practitioners, has become an important source of advice regarding economic policy. However, the establishment of new expert commissions has featured less prominently than in the first Tusk government. The consultation of experts has suffered from a lack of transparency, and in some cases experts have acted primarily 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 former government increased the number of boards or advisory groups where scholars (often but not always bona fide sympathizers of the ruling parties) could 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 toward 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 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 a few hundred think tanks – nongovernmental organizations that specialize in policy research and commentary. The Obama administration made extensive use of the scholarly talent pool in its first term, but 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 the official or authoritative status that might derive 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 debates. 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. 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. Australian governments accept advice on technical issues, but much less so on political and economic issues.

## Czech Republic

### Score 6

In the Czech Republic, there are several permanent or temporary advisory bodies and a number of public research institutions that are closely linked to certain ministries and partly dependent on state funding. Within the cabinet, there is a unit consisting of consultants and advisors to the prime minister. Under Prime Minister Sobotka, the number of official advisors more than doubled, from 17 under Prime Minister Nečas in January 2013 to 36, with an emphasis on prominent academics and researchers. The advisors' task is to evaluate the substantive content of legislative materials and to prepare a strategic agenda for the government. However, the government has taken up recommendations by these and other academic experts only selectively.



## Finland

Score 6 The government predominately organizes the collection of scholarly advice 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 generally tend to analyze, 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 respective ministries. In addition, ad hoc commissions are created to help with specific policy questions or major reforms that involve complex issues. There are other established expert advisory bodies providing the government with expertise and advice, such as the German Council of Economic Experts (Sachverständigenrat zur Begutachtung der Gesamtwirtschaftlichen Entwicklung) and the German Advisory Council on the Environment (Sachverständigenrat für Umweltfragen), which produce reports on current policy problems regularly (the former at least once a year, the latter every four years).

Most ministries maintain external, academic or legal advisory bodies. In addition, ministries commission studies that assess the likely impact of existing or planned measures. These independent evaluations sometimes have an impact on legislation that is manifest in some of the substantive policy reforms over the past decade. The 2003 Hartz reforms addressing labor market issues represent one notable example of how a report issued by an expert commission served as a blueprint for government reforms. The introduction in 2009 of the debt brake to the German constitution was prepared by a commission (Föderalismuskommission) that drew extensively on expert input from academia in defining the provisions for a debt limit. However, the impact of experts is often less visible and policymaking is heavily influenced by party positions. When the issue at hand is central to a party's ideology, the parties

tend to be less open toward independent or external advice.

The Commission of Experts for Research and Innovation (Expertenkommission Forschung und Innovation, EFI), established in 2006 by the federal government, presented its third report on research, innovation and technological performance in August 2014 with proposed measures that were, however, met with criticism by the government.

In a different case, an expert commission was established in 2009 to evaluate the impact of the state's family benefits. In its report that was published in 2014, the experts criticized these benefits as ineffective in practice and ill-suited to address specific problems. Although this report – like many others similar to it – did not have an immediate impact, they do bear some influence on political debates within the government, the parliament and among the general public because they are made publicly accessible.

## Greece

**Score 6** Non-governmental academic experts are consulted as advisors to the government, prime minister and ministers. Most of the ad hoc committees formed by ministers on public policy reform are staffed by academic experts.

The interpenetration of politics (and more specifically policymaking) and academia can be explained by the fact that expertise and substantive research are found more commonly in universities than within government or in businesses or other institutions. It also underscores just how unattractive a career in civil service is to those university graduates with tertiary-level degrees. Qualified academics often serve as experts in all sectors of the economy and administration, where they also act as administrative elites, which simply do not exist in Greece's highly politicized civil service. Moreover, the size and quality of policy think tanks varies significantly and often offers little alternative to ad persona advisory inputs.

## Iceland

**Score 6** The government occasionally consults academic experts. Typically these experts are trained lawyers, who provide advice on the preparation of specific laws or public administration practices, but economic and engineering experts have also been consulted. Moreover, these experts are often affiliated with the political party of respective minister seeking their advice. Meanwhile independent experts involved in the policy process have previously complained that their views were ignored. Thus, impartial, non-governmental experts should not be considered to have had a strong influence on decision-making.

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 with the April 2010 parliamentary Special Investigation Committee (Rannsóknarnefnd Alþingis) report, which investigated the causes of the economic collapse. A number of experts in various fields – including law, economics, banking, finance, media, psychology and philosophy – contributed to the report. While no data exists on the broader use of expert advice in governmental decision-making, the Special Investigation Committee experience may have expanded the role of experts overall.

Academic experts called upon to advise the government are commonly viewed as being politically partisan. This has reduced public confidence in academic expertise in Iceland.

## 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, academics, journalists, former civil servants and trade unionists. The question is whether advisory boards do truly impact policymaking or whether the executive simply uses them to legitimize preconceived policy plans. The answer may well vary from case to case. The recent hand-picked, high-level “Advisory Panel on Reconstruction of the Legal Basis for Security,” whose final report in May 2014 helped to legitimize a reinterpretation of the constitution allowing for collective self-defense, serves as an example for the latter. In other areas the current LDP-led government has to some degree relied on outside expertise in order to overcome opposition to policy changes and reform. Relevant moves include inviting Heizo Takenaka, former Prime Minister Koizumi’s leading reform advocate, to join the new Industrial Competitiveness Council and having Columbia University scholar Jeffrey Sachs provide economic policy advice to Prime Minister Abe. More generally, however, think tanks do not play a major role in Japan’s policymaking cycle.

Citation:

Pascal Abb and Patrick Koellner, Foreign Policy Think Tanks in China and Japan:

Characteristics, Current Profile, and the Case of Collective Self-Defense, unpublished manuscript, Hamburg 2014.

## 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. However, the procedures by which academic advice is sought are often not formalized enough, a fact that leads not only to a frequent lack of transparency regarding relations between academia and politics, but also to the fact 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 the broader civil-society sphere are unlikely to achieve much in contemporary Mexico. On the supply side, Mexico's civil society is as yet not particularly vibrant in international comparison. On the demand side, the lack of political will, rather than any lack of discussion per se, has stalled progress. Important reforms have been on the agenda for many years. What is clear is that President Peña Nieto has adopted a somewhat opaque policy style. His motto in pursuing reform is "politics, politics, politics," thus giving preference to political activities (negotiating, campaigning, ordering, overruling policy opposition, etc.) rather than 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.

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."

Citation:  
R. Hoppe, 2014.

## South Korea

Score 6 Nongovernmental academic experts have considerable influence on government decision-making. Academic experts participate in diverse statutory advisory bodies established under the office of president and prime minister. Advisory commissions are usually dedicated to special issues of the president's policy preferences. Many advisory commissions have been abolished after the change of government. The selection of scholars is very narrow and exclusive. The process of naming experts remains highly politicized and expert commission reports are 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/ind ex.asp>

Time running out on South Korea's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Stars and Strips, January 19, 2010, <http://www.strips.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 to advise the Popular Party government for the pension- and university-system reforms). Some recent trends, such as the emergence of several think tanks, may reinforce the influence of external experts. As an illustration of this, the Elcano Royal Institute (the leading Spanish think tank on international affairs) was commissioned in 2014 by the

Foreign Ministry to produce a foreign-policy report, laying the groundwork for the official strategy on external action that was approved later.

Citation:

[http://elpais.com/elpais/2014/02/25/inenglish/1393346199\\_347622.html](http://elpais.com/elpais/2014/02/25/inenglish/1393346199_347622.html)

## Switzerland

Score 6

In the Swiss political system, the drafting of bills takes place primarily within extraparliamentary and parliamentary committees. As of October 2014, 122 of these extraparliamentary committee 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.

## 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 or to help with surveys or reports on individual issues.

In 2013, a major step was the establishment of a so-called Wise Men Group of intellectuals, writers, academics and celebrities in favor of the government's reconciliatory approach. This group was tasked to start a dialogue with all segments of society on questions and worries related to Kurdish issue. The group reported the results of the dialogue to the government, and was reactivated in 2014 following the presidential elections.

In addition to working with pro-government think tanks, the government consults with pro-government academic experts even in the context of projects sponsored by

the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union. In other words, the spectrum of communication with outside experts is narrowing, as the government has begun to exclude “impartial” experts from the pool. As Turkish politics has become increasingly polarized, the government and the AKP have seemed to shut themselves off from broader societal influences, basing decision-making increasingly on information provided by loyal personal or clientelist networks. In many state and private universities, the number of pro-government faculty has increased through new hires or transfers from other institutions.

Citation:

Gazi'de ‘ikna odaları’ kuruldu akademisyenler tehdit ediliyor, 5 September 2014, <http://www.birgun.net/news/view/gazide-ikna-odalari-kuruldu-akademisyenler-tehdit-ediliyor/4959>

Akademisyenlerden Tanrıverdi'nin Projelerine Tam Not, Akhisar Haber, 27 March 2014, <http://www.akhisarhaber.com/akademisyenlerden-tanriverdinin-projelerine-tam-not-19020h.htm>

## 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.

The Institute for Advanced Studies now faces financial problems that threaten its existence and the overall system of scholarly advice provided to the government.

## Belgium

Score 5

Consultation with non-governmental academic experts depends on the subject matter; their actual influence on eventual decisions is quite limited most of the time, and certainly marginal when compared to the influence of experts who are attached full-time to ministerial cabinets (see below). 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. One exception might prove to be the Pension Commission, which brought together scholars and politicians to produce a



comprehensive report on how to reform the Belgian pension system. It remains to be seen what its impact will be.

A different channel through which academic expertise is used for policymaking is that ministers sometimes hire such experts to work in their cabinet, thereby allowing scholars to become policymakers. Revolving doors also exist between the university and the government itself. The former president of the Francophone Socialist Party, Paul Magnette, is a former political science professor. The new minister of justice, Koen Geens, was a law professor at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Hired experts, however, once they have become fully tied to their minister or to the government, often lose some independence of thought in the process. Therefore many academics maintain some distance vis-à-vis direct political expertise duties. There is also the risk that these experts are selected precisely because they share close political views with the minister or the party.

## 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 has also started to seek out 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. There are no formal routines for consulting academic experts during the course of government decision-making, but representatives of academia and research institutes are traditionally included in the process on an ad-hoc basis.

## Ireland

### Score 5

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. The Fiscal Advisory Council, established in 2011, is a panel of independent experts, mainly drawn from academia.

Academics have regularly held advisory posts in government ministries, including the prime minister's office and the department of finance. Advisers meet regularly with their ministers but there is no information on the impact on policymaking 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:

Academics are active in several recently-formed independent blogs that may have some influence on policy maker. These include

<http://www.irisheconomy.ie/>  
<http://www.publicpolicy.ie/>  
<http://www.politicalreform.ie>  
<http://www.nerinstitute.net/>

## Italy

### Score 5

The current government does not regularly consult non-governmental academics. A small group of academics loyal to the prime minister frequently offer technical advice, but more independent academics are not regularly consulted. Important bills rarely benefit from a public and transparent consultation of scientific experts. Under the Letta government in 2013, a process of this type was however organized for the constitutional reform proposals. A commission of experts involving highly qualified academics was set up and produced a comprehensive report. The Renzi government has been less keen to adopt similar procedures.

## 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.

In 2013, changes were made to the decision-making system, instituting a system of green papers – public discussion documents – that present policy proposals for public debate at an earlier stage in the planning process. The State Chancellery monitors ministerial use of green papers. From 1 September 2014, the Chancellery began postponing cabinet discussions on policy proposals that have not adhered to the green paper procedures.

Earlier stages of policy development are not as transparent, but do seek to engage and consult stakeholders. While ministries are not required to follow a set procedure for consultation, most have developed some good practices. For example, ministries often seek expert advice by inviting academics to join working groups. However, the government lacks the financial capacity to regularly commission input from the academic community. Consequently, expert engagement is given voluntarily, without remuneration. Experts participated in 290 policy planning groups in 2011 and 380 groups in 2012.

#### 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** Consultation processes involving academic experts has always been rather intermittent, but since 2013, such experts have been involved in a greater number of areas including family issues, gay rights, care of the elderly, health issues such as diabetes, IT in schools, and others, including on a Commission to Investigate the Manufacturing of Fireworks in Malta. With the exception of standing parliamentary committees, which regularly consult with academic experts, the government tends to consult with outside experts in an issue-based and ad hoc manner. Policy issues have at times been the focus of studies directly commissioned 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, an academic consultancy group. Information required by the government may also be contracted out on an individual basis.

The government generally seeks to appoint individual “expert” consultants, with these consultants typically tasked more with implementation of policies as outlined by the government than with the provision of advice on policy content. Many of the outside experts appointed already have close relations to the political party in government, sometimes having contested elections on behalf of the party. In the eyes of the public, this renders the process of consultation suspect, and indeed interferes with transparency.

## Portugal

**Score 5** The government utilizes academic experts for research on a wide variety of topics and to implement strategic development. However, they are largely used on an ad-hoc basis, and without a systematic pattern of academic consultation in place.

## Slovakia

**Score 5** Prime Minister Fico does not typically include non-governmental academic experts in government decision-making processes, preferring instead a more corporatist approach to seeking advice. External advisors largely come from the “Fico circle,” and include former cabinet members rather than independent experts. Under the second Fico government, the number of external advisors from the Slovak Academy of Science has significantly diminished.

## Croatia

Score 4 The 2009 Societal Consultation Codex, which serves as guidelines for the policymaking process, 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.

## 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 though outstanding nongovernmental academics may be chosen to sit in national reflection councils covering various policy fields (integration, education, etc.). 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. The presidential elections gave non-governmental academic experts a certain degree of influence on the public agenda in 2014, primarily through informal means rather than institutional channels, as official consultation mechanisms remain unusable.

## Slovenia

Score 4 In Slovenia, the Government Office and the ministries have various advisory bodies that include academic experts. The Bratušek government was relatively receptive to external advice. Miro Cerar, the new prime minister, relied on academic and practitioners' advice when establishing his party platform and government program.

## Cyprus

### Score 3

Cyprus has a tradition of advisory bodies that include academics and specialists in various disciplines. However, their tasks and scope of work have been limited to very specific topics. They have primarily served to inform the public on specific issues, or have drafted reports and made proposals that are generally ignored given their non-binding character. Hardly any of these bodies has had a role in strategic planning or top-level decision-making. In some cases, the administration has sponsored research by institutes or universities. A recently created Advisory Committee for Natural Gas, coordinated by a deputy minister to the president, involved academics; however, this group had a limited role (i.e., 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.

In the period under review, three consultative bodies were created, including a committee for economic issues headed by Cypriot Nobel laureate Christophoros Pissarides, a committee for energy policy, and a committee for geostrategic studies. Although all three included academics, their role and influence is still not well defined, which has led to criticism. Academics were additionally appointed to the governing bodies of semi-governmental organizations in 2014.

#### Citation:

1. Membership selection and role of consultative bodies, <http://cyprus-mail.com/2014/09/20/our-view-will-anyone-even-take-notice-of-new-geostrategic-and-energy-councils/>

## Hungary

### Score 2

The political polarization in Hungary has resulted in deep conflict between the government and non-governmental academic experts. The Orbán governments have shown no interest in seeking independent advice. Some eminent experts who were initially close to the Orbán government later turned against it. The most prominent case in this regard has been Tamás Mellár, president of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office under the first Orbán government, and research director of Századvég Institute during the second. Mellár supported the demonstrations against the Internet tax, and criticized his former institute in several interviews for being a “money laundering” institution. The third Orbán government dissolved the Institute of International Relations affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For administrative issues, it has relied almost exclusively on the newly established University of National Administration (Nemzeti Közszoigálati egyetem), at the cost of traditional universities’ influence.

This country report is part of the Sustainable Governance Indicators 2015 project.

© 2015 Bertelsmann Stiftung

Contact:

Bertelsmann Stiftung  
Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256  
33311 Gütersloh

Dr. Daniel Schraad-Tischler  
[daniel.schraad-tischler@bertelsmann-stiftung.de](mailto:daniel.schraad-tischler@bertelsmann-stiftung.de)

Dr. Christian Kroll  
[christian.kroll@bertelsmann-stiftung.de](mailto:christian.kroll@bertelsmann-stiftung.de)