



Interministerial Coordination Report

GO Expertise, Line Ministries, Cabinet Committees, Ministerial Bureaucracy, Informal Coordination, Digitalization for Interministerial C.

Sustainable Governance Indicators 2019

©vege - stock.adobe.com

Indicator

GO Expertise

Question

Does the government office / prime minister's office (GO / PMO) have the expertise to evaluate ministerial draft bills according to the government's priorities?

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 = The GO / PMO provides regular, independent evaluations of draft bills for the cabinet / prime minister. These assessments are guided exclusively by the government's priorities.
- 8-6 = The GO / PMO evaluates most draft bills according to the government's priorities.
- 5-3 = The GO / PMO can rely on some sectoral policy expertise but does not evaluate draft bills.
- 2-1 = The GO / PMO does not have any sectoral policy expertise. Its role is limited to collecting, registering and circulating documents submitted for cabinet meetings.

Australia

- Score 9 The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet is responsible for policy coordination, and as such evaluates and provides advice on major proposals from federal ministries. The department has significant resources, and has authority to draw from, and consult with, appropriate sources across the entire government system.

Citation:

<https://www.pmc.gov.au/who-we-are>

Canada

- Score 9 Draft bills are vetted primarily by the Privy Council Office and to a lesser extent by Finance Canada and the Treasury Board. These central agencies are highly prestigious and central-agency experience is extremely important for advancement to senior levels within the federal public service. Consequently, central-agency staff members are highly skilled and possess the comprehensive sectoral-policy expertise needed for the regular and independent evaluation of draft bills based on the government's strategic and budgetary priorities.

Chile

- Score 9 The president's advisory ministry (Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Segpres) and the Government or Cabinet Office (Ministerio Secretaría General de Gobierno, Segegob) have at their disposal the necessary instruments and capacities

to monitor and evaluate the policy content of line-ministry proposals. Nevertheless, channels of evaluation and advice are not fully institutionalized, and may change with a new head of state.

Finland

Score 9

As a ministry in itself, the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) has the capacity to evaluate proposed policy. The primary function of the PMO is to support the duties of the prime minister, who directs the work of government and coordinates the preparation and consideration of government business. The PMO monitors the implementation of the government program and coordinates Finland's EU policy. In addition, the PMO is tasked with coordinating communications between the government and various ministries, planning future-oriented social policies, and promoting cooperation between the government and the various branches of public administration. The PMO has six departments: the Government EU Affairs Department, the Government Administration Department, the Ownership Steering Department, the Government Communications Department, the Government Strategy Department and the Government Session Unit. The PMO has a secretary of state, a permanent undersecretary of state and some 550 employees arranged within several task-specific units. Team Finland, which is guided by the PMO, is a network tasked with promoting international trade and relations, improving the efficiency of business cooperation abroad, and increasing the ease with which Finnish customers can access international business services.

Citation:

<http://vnk.fi/en/frontpage>

<http://team.finland.fi/en/frontpage>

Latvia

Score 9

The formation of the PKC, which reports directly to the prime minister, has ensured a mechanism enabling input from the government office on the substance of policy proposals from line ministries. The PKC evaluates all proposals to be addressed by the cabinet on a weekly basis, focusing on three issues: cross-sectoral impact, adherence to the government declaration and compatibility with long-term strategy documents (such as the National Development Plan and Latvia 2030).

Citation:

1. National Development Plan 2020, Available at (in Latvian): <https://www.pkc.gov.lv/lv/valsts-attistibas-planosana/nacionalais-attistibas-plans>, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

2. Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, Available at: http://www.pkc.gov.lv/sites/default/files/images-legacy/LV2030/LIAS_2030_en.pdf, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

United Kingdom

Score 9

The primary coordinating role is undertaken by the Cabinet Office, which has expertise in all areas of government since Cabinet Office officials commonly worked in other departments before. According to its website, the Cabinet Office has over 2,000 staff, is responsible for the National Security Council and is central to “making government work better.” The Cabinet Office’s Economic and Domestic Secretariat is responsible for coordinating policy advice to the prime minister and the cabinet, and the attached Parliamentary Business and Legislation (PBL) Secretariat provides advice on legislation and supervises progress made by bill drafting teams. The head of the Economic and Domestic Secretariat is also responsible for the Implementation Unit and the operation of the Implementation Task Forces, which oversee the implementation of government policies, and coordinates between ministers and public officials. Implementation Unit staff are policy experts from the civil service with good ministerial networks and excellent substantive expertise. The role of the Treasury in putting pressure on departmental spending also contributes to interministerial coordination.

Mexico

Score 8

The presidential office offers positions of high prestige in Mexico. It is involved with the legislative process to a decisive degree. Due to the absence of a high-level career civil service, both the cabinet and the presidential office are staffed with presidential appointments. The independence of figures within the executive is thus questionable since everyone of influence in the presidential office is a political appointee. It is relevant to note that the majority of legislative proposals introduced by the executive failed in post-1997 Mexico – a successful proposal submitted as part the “Pact for Mexico” during the early years of the Peña Nieto administration notwithstanding. Political roadblocks rather than any lack of policy expertise are responsible for these problems.

New Zealand

Score 8

The policy-advisory group in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) currently consists of 12 staff members covering a broad spectrum of policy expertise. They are in constant contact with the prime minister and provide advice on all cabinet and cabinet committee papers. They also engage in coordinating interministerial cooperation. The policy-advisory group provides direct support to the prime minister on specifically commissioned initiatives. In 2015, a Legislation Design and Advisory Committee (LDAC) was established with the aim of improving the quality and effectiveness of legislation. The LDAC advises departments

regarding the design and content of bills while still in the development stage.

To support the prime minister and her government's priorities, DPMC added two new units in 2018: the Child Poverty Unit (CPU) and the Child Well-being Unit (CWU). DPMC's wider Policy Advisory Group continues to play a crucial role in aligning the public service's effort in supporting the government's priorities and providing free and frank advice to the prime minister on all items of government business.

Citation:

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Annual Report 2018. <https://dPMC.govt.nz/publications/annual-report-2018>.

Norway

Score 8

The Office of the Prime Minister has a small to medium-sized staff of 30 to 50 people, about 10 of which are political advisers, with the rest being professional bureaucrats. The office is not tasked with evaluating policy proposals in detail, but rather works to coordinate activities, ensure that government policies are roughly aligned, and monitor whether policy planning is adequate and is following prescribed procedures. The office has sufficient expertise and capacity for these purposes, and is considered to be an elite department with very highly skilled employees. The tradition of coalition governments in Norway involves strong coordination activity among the government coalition partners.

South Korea

Score 8

South Korea's presidential system has a dual executive structure, with the president serving both as head of state and head of government. The prime minister is clearly subordinate to the president and is not accountable to parliament. The presidential office, known as the Blue House, has the power and expertise to evaluate draft bills. As the real center of power in the South Korean government, the Blue House has divisions corresponding with the various line-ministry responsibilities. The Prime Minister's Office has sufficient administrative capacity and nonpolitical technocrats to design and implement policies and strategies politically chosen by the Blue House. President Moon has promised to decentralize powers, and plans to hold a referendum to amend the constitution in this manner. As of the time of writing, however, constitutional reform has been stalled due to objections by opposition parties.

Citation:

Government Performance Evaluation Committee, <http://www.psec.go.kr>

The Korea Institute of Public Administration (KIPA), <http://www.kipa.re.kr>

Kong, Kanga. "Moon Seeks to End South Korea's 'Imperial' Presidential System." Bloomberg.com, Bloomberg, Mar. 2018, www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-03-22/moon-seeks-to-end-south-korea-s-imperial-presidential-system.

Spain

Score 8 Spain's Government Office (Ministry of the Presidency) and Prime Minister's Office (Gabinete) are tasked with evaluating line-ministry proposals from the political and technical points of view. The two departments together form the very powerful political core of the executive. In general, these different units have ample staff with specific policy expertise, whose task is to substantively assess draft bills and other important sectoral initiatives to ensure they are compatible with the government's strategic and budgetary priorities. The internal structure of the Prime Minister's Office vaguely reflects the various ministerial portfolios, although without achieving a comprehensive policy expertise that enables perfect oversight throughout the executive. For its part, the Government Office, which is also responsible for organizing the Council of Ministers' cycle of sessions, and whose head is the powerful deputy prime minister, has no sectoral-policy expertise, but also evaluates the substantive content of draft bills to some extent. Nevertheless, despite the extensive constitutional and political strength of the Spanish premiership, these units enjoy only limited administrative resources. Their relatively small size is perhaps explained by the hierarchical, single-party nature of the Spanish government, in which it is not particularly necessary to monitor sectoral ministers from the center.

Citation:

Structure of the Ministry of the Presidency

<https://administracion.gob.es/pagFront/espanaAdmon/directorioOrganigramas/fichaUnidadOrganica.htm?idUnidOrganica=171&origenUO=gobiernoEstado&volver=volverFicha#.W8m9MWgzY2w>

Sweden

Score 8 Interministerial coordination has been a significant problem in the Swedish system of government for a long time but has now been addressed in a comprehensive strategy. The previous government (2006 – 2014) implemented a major program (“RK Styr”) in order to strengthen the coordination among departments. This goal was believed to be a necessary step to increase the capability of the GO to steer the agencies more effectively.

In formal and legal terms, the government and its departments act as a collectivity. All decisions in government are made collectively and there is no individual ministerial accountability. The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) plays a significant role in the coordination process. This is also the case for the finance ministry. Furthermore, when the incumbent government is a coalition government, as has been the case since 2006, policies must be coordinated not just among the relevant departments but also among the governing parties.

The practice of governing and coordination is much more complex. Each department has a fair amount of autonomy in their respective sector. Coordination among departments takes places at different organizational levels depending on whether the

issue is a technical and administrative issue, or whether it is a more political matter. With the latter, political actors make the final decisions. When bills involving more than one department are drafted, coordination is achieved through meetings where drafts of the bill are discussed. There are instances where drafts have gone through a very large number of revisions as part of the coordination process. In pro-growth policies in the mid-2000s, for instance, the bill that eventually was submitted to the parliament (Riksdag) was the 56th version of the bill.

The lack of coordination has to some extent been resolved by increasing the centralization within the Government Office. The finance ministry has become a “primus inter-pares” among the departments; a pattern that emerged in the wake of the financial crises in the early 1990s but that has remained ever since.

The PMO rarely coordinates policy content, which generally takes place during the process of deliberation or drafting of bills.

Citation:

Dahlström, C., B. G. Peters and J. Pierre (eds) (2011), *Steering from the Center* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Jacobsson, B., J. Pierre and G. Sundström (2015), *Governing the Embedded State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Niemann, C. (2013), *Villkorat förtroende. Normer och rollförväntningar i relationen mellan politiker och tjänstemän i Regeringskansliet* (Stockholm: Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm).

Pierre, J. and G. Sundström (eds) (2009), *Den nya samhällsstyrningen* (Malmö: Liber).

Premfors, R. and G. Sundström (2007), *Regeringskansliet* (Malmö: Liber).

Belgium

Score 7

The Prime Minister’s Office contains a “strategic cell” that helps the prime minister evaluate and steer policy across all levels. Typically, this oversight function is shared with deputy prime ministers (one per coalition party, apart from the prime minister’s party) in a regular “core” meeting. Each of the advisers and experts in the cell specializes in one field. They assess only the most important issues, as the relatively small size of the team limits its ability to deal with all issues at hand. The fact that governments are always coalitions (comprised of at least four parties) also gives a central role to party advisers of the corresponding minister in the lawmaking process.

Denmark

Score 7

The Danish Prime Minister’s Office (PMO) is relatively small. It normally has a staff of about 80, spread between three groups (i.e., academics, technical and administrative staff), the academic group being the largest.

The office is divided into two main sections, one dealing with foreign policy and the second with domestic political and economic issues. There is also a law division and an administrative division. The High Commissioner for the Faroe Islands and the High Commissioner for Greenland also fall under the PMO. The prime minister's portfolio tasks include the North Atlantic area (e.g., Greenland and the Faroe Islands), the press, constitutional law and relations with the Royal Family.

Given its small size, the PMO does not have the capacity to evaluate the details of all laws. But some officials are seconded from important line ministries to give the PMO a certain capacity. This capacity has been strengthened since the 1990s.

There is a strong tradition of so-called minister rule (ministerstyre). A minister is in charge of a certain area, but the cabinet is a collective unit and is supposed to have only one policy focus, for which the prime minister has the overall responsibility. Coordination takes place through special committees. Most important is the government coordination committee which meets weekly. Other committees are the committee on economic affairs, the security committee and the appointment committee. There is also a tradition of two-day government seminars once or twice per year where important government issues are discussed.

Citation:

Website of the Prime Minister's Office: http://www.stm.dk/_a_2570.html (accessed 16 October 2017).

Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen, Peter Munk Christiansen og Marius Ibseb, Politik og forvaltning, 4. udgave, Hans Reitzels Forlag, 2017.

Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen and Jørgen Elklit (eds.), Det demokratiske system. 4. udgave. Hans Reitzels Forlag, 2016.

France

Score 7

There are three main loci of policy evaluation once a policy proposal has been forwarded to the prime minister. The first is the Prime Minister's Office (PMO), the second is the President's Office, and the third, in cases of legislation or regulation, the Council of State. This hierarchical organization gives the prime minister the option of modifying ministers' draft bills. In important cases, this steering function is located in the President's Office. Both the president and the prime minister appoint civil servants from all ministries as policy advisers for every sector. All ministerial domains are covered. Several hundred people are involved in government steering, checking, controlling and advising functions.

However, it would probably be overstated to consider these various checks a method of evaluation. The PMO mainly coordinates and arbitrates between ministries, takes into consideration opinions and criticisms from involved interests and from the majority coalition, and balances political benefits and risks. The President's Office does more or less the same in coordination with the PMO. More than offering a thorough policy evaluation, these two institutions serve as a place where the ultimate arbitrations between bureaucrats, party activists and vested interests are made.

Hungary

Score 7

The Orbán governments have steadily expanded both the competencies and the resources of Prime Minister's Office (PMO). The PMO is central in policy coordination and makes sure that policies are as close in line as possible with the prime minister's policy preferences and Fidesz's ideological rhetoric. The PMO is supported by five background institutes with about 200 employees paving the ground for ideological coherence. The Veritas Institute, an institute of contemporary history, is the most important among them. Its main role is to rehabilitate the Horthy era. The usual expert bases are the Nézőpont and Századvég Institutes, both with well-paid, but strongly biased researchers. In addition to the PMO, there is the prime minister's cabinet office. Under its head Antal Rogán, it has developed into a ministry with state secretaries and undersecretaries responsible for government communication.

Ireland

Score 7

The influence and effectiveness of the Irish Prime Minister's Office (Department of the Taoiseach) is limited by a dearth of analytical skills. One frequently made criticism focused on the continued reliance on "generalist" recruitment to the civil service.

The department is focused on strategic policy issues and the delivery of the Programme for Government. The Department of the Taoiseach has steadily grown over the years from about 30 people in 1977 to just over 200 in 2017. The Department of Finance is much larger with over 500 people. The Department of the Taoiseach coordinates policy in specific policy areas (e.g., Northern Ireland, European affairs and, the current hot topic, Brexit). Nevertheless, most policymaking continues to take place in the line ministries.

An expert group on strengthening civil service accountability and performance reported to government in May 2014. Among the numerous recommendations it made, it proposed the establishment of an accountability board for the civil service, chaired by the taoiseach but including external members. This board would be tasked with reviewing and constructively challenging the performance of senior management as well as monitoring progress on the delivery of agreed-upon priorities. It also recommended that the Irish Civil Service be given an appointed head. The government rejected the proposal for a head of civil service, but an accountability board with independent members was established in May 2015.

Citation:

The report of the Independent Panel on Strengthening Civil Service Accountability and Performance is available here:

<http://www.per.gov.ie/civil-service-accountability-consultation-process/>

Niamh Hardiman, Aidan Regan and Mary Shayne (2012), 'The Core Executive: the Department of the Taoiseach and the Challenge of Policy Coordination,' in Eoin O'Malley and Muirís MacCarthaigh (eds). *Governing Ireland: from Cabinet Government to Delegated Governance*. Dublin: IPA.

Japan

Score 7 The Cabinet Secretariat has more than 800 employees with expertise in all major policy fields. These employees are usually temporarily seconded by their ministries. While these staffers possess considerable expertise in their respective fields, it is doubtful whether they can function in an unbiased manner on issues where the institutional interests of their home organizations are concerned. Moreover, the system lacks adequate infrastructure for broader coordination (including public relations or contemporary methods of policy evaluation).

Citation:

Izuru Makihara, The Role of the Kantei in Making Policy, nippon.com, 27.06.2013, <http://www.nippon.com/en/features/c00408/>

Markus Winter, Abe and the Bureaucracy: Tightening the Reins, The Diplomat, 16 June 2016, <http://thediplomat.com/2016/06/abe-and-the-bureacracy-tightening-the-reins/>

Lithuania

Score 7 Under Prime Minister Kubilius, the Government Office was reorganized into a Prime Minister's Office and given the task of assisting in the formulation and execution of government policies. This reform increased the capacities of the core government to assess the policy content of draft government decisions, at the expense of its capacity to review their legal quality. However, this latter function was moved to the Ministry of Justice. Shortly after taking power, the Butkevičius government reversed this organizational reform, reorganizing the Prime Minister's Office once again into a Government Office. Under Prime Minister Skvernelis, the Government Office was again reorganized to better support the formulation of strategic reforms and centralize quality control of draft legal acts.

Over the last ten years, the development of evidence-based decision-making instruments (e.g., a monitoring information system, a budget-program assessment system, and an impact-assessment system) has increased the capacity of the core government to monitor and evaluate draft policy decisions based on the government's political agenda. However, the degree of effectiveness has varied by instrument, as well as with the relevance and quality of the empirical evidence available for decision-making. After assessing the coordination of regulatory policy in Lithuania, the OECD recommended establishing an integrated strategic plan for better regulation, a high-level coordination body and a better-regulation unit within the central government.

Citation:

OECD, Regulatory Policy in Lithuania: Focusing on the Delivery Side, OECD Reviews of Regulatory Reform, OECD Publishing, Paris, 2015 http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/regulatory-policy-in-lithuania_9789264239340-en.

United States

Score 7 The closest comparison to a government office or prime minister's office in the U.S. system is the White House staff, along with other units of the Executive Office of the President (e.g., the Council of Economic Advisers, the Office of Management and Budget, and the National Security Council).

Because of the separation of powers, Congress or particular congressional committees sometimes compete with the president to shape policymaking in executive agencies. In response to these challenges, presidents have gradually established a large executive apparatus designed to help assert presidential control over the departments and agencies as well as enable the independence of presidential policy decisions. The total professional staff in the presidential bureaucracy vastly exceeds that of a parliamentary system's GO or PMO, with roughly 2,500 professionals and a budget of \$300 million to \$400 million.

The Trump White House is by all accounts vastly inferior in expertise and organization to that of any prior modern president. Trump has not seriously attempted to maintain orderly processes or to rely on experienced or expert judgment. Insiders have regularly described a state of "chaos," with White House staff often preoccupied with preventing destructive behavior by the president. Office of Management and Budget still has a large permanent staff that can analyze bills, but the president's use of such expertise is accidental or haphazard.

Austria

Score 6 Two aspects of Austria's governance system limit the efficiency of interministerial coordination. First, members of the cabinet ("Ministerrat," which is officially translated as the Council of Ministers but is essentially a cabinet) all enjoy the same legal status. The federal chancellor, who chairs the cabinet, is only first among equals. He or she has no formal authority over the other members of the council. Secondly, with the exception of the years between 1966 and 1983, Austria has been governed by coalitions since 1945. This further reduces the authority of the head of government, as another member of the government – typically the vice-chancellor, is head of another part in the coalition. The result is a significant fragmentation of strategic capacities. Responsibility within the government is distributed among highly autonomous ministers and among political parties linked by a coalition agreement but nevertheless competing for votes.

The Federal Chancellery does have a department called the Legal and Constitutional Service (Verfassungsdienst), which is responsible for checking the constitutionality of policy proposals coming from the various ministries. Another instrument of

oversight is the evaluation of policy effects (Wirkungsorientierte Folgenabschätzung, WFA) that as of 2013 must be integrated into every policy proposal. Under this policy, every draft law has to include an evaluation of its effects in financial, social and other terms, thus enabling other members of government to evaluate its consequences. The cabinet is de facto a collective leadership, complicated by the conflicting interests of coalition partners.

The new coalition government (between the ÖVP and FPÖ) will not be able to change the structural conditions of the system. Any strengthening of the position of the chancellor will not be in the interest of the vice-chancellor. The new coalition (like the outgoing) will be based on a balance between two equally strong partners.

Nevertheless, the new government has succeeded in streamlining the cabinet's performance. Following the concept of "message control," the chancellor and his deputy – representing the two governing parties – monopolized the role of explaining government policy to the public. Intra-government disputes have been played down and the cabinet's role as the main instigator of legislation has become even more apparent than in the past.

Germany

Score 6

Interministerial coordination is characterized by the prevalence of the departmental principle in the federal government and the main bulk of coordination is carried out at the working level. The lead section prepares a draft and establishes a process of negative coordination through which all other departments respond resulting in lowest-common-denominator policies.

The Chancellery is organized into seven directorates, with various numbers of subgroups that are again subdivided to better "mirror" the line ministries ("Spiegelreferate"). However, only four directorates with their sub-directorates (Referate) mirror the respective line ministries and may evaluate the ministerial draft bills. In general, the Chancellery does not autonomously evaluate important draft bills or assess them according to strategic and to budgetary government guidelines. In addition, it appears that its capacities are generally lower than those of the line ministries. With respect to European politics and international tasks, the Chancellery seems to coordinate with partners and to function quite effectively. However, in other policy areas the powers of the Chancellery remain astonishingly limited.

Greece

Score 6

The center of government has traditionally struggled to coordinate and evaluate government legislation. As with previous governments, in the period under review, under the Syriza-ANEL government, draft legislation has rarely been subjected to substantive and systematic evaluation. In fact, ministers have often been able to add

last-minute amendments to draft legislation in order to favor selected interest groups, organizations, or municipalities in their own electoral district or former colleagues of the minister.

Under Syriza-ANEL, there have been several offices and government ministers that have been entrusted with steering government initiatives in sectoral policy. As was the case before 2015, a primary role is played by the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). A second relevant organ, which collects, registers and circulates documents is the General Secretariat of Coordination of Governmental Tasks, which is also very close to the prime minister. Individual ministers without a portfolio are periodically given one-off tasks which demand the collection and evaluation of policy expertise. It is unclear if these organs and ministers have clearly demarcated areas of competences and sectoral expertise. In the period under review, as in the past, interministerial coordination was largely carried out by a small informal circle of ministers and advisers who met daily at the seat of the prime minister.

Iceland

Score 6

The Prime Minister's Office has the fewest staff members of any of the country's ministries and a limited capacity for independently assessing draft bills. The left-wing cabinet (2009 – 2013) merged a number of ministries together, reducing the total number of ministries from 12 to 8. A primary justification was that some ministries lacked broad-based expertise and the merger would make this expertise more widely accessible, which has in some cases been achieved. The Gunnlaugsson center-right cabinet (2013 – 2016) partially reversed this reform in 2013 by appointing separate ministers to head the Ministry of Welfare's subdivisions of Social Affairs and Housing, and Health Affairs. Furthermore, a separate minister of environment and resources was appointed at the end of 2014. These changes increased the number of ministers from 8 to 10. After the 2016 elections a cabinet comprising three parties was established – the Benediktsson cabinet coalition. This led to an increase in ministerial posts from 10 to 11. The Ministry of Interior was split in two so that separate ministers took care of justice, and communications and local government affairs. This has remained the same under the Jakobsdóttir cabinet, which has been in office since late 2017.

Israel

Score 6

The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) relies on sectoral policy expertise. Its need for a staff of independent and professional analysts originally led to the establishment of the National Economic Council, the National Security Council and the Policy Planning Department that advises the prime minister directly. The 2012 Kochik committee viewed these as positive but insufficient steps, and recommended that the PMO's consulting mechanism be strengthened.

Recent changes have shifted this system somewhat. The PMO's planning reforms have de facto given it the capacity to advise other ministries regarding their policy proposals and bills. This is practically done via collaboration with (and to some extent supervision of) the ministries' vice directors of strategic planning and economy, who are officially the heads of the ministerial planning units.

The PMO also has the expertise to evaluate ministerial draft bills through Regulatory Impact Assessments. This is a part of a broader policy to reduce the so-called regulatory burden. Following a 2014 government decision, the PMO has delegates in government ministries who manage regulations affecting each ministry. This book also allows for closer supervision of laws and the work of government offices.

Every government ministry has a team responsible for regulation. These teams are responsible for advising government on regulations, including new law proposals. The teams are operated by PMO staff, although they are stationed in different government offices.

Citation:

Arian, Asher, "Politics in Israel: The Second Republic," 2nd Edition 2005 (Hebrew).

"The committee to investigate the Prime Minister's headquarter," Official report (April 2012) (Hebrew).

Reducing the Regulatory Burden Discussing the decision of the Ministerial Committee on Social and Economic Affairs no, 39, September 2014, <http://www.pmo.gov.il/policyplanning/Regulation/Documents/dec2118.pdf>

"Reduction of Regulatory Burden Book", PMO Office, March 2018 (Hebrew): <http://go.ynet.co.il/pic/calcala/regulation.pdf>

Transparency report of the planning and strategy units and their interaction with private consultation firms," Knesset Committee Protocol, 21.11.2016 (Hebrew): <https://oknesset.org/committee/meeting/13867/?page=2>

Luxembourg

Score 6

The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) employs around 40 civil servants, mostly trained in law, economics and political science. As a result, the PMO does not have sufficient resources to assess all the activities of government ministries. Due to the limited capacities of all ministries, including the PMO, there is no management body or special committee designated to manage interministerial coordination.

Thus, senior civil servants in the ministries prepare a "pré-conseil" or pre-briefing for the weekly meeting of ministers (conseil de gouvernement). All draft bills must be adopted at both stages before being introduced to parliament, as well as revised within these two interministerial meetings. In addition, the Inspectorate General of Finance (Inspection générale des finances, IGF) evaluates draft bills and participates in numerous committees.

Citation:

"Conseil de gouvernement." Le portal de l'actualité gouvernementale. https://gouvernement.lu/fr/actualites/conseils_de_gouvernement.html. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

"Gouvernement." Le portal de l'actualité gouvernementale. <https://gouvernement.lu/fr/gouvernement.html>. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Netherlands

Score 6

The Dutch prime minister is formally in charge of coordinating government policy as a whole, and has a concomitant range of powers, which include deciding on the composition of the Council of Ministers' agenda and formulating its conclusions and decisions; chairing Council of Ministers meetings, committees (onderraad) and (in most cases) ministerial committees; adjudicating interdepartmental conflicts; serving as the primary press spokesperson and first speaker in the States General; and speaking in international forums and arenas (e.g., European Union and the United Nations) on behalf of the Council of Ministers and the Dutch government as a whole.

The prime minister's own Ministry of General Affairs office has some 14 advising councilors (raadadviseurs, with junior assistants) at its disposal. The advising councilors are top-level civil servants, not political appointees. In addition, the prime minister has a special relationship with the Scientific Council of Government Policy. Sometimes, deputy directors of the planning agencies play the role of secretaries for interdepartmental "front gates." To conclude, the Prime Minister's Office and the prime minister himself have a rather limited capacity to evaluate the policy content of line ministry proposals unless they openly clash with the government platform (regeerakkoord). Of course, personal skills and experience make a difference, but structural capacity remains weakly developed. For example, over the entire Rutte II cabinet period, no less than seven ministers had to resign. In the Rutte III cabinet, this pattern is likely to repeat itself, with the former minister of foreign affairs having had to resign over lying about meeting Russian president, Putin, and his successor having barely survived accusations of xenophobic and other contestable statements made during informal lectures. A year after their installation, several other ministers are also in deep political trouble.

Citation:

<http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/regering/bewindspersonen/jan-peter-balkenende/taken>

http://www.nationaalarchief.nl/selectielijsten/BSD_Coordinatie_algemeen_regeringsbeleid_stcrnt_2009_63.pdf

Additional reference:

R.B. Andeweg and G.A. Irwin (2014), *Governance and politics of the Netherlands*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

M. Rutte, *De minister-president: een aanbouw aan het huis van Thorbecke*, Lecture by the Prime Minister, 12 October 2016 (rijksoverheid.nl, consulted 8 November 2016)

J. Tamse, *De afgetreden bewindslieden onder minister-president Mark Rutte*, *Fiat Justitia*, (fiatjustitia.nl, accessed 31 October 2018)

Volkscrant, *Tussentijds rapport Rutte III: zo staan de ministers er na het eerste jaar voor*, 17 September 2018

Poland

Score 6

The policy expertise of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister has declined under the PiS government, as the main criterion for staff employment is political obedience, not expertise or professionalism.

Portugal

- Score 6** The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) has limited policy expertise. While it is able to assess bills, it lacks the resources for in-depth policy assessment capabilities within most policy areas. Under the preceding Passos Coelho government, policy assessment largely centered on budgetary implications, notably in terms of reducing costs and/or increasing revenue. This was particularly true during the bailout period, but persisted into the post-bailout. Under the Costa government, budgetary implications have remained important, as the government has sought to maintain its euro zone commitments. However, this government also evaluates how policy proposals might impact its parliamentary entente with its governing partners, the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), the Left Bloc (BE) and the Greens (PEV).

Czechia

- Score 5** The Government Office is relatively small and has little sectoral policy expertise. To partially compensate for this weakness, it also uses the services of consultants on the basis of commercial contracts.

Estonia

- Score 5** The GO and prime minister's support structures primarily provide consulting services, monitor governmental processes and provide technical (judicial) expertise. There is no capacity to perform substantial evaluation of line-ministry proposals. The 2015 OECD report recommends that the government sharpens its focus and concentrates, at maximum, on five policy priorities. The current government of Ratas has defined four priorities in the "Basic Principles of the Government Coalition" for the 2016 – 2019 period. This step was not, however, accompanied by another, also recommended by the OECD: to give the GO more discretion in (re)allocating organizational, financial and human resources for the implementation of key priorities.

Italy

- Score 5** The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) as a rule evaluates all draft bills before they are submitted to the Council of Ministers for approval. This scrutiny however mainly deals with legal aspects (which largely concern compatibility with European laws) as the PMO itself does not have the size and the systematic sectoral expertise that would allow it to scrutinize policy in detail. This means that intervention by the PMO is in general more reactive than proactive. As a result, corrections to the

legislative proposals of the government are often necessary prior to parliamentary approval. Important draft bills are in general scrutinized by the office with regard to the effects a bill may have on the cohesion of the majority coalition. A detailed scrutiny of the financial implications of each bill is conducted by the Treasury, which has a kind of preventive veto power.

Compared to Renzi, the previous prime minister, Gentiloni, adopted a rather softer leadership style when guiding the cabinet. Under the new prime minister, Conte, the Government Office has even less control over the legislative process.

Malta

Score 5

Government ministries in Malta enjoy almost complete autonomy, with limitations only in the form of budgetary constraints imposed by the Ministry of Finance and cabinet approval. The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) relies largely on the attorney general's office to evaluate draft bills; however, it also consults with specialists on legal and non-legal issues. Before going to the Attorney General's Office, draft laws and policies are scrutinized by the cabinet. In recent years, the PMO has increased the number of experts supporting the policy process. The 2015 ministerial code of ethics specifies the number of consultants and advisers each ministry is allowed to engage. Consultation with a greater number of sectoral-policy experts, in some cases employed by the government itself, has contributed an improvement in the policy process.

In March 2013, the government appointed a minister, as part of the PMO, to oversee the implementation of the government's manifesto and more recently introduced a specific strategy to implement the government's program. This strategy operates on a three-year planning cycle in conjunction with the budgetary cycle implementation program. Ministries have full responsibility for the policy, and draw up action plans that are monitored on a monthly basis by the PMO; areas of concern are flagged and brought to the attention of the public service and cabinet.. Malta's EU presidency has also contributed greatly to improving ministerial coordination. Great efforts are also being made to upgrade the capacity of the public service through the recruitment of graduates with specialized training. In collaboration with the University of Malta, MCAST and other bodies, the government has recently established the Institute for Public Service (IPS) to coordinate training at all levels. The PMO has recently demonstrated an improved ability to respond to policy implementation failures. For example, during the period under review, the PMO heightened its overview of ministries to make up for a number of policy failures that occurred during the previous legislature, although certain ministries still make occasional efforts to evade oversight.

Citation:

Sansone, K Justice to be transferred to OPM - Labor MP is Commissioner Against Bureaucracy Times of Malta 18/06/13

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20151029/local/over-32m-in-government-consultancies-in-one-year.590017>

Romania

Score 5 The organization of the Government Office has undergone some changes. Until January 2017, it featured two bodies involved in interministerial coordination, the General Secretariat of the Government (GSG) and the Prime Minister's Chancellery (PMC). Whereas the GSG focused on the formal coordination, the PMC, consisting of about 15 state counselors with different backgrounds, provided the policy expertise. In January 2017, Prime Minister Grindeanu dismantled the PMC and transferred its responsibilities to the GSG. Once appointed, its successor, Prime Minister Tudose, re-established the PMC and the old dual structure. These changes have infringed upon the government office's capacity to do comprehensive evaluations of draft bills.

Slovakia

Score 5 Slovakia has a strong tradition of departmentalism and collegial cabinets, and these two features have deepened under the current coalition, comprised of three very different partners. The Government Office focuses on the legal and technical coherence of draft bills, but lacks the capacity and sectoral expertise to evaluate their policy content.

Citation:

Blondel, J., F. Müller-Rommel, D. Malová et al. (2007): *Governing New Democracies*. Basingstoke/ London: Palgrave.

Switzerland

Score 5 The Swiss political system does not have a prime minister or a prime minister's office. The government is a collegial body. However, there are several instruments of interministerial coordination and various mechanisms by which ministries' draft bills are evaluated. Departments engage in a formal process of consultation when drafting proposals, the Department of Justice provides legal evaluations of draft bills, and the Federal Chancellery and Federal Council provide political coordination.

Due to the double role of the Federal Council as a collegial unit with the task of producing widely acceptable proposals, and individual federal councilors as heads of departments with the task of satisfying their parties' programs and their department policies, coordination becomes more difficult with the increasing political polarization between government parties.

Turkey

Score 5

Following the April 2017 referendum and the June 2018 early elections, the governmental system was changed to a presidential model and the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) was abolished. The organization of the new presidential system was regulated by presidential decree No. 703 in July 2018. In addition to a vice-president, the head of administrative affairs was established. Its main task is to coordinate between public institutions and organizations and examine the congruity of laws adopted by the parliament and draft legislation prepared by government institutions with the constitution, current legislation, presidential decrees and government program.

There is no available and updated data about the number and qualifications of presidential personnel. In 2017, the PMO had a total of 2,168 employees, a quarter of whom were able to provide advice (e.g., were experts or advisers). A Sectoral Monitoring and Assessment Unit was established to provide advice to the PMO in 2011. In May 2015, about 266 career employees from various public institutions were assigned to this unit. Critics argue that these senior civil servants lack sufficient resources, as well as incentives for effective action. Until the "cleansing" activities of the government following the averted coup attempt of 2016, the unit was also alleged to be a "detention camp" for bureaucrats supposedly close to illegal Gülenist organizations. Most of these personnel were employed in the president's office.

According to presidential Decree No. 1, nine councils (e.g., Local Governing Council, Social Policies Council, the Health and Food Policies Council) are formed to improve the president's capacity for public policymaking. The councils will report to the president by taking the views of ministries, civil society and sector representatives and experts, and follow the policies and developments implemented. It will also give opinions to public institutions and organizations in their fields. It is too early to assess their effectiveness.

Citation:

TC Başbakanlık 2016 Yılı Faaliyet Raporu, http://www.basbakanlik.gov.tr/docs/KurumsalHaberler/Basbakanlik_2016_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf (accessed 1 November 2017)

TC Başbakanlık 2017 Faaliyet Raporu (özet), <https://www.kamusaati.com/gundem/basbakanlik-2017-faaliyet-raporu-personel-h31991.html> (accessed 1 November 2018)

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Karamamesi 1, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180710-1.pdf>

K. Gözler, Türkiye'nin Yönetim Yapısı (TC İdari Teşkilatı), Bursa: Ekin Basın Yayın Dağıtım, 2018.

Z.Sobacı et al., Turkey's New Government Model and the Presidential Organization, SETA Perspective No. 45, July 2018.

"76 people appointed to Turkey's presidential policy councils," *Hürriyet*, 9 October 2018, <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/76-people-appointed-to-turkeys-presidential-policy-councils-137697> (accessed 1 November 2018)

Bulgaria

- Score 4 The official government office in Bulgaria, the Administration of the Council of Ministers, plays a mainly administrative role. It prepares cabinet meetings, but is still developing the capacity for in-depth evaluation of the policy content of line-ministry proposals. Specialized directorates within the Council of Ministers' administration review submissions from the line ministries, but more from a formal than from a substantive point of view. The prime minister's own political-cabinet staff is relatively small and has little expertise to evaluate the policy content of line-ministry proposals.

Slovenia

- Score 4 Slovenia has a strong tradition of departmentalism and collegial cabinets. The Government Office focuses on the legal and technical coherence of draft bills but lacks the capacity and sectoral expertise to evaluate their policy content, especially since the recruitment of expert staff is limited and often subject to political pressures and political compromise. The change in the head of the Government Office in October 2016 – from Darko Krašovec, who had to resign after allegations of corruptions, to Lilijana Kozlovič, a member of parliament belonging to Prime Minister Cerar's SMC party – did little to change the situation. Marjan Šarec, the new prime minister, has brought in new experts. Among others, he made Damir Črnčec, an influential security expert, his national security advisor.

Croatia

- Score 3 Until 2014, the Prime Minister's Office lacked a central policy unit able to evaluate and coordinate the activities of the line ministries. At the beginning of 2014, a unit for public policy coordination and support to the prime minister was established in the Prime Minister's Office. The unit is tasked with coordinating and monitoring public policies performed by line ministries. However, the capacity of the staff to provide reliable applied policy analysis is limited.

Cyprus

- Score 2 Under the constitution, line ministers are fully responsible for their ministries. They draft bills and forward them to the Secretariat of the Council of Ministers, which supports the cabinet's work. The secretariat forwards decisions to relevant offices and eventually monitors implementation. Though, "the general direction and control of the government and the direction of general policy" lies with the Council of

Ministers, the council does not possess administrative depth and the necessary mechanisms to collect advice and collectively chart policy. The only advice received is limited to constitutionality checks of legislative drafts provided by the attorney general.

There might be some GO control by the minister of finance and cabinet under the law on fiscal responsibility. This is limited to mostly budgetary issues.

Indicator

Line Ministries

Question

To what extent do line ministries involve the government office/prime minister's office in the preparation of policy proposals?

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 = There are inter-related capacities for coordination between GO/PMO and line ministries.
- 8-6 = The GO/PMO is regularly briefed on new developments affecting the preparation of policy proposals.
- 5-3 = Consultation is rather formal and focuses on technical and drafting issues.
- 2-1 = Consultation occurs only after proposals are fully drafted as laws.

Belgium

Score 10

Before implementation, each government project is submitted to the ministers' council, which meets weekly. The council is composed of a secretariat that scrutinizes each proposal before it is debated and prepares the ministers' council agenda, and 14 line ministers and the prime minister, who debate each proposal. Decisions are made on the basis of political consensus, not of majority vote.

Either directly or through the council's secretariat, the prime minister can block any item presented and either return it for redrafting or turn it down completely. This may be because a project does not fit the government agreement or conflicts with one of the coalition parties' agenda, but can be for any other reason as well. All government members must by contrast defend accepted projects on a collegial basis.

:
<http://www.premier.be/fr/conseil-des-ministres>

United States

Score 10

In the U.S. system, this item relates to how the executive departments and agencies involve the president and the White House in their work. Under long-established practice, however, the president and the White House are in fact dominant within the executive branch and can therefore prioritize issues they see as important to the president's agenda. In the Trump administration, agency policy development has been heavily shaped by Trump's desire to cut regulations and in to reverse actions taken by the Obama administration. There has been little policy development shaped by long-term agency missions or priorities, nor has White House involvement reflected organized deliberative processes.

Australia

- Score 9 The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (PMC) is always involved at an early stage in assisting with the development and drafting of any significant government policy and the resulting legislation. The PMC and the other relevant department must agree on a policy before it can be tabled in cabinet or considered by the relevant minister or ministers.

Canada

- Score 9 Line departments and central agencies have interrelated and complementary capacities for the coordination of policy proposals, with ultimate authority lying with central agencies. Thus, line ministries in Canada have a relatively high level of responsibility to involve the government office, the PCO, in the preparation of policy proposals. On the other hand, line departments are not always forthcoming with information that casts themselves in a bad light.

Chile

- Score 9 The Government or Cabinet Office (Ministerio Secretaría General de Gobierno, Segegob) and line ministries have a strong tendency to coordinate activity, and in practice the president or Government Office and the Ministry of Finance are nearly always involved in the preparation of policy proposals. No serving minister would ignore the president's opinion in the preparation and elaboration of a policy proposal.

Denmark

- Score 9 The norms of "minister rule" and the "resort" principle (where ministers are in charge of certain areas) give the line ministries a fair amount of autonomy. It is also the line ministries that have the most technical expertise. Nonetheless, to achieve coherent government policy, interdepartmental coordination takes place. Since most governments are coalition governments this is particularly important. This is not a hierarchical coordination, but is rather based on negotiations. The prime minister has a special position given his/her constitutional prerogatives as the person who appoints and dismisses ministers. Major issues and strategic considerations are dealt with in the government coordination committee (regeringens koordineringsudvalg) involving the prime minister and other key ministers. The standing committees are also important coordination devices. In addition, there are ad hoc coordination

meetings between the leaders of the parties constituting the governing coalition. The current three-party government formed in November 2016 is a minority government. The prime minister must maintain contact with the leaders of the other government parties, the Conservatives and Liberal Alliance, as well as the parliamentary support party, the Danish People's Party.

The Ministry of Finance also plays an important role whenever financial resources are involved. No minister can go to the finance committee of the parliament (Folketinget) without prior agreement from the Ministry of Finance. The position of the Ministry of Finance has been strengthened by the "budget law" adopted in 2012, establishing a clear top-down approach for the budget process.

Apart from coordinating the preparation of next year's finances, the Ministry of Finance is also involved in formulating general economic policy and offering economic and administrative assessments of the consequences of proposed laws.

Citation:

Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen et al., *Politik og forvaltning*, 4. udg., 2017.

"Regeringen indgår aftale om ny budgetlov," <http://www.fm.dk/nyheder/pressemeddelelser/2012/03/regeringen-indgaar-aftale-om-ny-budgetlov/> (Accessed 10 October 2015)

Finland

Score 9

The guiding rule in Finland is that each ministry is, within its mandate, responsible for the preparation of issues that fall within the scope of government and also for the proper functioning of the administration. Given this framework, rather than line ministries involving the Prime Minister's Office in policy preparation, the expectation is that the Prime Minister's Office involves ministries in its own policy preparations. In practice, of course, the patterns of interaction are not fixed. For one thing, policy programs and other intersectoral subject matters in the cabinet program are a concern for the Prime Minister's Office as well as for the ministries, and efforts must be coordinated. The government's analysis, assessment and research activities that support policymaking across the ministries are coordinated by the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). In addition, because decision-making is collective and consensual in nature, ministry attempts to place items on the cabinet's agenda without involving the Prime Minister's Office will fail. Finland has a recent tradition of fairly broad-based coalition governments. Though the current Sipilä government is an exception, as its majority in parliament has shrunk to 52.5%. This tradition amalgamates ideological antagonisms and thereby mitigates against fragmentation along ministerial and sectoral lines.

Citation:

Jaakko Nousiainen, "Politiikan huipulla. Ministerit ja ministeriöt Suomen parlamentaarisessa järjestelmässä", Porvoo: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, 1992, p. 163.

France

Score 9

Line ministers have to inform the prime minister of all their projects. Strong discipline, even at the public communication level, is imposed, and this rule is reinforced by the attitude of the media, which tend to cover any slight policy difference as the expression of political tension or party divergence. Not only the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) oversees the policy process but also his cabinet assistants, in each area, supervise, liaise and coordinate with their counterparts in line ministries about the content, timing and political sequences of a project. The secretary-general of the PMO (as well as his counterpart at the Elysée) operates in the shadow, but he is one of the most powerful actors within that machinery. He can step in if the coordination or control process at that level has failed to stem the expression of differences within the government. Traditionally the secretary-general is a member of the Conseil d'État and – in spite of the fact that he could be fired at any time for any reason – there is a tradition of continuity and stability beyond the fluctuation and vagaries of political life. It has to be added that given the presidential character of the Fifth Republic, the same type of control is exerted by the President's Office in coordination with the PMO. In practice, the two general secretaries are the most powerful civil servants whose opinions might prevail on ministry choices.

Ireland

Score 9

The Prime Minister's Office is involved in legislative and expenditure proposals. The process is a highly interactive with much feedback between the line ministries, the Prime Minister's Office and the Office of the Attorney General. The Department of Finance has considerable input into all proposals with revenue or expenditure implications. Any significant policy items have to be discussed in advance with the Department of the Taoiseach. The Cabinet Handbook lays out detailed procedural rules for the discussion of policy proposals and the drafting of legislation. It is publicly available on the website of the Department of the Taoiseach.

As in many countries, the Department of Finance is a lot more than a regular "line ministry." The procedures state:

"As a matter of principle, the sanction of the minister for finance is required for all expenditure. In any proposal for new legislation, it should be made clear that the sanction of the Minister for Finance is required to incur any expenditure under the legislation. Neither the voting of money by Dáil Éireann, nor the inclusion of an allocation in an Estimate constitutes sanction" (Department of Finance 2008: Public Financial Procedures).

New Zealand

Score 9 If line ministries prepare a policy proposal, they are obliged to consult other ministries that are affected, as well as the coordinating units, the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC), the Treasury and the State Services Commission. There are clear guidelines which govern the coordination of policy formulation in the core executive.

:

Cabinet Office Circular CO (17) 10, Labour-New Zealand First Coalition, with Confidence and Supply from the Green Party: Consultation and Operating Arrangements. December 17, 2017. <https://dpmc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2017-12/coc-17-10.pdf>

South Korea

Score 9 Executive power is concentrated in the president's hands. Thus, line ministries have to involve the Blue House in all major policy proposals. The president has the authority to, and often does rearrange, merge and abolish ministries according to his or her agenda. For example, President Moon created a Ministry of SMEs and Startups; renamed the Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning as the Ministry of Science and ICT, and merged the National Security Agency and the Ministry of Public Administration and Security into a single Ministry of the Interior and Safety. He also (re-)established the National Fire Agency and the Korea Coast Guard abolished by his predecessor. However, while Moon has promised to decentralize power, there have as yet been few signs of any weakening of the role of the Blue House. The Blue House gets involved with and coordinates certain policies through the exertion of political dominance rather than through administrative capability. This is particularly true for policy areas falling outside the president's main priorities for which the Blue House lacks sufficient knowledge and human-resources capacity to act effectively.

United Kingdom

Score 9 The Cabinet Office is at the center of policymaking. Since the May 2015 general election, all line ministries are required to prepare single departmental plans (SDP), building on a process already launched during the previous coalition government. As explained by John Manzoni, the Chief Executive of the civil service appointed in October 2014, these SDPs are intended to bring together inputs and outputs, clarify trade-offs, and to identify where departments and the cross-departmental functions need to work together to deliver the required outcomes.

The creation of implementation taskforces, working alongside cabinet committees, is intended to strengthen the central oversight of policy proposals. Nevertheless, some of the political tensions around Brexit have complicated the coordination process.

Hungary

Score 8 Under the Orbán governments, line ministries have mostly acted as executive agencies that follow orders from above and whose activities have been subject to detailed oversight by the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). The PMO has made sure that policies are as close in line as possible with the prime minister's policy preferences and the ideological rhetoric. However, the strong coordination capacity of the PMO has also meant that it has sometimes become a bottleneck in the process of policymaking. Moreover, the co-existence of the PMO and the Cabinet Office has created unnecessary complexity.

Citation:

Hajnal, G., K. Kádár, É. Kovács (2018): Hungary, in: N. Thijs, G. Hammerschmid (eds.), *Public Administration Characteristics and Performance in EU28*. Luxembourg: European Union, 426-459, 442-443 (<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ae181e42-9601-11e8-8bc1-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>).

Iceland

Score 8 Due to a strong tradition of ministerial independence, ministries have considerable flexibility in drafting their own policy proposals without consulting the Prime Minister's Office. Yet, where a minister and prime minister belong to the same party, there is usually some Prime Minister's Office involvement. However, where the minister and prime minister belong to separate coalition parties the Prime Minister's Office has little or no involvement in policy development. After the publication of the Special Investigation Committee report in 2010, a committee was formed to evaluate and suggest necessary steps toward the improvement of public administration. In order to improve working conditions within the executive branch, the committee proposed introducing legislation to clarify the prime minister's role and responsibilities. In March 2016, new regulations on governmental procedures were approved (Reglur um starfshætti ríkisstjórnar), requiring ministers to present all bills they intend to present in parliament first to the cabinet as a whole.

Citation:

Reglur um starfshætti ríkisstjórnar. Nr. 292/2016 18. mars 2016.
Skýrsla starfshóps forsætisráðuneytisins (2010): Viðbrögð stjórnáslunnar við skýrslu rannsóknarnefndar Alþingis. Reykjavík, Forsætisráðuneytið.

Japan

Score 8 In Japan, the role of line ministries vis-à-vis the government office is complicated by the influence of a third set of actors: entities within the governing parties. During the decades of the LDP's postwar rule, the party's own policymaking organ, the Policy Affairs Research Council (PARC) developed considerable influence, ultimately

gaining the power to vet and approve policy proposals in all areas of government policy.

Under the current LDP-led government, Prime Minister Abe has tried successfully to make certain that he and his close confidants determine the direction of major policy proposals. The reform program does indeed show the influence of the Cabinet Office, with the ministries either following this course or trying to drag their feet. Abe's main instrument is the Cabinet Bureau of Personnel Affairs, which grants control over more than 600 appointments, or as many as half a dozen political appointees per ministry.

Still, ministries can try to regain former clout over their areas. For example, the METI industry ministry has become somewhat more assertive again in trying to influence industry, though it remains guided by the priorities of Abenomics.

Citation:

Leo Lewis and Kana Inagaki, Japan Inc.: Heavy meddling, *The Financial Times*, 15 March 2016, <https://www.ft.com/content/0118e3a6-ea99-11e5-bb79-2303682345c8>

Latvia

Score 8

Since its establishment in 2011, the PKC has become increasingly involved in line ministry preparation of policy proposals. PKC representatives are invited to participate in working groups. Involvement of the PKC is at the ministry's discretion. Informal lines of communication ensure that the PKC is regularly briefed on upcoming policy proposals.

Latvia has a "fragmented" cabinet government system. Consequently, ministers enjoy relatively substantial autonomy, weakening the power of the prime minister. As a result, ministers belonging to a different party than the prime minister will attempt to block the prime minister's office from interfering in sensitive policy issues whenever possible.

Luxembourg

Score 8

The Prime Minister's Office is not legally allowed to be involved in the preparation of bills or proposals by line ministries. Sensitive political proposals are often included in the coalition program. There are no institutionalized mechanisms of coordination between line ministries and there is no unit dealing with policy assessment and evaluation. Informally, however, no sensitive proposal is presented to the Council of Ministers without being approved beforehand by the prime minister. An informal body of ministerial civil servants meets ahead of the Council of Ministers, to prepare the agenda and make adjustments if needed. Even though the prime minister has not held the influential finance portfolio since 2009, his central role in the governance process has not been weakened.

Citation:

“Arrêté grand-ducal du 28 janvier 2015 portant constitution des Ministères.” Journal officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, 30 January 2015. www.data.legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/agd/2015/01/28/n1/jo. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Netherlands

Score 8

Generally, line-ministry legislative or white-paper initiatives are rooted in the government policy accord, EU policy coordination, and subsequent Council of Ministers decisions to allocate drafting to one or two particular ministries. In the case of complex problems, draft legislation may involve considerable jockeying for position among the various line ministries. The prime minister is always involved in the kick-off of major new policy initiatives and sometimes in the wording of the assignment/terms of reference itself. After that, however, it may take between six months and four years before the issue reaches the decision-making stage in ministerial and Council of Ministers committees, and again comes under the formal review of the prime minister. Meanwhile, the prime minister is obliged to rely on informal coordination with his fellow ministers. The large number of ministerial dismissals during the Rutte II cabinet, unfortunately, does not allow conclusions to be drawn about the effectiveness of such informal coordination, and information procedures and practices. High-level civil servants around the prime minister have complained about the increasing use of spin-doctors and political assistants in such processes.

Citation:

R.B. Andeweg and G.A. Irwin (2014), *Governance and politics of the Netherlands*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

NRC-next, Topambtenaar vond Balkenendes optreden slechte zaak, 18 June, 2018

Norway

Score 8

Responsibility for the preparation of policies lies with line ministries. As a matter of routine, line ministries will involve the Office of the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice, when addressing potentially controversial matters and for the purpose of coordinating with other policies. This interaction often involves ongoing two-way communication during the planning process. Initiatives lacking support by the Office of the Prime Minister would not win cabinet approval.

Spain

Score 8

Both the Government Office (GO) and the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) are regularly briefed on new developments affecting the preparation of policy proposals by line ministries. Although these offices are formally autonomous, the legal and political hierarchy within the government facilitates and even encourages this pattern

of consultation with the prime minister's entourage. Consultation with the GO tends to focus on drafting or technical issues, while the PMO is more interested in political and strategic considerations. The process is firmly institutionalized and takes place weekly, since representatives of all ministries gather at the cabinet meeting preparatory committee, which is held every Wednesday and chaired by the GO head and the deputy prime minister. Advisers from the PMO also participate in this committee and in the important specialized ministerial committee on economic affairs (see "Cabinet Committees") that also assists the Council of Ministers. However, even if the primary joint role of the GO and the PMO is horizontal coordination, their staff resources are limited, and cannot be briefed on the whole range of government activity. Therefore, they normally focus on each ministerial department's most important sectoral developments.

Citation:

Paniagua (2018), La Moncloa, in: Lanzaro (coord.) Centros de Gobierno, Tecnos, Madrid.

Ley 39/2015

September 2018, Politico, Sánchez's 100 days of commotion, <https://www.politico.eu/article/pedro-sanchez-spain-100-days-of-commotion/>

Estonia

Score 7

Two different forms exist to communicate line ministries' proposals to the GO. Firstly, all policy initiatives are discussed in coalition council. Second, the cabinet informally examines all substantial issues at its weekly meetings. No binding decisions are made in the meetings, the main function being to exchange information and to prepare for formal government sessions.

Israel

Score 7

Traditionally, the prime minister did not hold the power to return items to Israeli general cabinet meetings. However, in 2012, it filed for an amendment to standard practice, which was then ratified by the government. This included expanding the prime minister's authority to delay the implementation of government decisions by resubmitting an issue to vote after it had been rejected, as well as authorizing the prime minister to cancel, postpone or summon meetings for government decisions. Since the passage of this amendment, the prime minister has returned several items and the prime ministerial position has been significantly strengthened.

In an indirect way, the PMO is involved in the preparation of policy proposals (see section G2.1). Each team is responsible for each government ministry's regulation. Those teams are responsible for advising on regulations across all policy fields, including new law proposals, and are operated by PMO staff, although they are stationed in different governmental ministries. These teams allow for the PMO to be kept informed of proposals and policy developments across different government offices.

Citation:

Barnea, Shlomit and Ofer Kenig, "Political nominations in the executive branch," IDI website June 2011 (Hebrew)

Reducing the Regulatory Burden Discussing the decision of the Ministerial Committee on Social and Economic Affairs no, 39, September 2014 (Hebrew): <http://www.pmo.gov.il/policyplanning/Regulation/Documents/dec2118.pdf>

"Government bill amendment 868 from 12.8.2012," PMO official website: <http://www.pmo.gov.il/Secretary/sederyom/Pages/seder120812.aspx> (Hebrew)

Weisman, Lilach, "Expansion of the Prime Minister's authorities was approved; We must stop the madness," Globes website 12.8.2012: <http://www.globes.co.il/news/article.aspx?did=1000773448> (Hebrew)

Lithuania

Score 7

The government adopts multiannual political priorities, coordinates their implementation and regularly monitors progress. As a result, it focuses on policy proposals and strategic projects related to these annual priorities. The majority of policy proposals are initiated by ministries and other state institutions, but the Government Office is kept informed with regard to their status and content. The fact that all policy areas are legally assigned to particular ministers, coupled with the fact that since 2000 governments have been formed by party coalitions rather than a single party, has meant that line ministries enjoy considerable autonomy within their policy areas. The Government Office is sometimes called upon to mediate policy disagreements between line ministries. Under the Skvernelis government, a new commission for strategic projects has been established to coordinate 41 IT, infrastructure and change projects. The commission is chaired by the prime minister, and includes a government chancellor; a prime ministerial adviser; and ministers for finance, foreign affairs, and transport and communication.

Mexico

Score 7

Given Mexico's presidential system, cabinet ministers are respectful of and even deferential to the presidential office. Moreover, cabinet ministers dismissed by the president after disagreements rarely find a way back into high-level politics, which promotes loyalty to the president and presidential staff. Accordingly, senior figures in the presidential office are very powerful, because they determine access to the president and can influence ministerial careers. President Peña Nieto has built his cabinet around two super-ministries and ministers, the finance minister and the minister of interior, and good personal relations with the president are important for cabinet members.

Portugal

- Score 7** The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) is regularly briefed on new developments affecting the preparation of policy proposals.
- The Minister of Finance, Mario Centeno, is by far the most influential minister in the Council of Ministers. Not only does he have tremendous prestige within Portugal, but also internationally and has been named president of the Eurogroup, the influential collective of euro zone finance ministers. In many cases, it is Minister Centeno that pushes back on policies.

Sweden

- Score 7** The leadership of the GO and the PMO are primarily involved when policies are initiated, when final decisions are to be made, and if a disagreement emerges among the governing parties or ministers. However, the line nature of the GO – and the chain of command between the political and administrative levels – means that the top leadership, apart from initiating and deciding on policy, does not routinely monitor its development. There are instead regular briefings and informal consultations. This informal coordination procedure nevertheless ensures that the PMO, in line with the finance ministry, play a crucial role in policy developments. Also, there are established but informal rules regulating procedures when there is disagreement among the non-political advisers on how to design policy. Essentially, the political level of the department should only be consulted when its ruling is critical to policy formulation; otherwise policy design should rest with non-partisan members of staff.

When the government is made up of more than one party, as has been the case for most of Sweden's recent history, there are mechanisms in place when disagreement arises. Either the political leadership proactively intervenes in the policy-planning process to resolve disagreements or such disagreements are "lifted" to the political level for a ruling.

It should also be noted that line ministries frequently ask for advice from the executive agencies during the early stages of the policy process.

Citation:

Jacobsson, B., J. Pierre and G. Sundström (2015), *Governing the Embedded State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Niemann, C. (2013), *Villkorat förtroende. Normer och rollförväntningar i relationen mellan politiker och tjänstemän i Regeringskansliet* (Stockholm: Department of Political Science, University of Stockholm).

Page, E. C. (2012), *Policy Without Politicians: Bureaucratic Influence in Comparative Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Premfors, R. and G. Sundström (2007), *Regeringskansliet* (Malmö: Liber).

Switzerland

Score 7 Switzerland's government consists of only seven ministries, each of which has a broad area of competency and is responsible for a large variety of issues. There are no line ministries. However, there are federal offices and institutions connected to the various ministries. These work closely with the minister responsible for their group. Since ministers must achieve a large majority on the Federal Council in order to win success for a proposal, there is strong coordination between offices. Indeed, political coordination among the high ranks of the administration can be rather intense, although the limited capacity and time of the Federal Council members, as well as their diverging interests, create practical bottlenecks.

Turkey

Score 7 Following the April 2017 referendum and the June 2018 early elections, the governmental system was changed to a presidential model and the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) was abolished. The organization of the new presidential system was regulated by presidential decree in July 2018.

Currently there are 16 line ministries and nine policy councils, which develop long-term strategic vision and report on the progress of governmental activities. The Ministry of Development, which has been the primary consultative body for preparing policies according to the government's program, was abolished. In addition, four offices were established: finance, investment, digital transformation and human resources.

Six departments are attached to the presidency: Chief of Staff, Religious Affairs, National Security Council, Defense Industry, State Supervision Council, Communication and Strategy, and Budget Unit. These departments were established to promote efficiency and coordination in the executive.

Until the new governmental system change, policymaking was occasionally tarnished by issues of bureaucratic competition, including among politicians. The former PMO's inability to foster interministerial cooperation had been a serious institutional shortcoming. A previous reorganization of the PMO and line ministries led to some performance declines. Conflicting announcements regarding policy proposals made by the PMO and line ministries were a sign of weak coordination.

The effectiveness of the system, which is based on centralization and unification in decision-making, should be reviewed in the near future.

Citation:

TC Başbakanlık 2017 Faaliyet Raporu (özet), <https://www.kamusaati.com/gundem/basbakanlik-2017-faaliyet-raporu-personel-h3199-1.html> (accessed 1 November 2018)

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi 1, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180710-1.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)
 KHK 703, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180709M3.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)
 K. Gözler, Türkiye'nin Yönetim Yapısı (TC İdari Teşkilatı), Bursa: Ekin Basın Yayın Dağıtım, 2018.
 Z. Sobacı et al., Turkey's New Government Model and the Presidential Organization, SETA Perspective No. 45, July 2018.
 2017 Programının Uygulanması, Koordinasyonu ve İzlenmesine İlişkin Karar, Resmi Gazete, 19 October 2017, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2016/10/20161019-13.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)

Austria

Score 6

As all ministers are equal, the autonomy of line ministries is substantial. The chancellor cannot determine the outlines of government policy and does not have to be involved in the drafting of legislation. Normally, however, proposals are coordinated by the prime minister's office. Formally, the Federal Ministry of Finance can offer its opinion as to whether a proposal fits into the government's overall budget policy. The Ministry of Finance thus has a kind of cross-cutting power.

The new government has developed a policy of "message control" which reduces the significance of ministers substantially, and increases the guiding power of the chancellor and his deputy – at least as long as both are in control of their respective parties.

Bulgaria

Score 6

Line ministries tend to prepare policy proposals independently and introduce them to the prime minister and the Council of Ministers when they are completed. The prime minister and the Administration of the Council of Ministers are consulted when proposals cross ministerial lines, or are incompatible with other proposed or existing legislation. Even in such cases, the involvement of the administration tends to focus mainly on technical and drafting issues and formal legal considerations. There are no official procedures for consulting the prime minister during the preparation of policy proposals.

Czechia

Score 6

The legislative plan of the government divides tasks among the ministries and other central bodies of the state administration and sets deadlines for the submission of bills to the cabinet. The line ministry has to involve, and take comments from, a range of institutions, including the Government Office and the Government Legislative Council. This consultation process primarily focuses on technical issues and the harmonization of legal norms.

Germany

Score 6 The preparation of bills is mainly the prerogative of the line ministries (Ressortprinzip). Over the course of regular policy processes, the Chancellery is most of the time well informed, but is not strongly involved in ministerial initiatives. Most disputes between ministries and the Chancellery are discussed and resolved in the often-weekly meetings between the state secretaries and the Chancellery's staff. Because of the rapidly decreasing electoral support of the three governing parties (the CDU, CSU and SPD), the line ministries and their respective policies became more and more independent and follow the preferences of the political parties involved. Each party now tries to push through its own policy conception which may contradict that of the other parties. Negotiating a commonly developed government policy is highly contested and extraordinarily difficult. On migration and asylum policies, the first half of 2018 saw a heavy conflict between the minister of the interior, building and community, Horst Seehofer (CSU), and the Chancellery. In August 2018, Seehofer stated his intention to end the continuous dispute over migration policy, and develop a common policy line with Chancellor Merkel and the rest of the government.

Greece

Score 6 Since the onset of the crisis in 2010, the PMO has gradually acquired more power and resources to supervise line ministries, the policies of which were streamlined to fit the fiscal consolidation effort of Greece. However, during the period under review, the PMO's coordination of line ministries was further enhanced as Greece completed the requirements of the Third Economic Adjustment Program (2015 – 2018), which officially ended in August 2018. However, the PMO was not the only authority with which line ministries consulted. In fact, as the implementation of the Third Economic Adjustment Program for Greece unfolded, line ministers often turned to the Ministry of Finance for technical and drafting guidance in cases where legislation in development within individual ministries ran into financial constraints imposed by Greece's creditors.

Citation:

Kevin Featherstone and Dimitris Papadimitriou (2013), "The Emperor Has No Clothes! Power and Resources within the Greek Core Executive," *Governance*, Vol. 26, Issue 3, pp. 523-545.

Italy

Score 6 The Prime Minister's Office is in principle regularly kept informed of the development of policy proposals generated by line ministries. With regard to the policy proposals of particular political relevance for the government, the consultation

process starts from the early stages of drafting and is more significant, involving not only formal but also substantive issues. In the fields less directly connected with the main mission of the government, exchanges are more formal and occur only when proposals have been fully drafted. Under the new Conte government, given the political weakness of the prime minister and the dual nature of the coalition, government control over line ministries is less strong than in previous governments. It is likely that ministers will respond more readily to their party leader than to the head of government.

Poland

Score 6 Under the PiS government, the Chancellery has kept its enhanced formal involvement in the preparation of policy proposals by the line ministries. However, its actual gatekeeping role has declined. Most bills are submitted by individual members of parliament rather than by ministries, as this enables a swifter legislative process with fewer consultation requirements, which in turn can be more effectively controlled by PiS leaders.

Malta

Score 5 Since 2013, a sustained effort at coordination has been made in the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and in line ministries. During the period under review, the government established an office within the PMO to coordinate the policies contained in the ruling party's electoral manifesto. In a new review strategy, ministries monitor the outputs of policies previously discussed with the cabinet; the OPM then monitors policies until they are implemented and supports the ministries in their implementation. Coordination meetings are also organized by the OPM bringing together the various ministries. Decisions taken by ministries have more than once been rescinded by the PMO, a practice less common in the past. The PMO may also seek to review its own policies with the help of the Management Efficiency Unit and occasionally employs consultants. Cabinet meetings have allowed experts to give direct advice to ministers, a departure from the past. From time to time, cabinet meetings are held in different regions for the purpose of consultations. As a consequence of a number of policy failures that occurred during the last legislative period, a greater share of policy proposals are now required to be approved by the cabinet.

Citation:

http://www.maltatoday.com.mt/news/national/33324/prime-minister-holding-cabinet-meeting-in-mellieha-20140121#.V_uQfv196M8

http://www.maltatoday.com.mt/news/national/48377/cabinet_meeting_in_gozo_cost_taxpayers_7000#.V_uQpf196M8

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20160223/local/cabinet-meeting-in-birzebbuga.603449>

Romania

- Score 5** Policy proposals are usually drafted within ministries. The Secretariat General of the Government provides administrative and legal support for policymaking but has a limited role in the quality control of policy design. The Prime Minister's Chancellery usually becomes involved only after the compulsory public-consultation procedures are finalized, and its mandate is to ensure that policy proposals align with broader government strategy. While the prime minister occasionally publicly involves himself in debating certain legislative proposals and may contradict line ministers, the final decision on the content of the policy proposal tends to be made by the line ministry.

Croatia

- Score 4** Line ministries consult with the government's Legislation Office, but this consultation is mostly formal, focusing on technical and drafting issues. Ministries normally enjoy huge leeway in transforming government priorities into legislation, and there is no stable and transparent arbitration scheme that would give the Prime Minister's Office a formal role in settling interministerial differences.

Citation:

Giljević, Z. (2015): Utjecaj okoline organizacije na upravu koordinaciju: Ministarstvo uprave kao studija slučaja (The Influence of Organizational Environment on Administrative Coordination: Croatian Ministry of Public Administration as a Case Study), in: *Hrvatska i komparativna javna uprava* 15(4): 875-908.

Slovakia

- Score 4** In Slovakia, the government manifesto defines certain priorities that are elaborated in legislative plans. These additionally divide tasks and responsibilities among the line ministries and other central bodies, and set deadlines for the submission of bills to the cabinet. In their policy-development process, the line ministries legally must include a range of institutions and interest groups that are defined as stakeholders in their respective fields. Ministries are also obliged to consult with the Government Office and its legislative council as they develop bills. However, full responsibility for drafting bills has traditionally rested with the line ministries, and consultation with the Government Office is mainly technical. Prime Minister Fico tried to increase the monitoring activities of the Government Office, especially those related to EU structural funds. Peter Pellegrini, his successor, has continued this approach.

Cyprus

Score 3 The services within the presidential palace are essentially ad hoc in character and determined by the president for the duration of their term. Similarly, the tasks of the Secretariat of the Council of Ministers are limited mostly to providing secretarial support. The involvement of the Attorney General's Office consists in effecting legality checks of draft legislation. Ministries tasked with drafting laws can refer to policies formulated by the government or to frameworks decided by the cabinet. It appears that draft laws are discussed only during the presentation and deliberation process in the Council of Ministers and not within an advanced and broader policy discussion.

Under the law on fiscal responsibility, the budgetary aspects of policy proposals are controlled by the finance minister to ensure compliance with general budgetary plans. No central coordinating body has thus far been established.

Slovenia

Score 3 The Government Office is not directly and systematically involved in line ministries' preparation of policy proposals. Once the coalition agreement and government program have defined certain projects, full responsibility for drafting bills rests with the line ministries, interministerial commissions or project teams. The Government Office is seldom briefed about the state of affairs. If it is, consultation is rather formal and focuses mostly on legal and technical issues.

Indicator

Cabinet Committees

Question

How effectively do ministerial or cabinet committees coordinate cabinet proposals?

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 = The vast majority of cabinet proposals are reviewed and coordinated first by committees.
- 8-6 = Most cabinet proposals are reviewed and coordinated by committees, in particular proposals of political or strategic importance.
- 5-3 = There is little review or coordination of cabinet proposals by committees.
- 2-1 = There is no review or coordination of cabinet proposals by committees. Or: There is no ministerial or cabinet committee.

Belgium

Score 10

The Council of Ministers (Conseil des ministres/Raad van ministers), which is one of the central components of the government, meets every week. Each minister is responsible for drafting a proposal, which gets submitted to the council. The council's secretariat then checks whether the proposal can be debated, asking a number of questions: Is it complete and technically sound? Does it conflict with other past decisions? Is it contained in the governmental agreement? Proposals are debated by ministers only if they pass this first filter, a process that allows them to focus on the strategic aspects of the issue. However, the most important strategic considerations are mainly political.

Before reaching the Council of Ministers, projects are always discussed beforehand in formal or informal cabinet committee meetings that include experts and senior officers from the relevant ministries. Most negotiation is performed at that stage and, if necessary, further fine-tuned in the "core" meeting in the case of particularly important or sensitive policy issues.

Finland

Score 10

Cabinet committees effectively prepare cabinet meetings. The government has four statutory cabinet committees: the Ministerial Committee on Foreign and Security Policy (which meets with the president when pressing issues arise), the Ministerial Committee on European Union Affairs, the Ministerial Finance Committee and the Ministerial Committee on Economic Policy. Additionally, ad hoc cabinet committees can be appointed by the government plenary session. All these committees are

chaired by the prime minister, who also chairs sessions of the Economic Council, the Research and Innovation Council, and the Title Board. In addition, there are several ministerial working groups. The primary task of these committees and groups is to prepare cabinet meetings by helping to create consensus between relevant ministries and interests. In all, a large majority of issues are reviewed first by cabinet committees and working groups.

Denmark

Score 9

Policy preparation tends to take place in cabinet committees (regeringsudvalg) involving a smaller number of ministers. The number of such committees has varied over time. Currently, the following standing cabinet committees exist: the government coordination committee (chaired by the prime minister), the economy committee (chaired by the finance minister), the security committee (chaired by the prime minister), the appointments committee (chaired by the prime minister) the government's EU implementation committee (chaired by the minister of employment), and the Ministerial Committee for Public Renewal (chaired by the minister for public innovation).

This system was strengthened under the previous liberal-conservative government in the early 2000s and there are parallel committees of high-level civil servants.

Citation:

Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen et al., *Politik og forvaltning*, 4. udg., 2017.

Oversigt over faste regeringsudvalg, http://www.stm.dk/_p_8011.html (Accessed 4 October 2018).

New Zealand

Score 9

There are clear guidelines for policy formulation in the New Zealand core executive. All policy proposals are reviewed in cabinet committees. Full cabinet meetings therefore can focus on strategic policy debates and policy conflicts between coalition partners or between the government and its legislative support parties in the House of Representatives. In quantitative terms, from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018, the full cabinet met 44 times while cabinet committees met 139 times. A revised cabinet committee structure was implemented in October 2017 following the formation of the government after the general election. The overall number of committees remained ten, but seven out of ten committees were discontinued or superseded. Key committees are now the Cabinet Legislation Committee, the Committee on Economic Development and the Cabinet Environment, Energy and Climate Committee.

Citation:

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. *Annual Report 2018*. <https://dpmc.govt.nz/publications/annual-report-2018>.

Spain

Score 9 Two powerful ministerial committees effectively prepare cabinet meetings in Spain: the Committee for Economic Affairs, and the Committee of Undersecretaries and Secretaries of State. The Committee for Economic Affairs normally meets on Thursdays to review and schedule economic or budgetary interministerial coordination. This committee has been chaired since June 2018 by the minister of economy and business, and also includes the other ministers and secretaries of state who hold economic responsibilities. For its part, the Committee of Undersecretaries and Secretaries of State effectively filters out and settles issues prior to cabinet meetings. This committee of top officials meets every Wednesday to prepare the Council of Ministers' weekly sessions, which are held every Friday (see "Ministerial Bureaucracy" for further details). No cabinet member participates apart from the deputy prime minister, who serves as its chairperson. Spain's only Council of Ministers committee composed exclusively of cabinet members is the Foreign Policy Council, which meets only about once a year. Other ministerial committees are regulated by Royal Decree 694/2018.

Citation:
Real Decreto 694/2018
Real Decreto 595/2018

United Kingdom

Score 9 The composition and terms of reference of cabinet committees are decided by the prime minister. Though Minister for the Cabinet Office David Lidington also has an influential role, chairing ten and sitting on all but two cabinet committees. The creation of implementation taskforces alongside conventional committees has meant a net increase in committee numbers. Since the change of prime minister in the summer of 2016, two noteworthy innovations are the establishment of the European Union Exit and Trade Committee and the Economy and Industrial Strategy Cabinet Committee, both of which are chaired by the prime minister. Additionally, a committee on social reform was created. However, leaks from cabinet ministers have suggested that key decisions on Brexit have not been adequately shared outside the prime minister's inner circle.

Where the previous coalition government (2010 – 2015) installed a coalition committee to ease the uncommon situation of a two-party government, the incumbent minority government has created a coordination committee in which the Conservative and the DUP parliamentary leaders meet, and jointly oversee the implementation of the Conservative-DUP arrangement. This exemplifies the UK government's tendency to create new committees rapidly in response to shifts in political priorities, demonstrating the flexibility of the system.

Cabinet committees reduce the burden on the cabinet by enabling collective decisions to be taken by a smaller group of ministers. Since the Conservative government of Edward Heath (1970 – 1974), it has become an established norm that decisions settled in cabinet committees are not questioned in full cabinet unless the committee chair or the prime minister decide to do so.

Citation:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720421/2018-06-27_DUP_CC_Transparency_Return__October_to_March__FINAL.pdf

<https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publication/whitehall-monitor/whitehall-explained/cabinet-committees>

Australia

Score 8 Committees serve a purpose in dealing with various matters, which include: highly sensitive issues, for example revenue or security matters; relatively routine issues, for example a government's weekly parliamentary program; business that is labor intensive or requires detailed consideration by a smaller group of ministers, for example the expenditure review that takes place before the annual budget, or oversight of the government's initiatives in relation to a sustainable environment. The prime minister usually establishes a number of standing committees of the cabinet (e.g., expenditure review, national security, parliamentary business). Additional committees, including ad hoc committees, may be set up from time to time for particular purposes, such as handling a national disaster.

Citation:

https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint

Canada

Score 8 Cabinet committees have both the legal and de facto power to prepare cabinet meetings in such a way as to allow the cabinet to focus on vital issues. The de facto power to sort out issues before they go to cabinet belongs to senior officials in the PMO and PCO, not to cabinet committees. Still, this allows the cabinet to focus on strategic policy issues.

France

Score 8 Coordination is strong within the French government, and is in the hands of the PMO and the President's Office, which constantly liaise and decide on every issue. Coordination takes place at several levels. First at the level of specialized civil servants who work as political appointees in the PMO (members of the cabinet, that is political appointees belonging to the staff of the prime minister), then in meetings chaired by the secretary-general and finally by the prime minister himself, in case of

permanent conflicts between ministers or over important issues. In many instances, conflicts pit the powerful ministers of budget or finance against other ministries. Appeals to the prime minister require either a powerful convincing argument or that the appealing party is a key member of the government coalition, as it is understood that the prime minister should not be bothered by anything but the highest-level issues. A powerful instrument in the hands of the prime minister is his capacity to decide which texts will be presented to the parliament with priority. Given the frequent bottlenecks in the process, ministerial bills can end up indefinitely postponed.

The new government has introduced the practice of “government seminars” to ensure better cohesion and harmonization. The team spirit seems to have improved a lot in comparison with the past given that many ministers are not professional politicians.

Latvia

Score 8

Cabinet committees are an integral part of the official decision-making process. If ministerial agreement on draft policy proposals cannot be reached at the state-secretary level, issues are automatically taken up by a cabinet committee for resolution. The cabinet committee’s mandate is to iron out differences prior to elevating the proposal to the cabinet level. In 2017, cabinet committees considered 142 issues, of which 141 were sent on to cabinet.

The cabinet committee may be complemented by informal mechanisms such as the coalition council if agreement cannot otherwise be reached.

Citation:

State Chancellery (2017), Report, Available at (in Latvian): https://www.mk.gov.lv/sites/default/files/page/attachments/valsts_kancelejas_gada_parskats_2017_final_6.pdf, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

Luxembourg

Score 8

There are no cabinet committees, in the strict sense. The Council of Ministers (Luxembourg’s cabinet) has to rely entirely on the work of line ministries or interministerial groups, if more than one department is concerned. Generally, the Council of Ministers is well prepared, as only bills that have been accepted informally are presented. Moreover, bills must be scrutinized by experts at the Ministry of Finance and the inspector general of finance (Inspection générale des finances), which is comprised of senior civil servants and chaired by the secretary-general of the Council of Ministers. This informal body insures that coherence prevails. The Prime Minister’s Office has assumed some horizontal competences on issues that concern more than one ministry, notably in the field of administrative simplification, ethical and deontological questions.

There are regular sessions of the government council (“Regierungsrat”). The government council includes ministers and sometimes state secretaries, although there are currently no state secretaries (“Staatssekretäre”). There are no other cabinet committees outside the government council. Additional cabinet committees do not seem necessary as there are ad hoc meetings between relevant ministers on specific issues. The system is not rigid or predetermined, but works well.

Citation:

<http://luxembourg.public.lu/de/le-grand-duche-se-presente/systeme-politique/institutions-politiques/gouvernement/index.html>. Accessed 15 Dec. 2018.

Netherlands

Score 8

Council of Ministers committees (onderraad) involve a separate meeting chaired by the prime minister for the ministers involved. Each committee has a coordinating minister responsible for relevant input and documents. Discussion and negotiations focus on issues not resolved through prior administrative coordination and consultation. If the committee fails to reach a decision, the matter is pushed up to the Council of Ministers.

Since the Balkenende IV Council of Ministers there have been six standing Council of Ministers committees: international and European affairs; economics, knowledge and innovation; social coherence; safety and legal order; and administration, government and public services. Given the elaborate process of consultations and negotiations, few issues are likely to have escaped attention and discussion before reaching the Council of Ministers.

However, since the Rutte I and II cabinets have consisted of two or more political parties of contrary ideological stripes (the conservative-liberal VVD and the PvdA or Labor Party, in the case of Rutte II), political pragmatism and opportunism has tended to transform “review and coordination” to simple logrolling, or in Dutch political jargon: “positive exchange,” meaning that each party agrees tacitly or explicitly not to veto the other’s bills. This tendency has negative consequences for the quality of policymaking, as minority views effectively win parliamentary majorities if they are budgetarily feasible, without first undergoing rigorous policy and legal analyses. In the second half of the Rutte II cabinet, the government had to garner political support for its policy initiatives through elaborate negotiations with political parties in the Senate/First Chamber who were not formally part of the governing coalition. Introducing a wider range of perspectives and decision criteria may have increased the quality of policymaking and the democratic nature of the process, given that not only ministerial committees but also political parties were involved.

Slovenia

Score 8 Cabinet committees play an important role in the preparation of cabinet proposals in Slovenia and settle issues prior to the cabinet meeting. Under the Cerar government, there were three standing committees: the Committee of State Matters and Public Issues, the Committee of National Economy and the Commission of Administrative and Personnel Matters. In addition, the Cerar government established 11 temporary committees for particular tasks, including cabinet committees for youth issues, disability issues, integration of migrants and protection against natural disasters. The Šarec government has so far kept the three standing cabinet committees.

Hungary

Score 7 Given the dominant role of the PMO and the small number of ministries, cabinet committees played a much less significant role under the second and third Orbán governments than under previous governments. Whether or not the institutional changes after the 2018 elections will have an effect on the role of cabinet committees remains to be seen.

Ireland

Score 7 Cabinet committees are established by the government and managed by the Department of the Taoiseach. Cabinet committees derive their authority from government. Membership of cabinet committees includes cabinet ministers, ministers of state (junior ministers) and may also include the attorney general.

When a policy area cuts across departmental boundaries or is an urgent priority (e.g., Brexit) a common response is to set up a cabinet committee. The number of committees, and their relative size and composition is very much at the discretion of the taoiseach, so there is no semi-permanent standing committee structure as there is in some other countries.

For example, under the 2002 – 2007 government, there were 11 cabinet committees, whereas under the following government there were only six.

This means that many government ministers will serve on multiple cabinet committees. In 2011, the minister for finance was a member of five out of eight cabinet committees. The essential job of cabinet committees is to coordinate policy initiatives, especially when substantive policy proposals concern multiple line ministries.

In 2016, there were 10 cabinet committees. The most recent addition focuses on Brexit, while other cabinet committees focus on the economy, trade and jobs;

housing; health care; social policy and public-sector reform; justice reform; European affairs; regional and rural affairs; infrastructure, environment and climate change; and the arts, Irish culture and the Gaeltacht.

Each of the cabinet committees is supported by a group of senior officials who meet in advance of the committee to prepare agendas and identify problem areas. During the 2000s, “it has been reported that cabinet committees were attended not only by cabinet members but also by senior officials and often heads of agencies too.” (Hardiman et al, 116).

When Leo Varadkar became the taoiseach (prime minister) in June 2017 he reduced the number of cabinet committees to seven (economy, social policy and public services, European Union including Brexit, infrastructure, health care, national security, and justice and equality). They ranged in size from health care with eight members to social policy with 20. In terms of their official composition, members are a mixture of full cabinet ministers and ministers of state (e.g., the cabinet committee for the economy is composed of 10 cabinet ministers and five ministers of state). The minister for finance is a member of six out of the seven committees. The minister for foreign affairs is a member of all of seven committees, mostly likely because he is also the tanaiste (deputy prime minister).

Cabinet committees are chaired by the taoiseach or a senior official of the Department of the Taoiseach. Cabinet committees generally make policy recommendations, which are followed up by a formal memo to the government.

Citation:

For information about Cabinet Committee see:

http://www.taoiseach.gov.ie/eng/Taoiseach_and_Government/Cabinet_Committees

Niamh Hardiman, Aidan Regan and Mary Shayne ‘The Core Executive: The Department of the Taoiseach and the Challenge of Policy Coordination, in Eoin O’Malley and Muiris MacCarthaigh (eds, 2012), *Governing Ireland: From Cabinet Government to Delegated Governance*. Dublin: IPA.

Italy

Score 7

A significant number of policy proposals require de jure scrutiny by a Council of Ministers committee or even the explicit consent of a plurality of ministers. In a number of cases, this is only a formal exercise and the Council of Ministers committees are not an important mechanism. It is more significant that a number of important issues are de facto dealt with through consultations among a few ministers (and their ministerial cabinets) before being brought to the Council of Ministers or are sent to this type of proceeding after preliminary discussion in the council. These consultations, which usually include the Treasury, typically avoid provoking conflicts in the council. In meetings of the Council of Ministers, discussion of policy proposals are typically very cursory. Most problems have been resolved before meetings of the Council of Ministers, either in formal or informal meetings. Under the new Conte government, the strong political clout of the two coalition party leaders (who are also both deputy prime minister) will make consultations between

the prime minister and the party leaders an essential instrument for the solution of conflicts.

Lithuania

Score 7 Although Lithuania's government can create advisory bodies such as government committees or commissions, the number and role of such committees has gradually declined since the beginning of the 2000s, when coalition governments became the rule. Top-priority policy issues are frequently discussed in governmental deliberations organized before the official government meetings. The Strategic Committee is composed of several cabinet ministers, the chancellor and a top prime-ministerial deputy who manages the government's performance priorities, policy and strategy. Another government committee, the Crisis Management Committee, advises the government on crisis management. A European Union Commission continues to act as a government-level forum for discussing Lithuania's EU positions; made up of relevant vice-ministers and chaired by the minister of foreign affairs.

Mexico

Score 7 Mexico is unusual, because the constitution does not recognize the cabinet as a collective body. Instead, Mexico has four sub cabinets, respectively dealing with economic, social, political and security matters. As a result, Mexico in practice has a system of cabinet committees each of them normally chaired by the president. The full cabinet never or hardly ever meets. Mexico's cabinet, as a collective, matters less than in most countries. The cabinet is not a supreme executive body as it is in, say, Britain. For one thing, there are a number of heads of executive agencies, with cabinet rank, who are not directly subject to a minister. There is a trend of governments to increase this process, partially out of the logic of depoliticizing and cementing programmatic decisions and views in social and economic policy fields. Under the current administration, cabinet reshuffles have frequently taken place, often in response to unpopular policy outcomes or political pressure. The central political figure has been and is the president.

Portugal

Score 7 Most ordinary meetings of the Portuguese cabinet – the Council of Ministers – are used for policy decisions rather than strategic policy debates. Political issues and strategic policy considerations are by-and-large prepared by an inner core of ministers, augmented by other ministers and staff when required. This inner core is an informal group, with a composition that can vary depending on the policy area.

In addition, Council of Ministers meetings are preceded by a formal weekly meeting of junior ministers (Reunião dos Secretários de Estado), which is intended to prepare the Council of Ministers meeting. These meetings of the junior ministers play a crucial role in filtering out and settling more technical issues prior to cabinet meetings. These meetings are chaired by the minister for the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (Presidência do Conselho dos Ministros), who has a seat in the Council of Ministers.

South Korea

Score 7

Formally, the cabinet is the executive branch's highest body for policy deliberation and resolution. In reality, the role of the cabinet is limited because all important issues are discussed bilaterally between the Blue House and the relevant ministry. However, bureaucratic skirmishing takes place on many issues. The Blue House's capacity to contain rivalries between the various ministries tends to be relatively high early in a given president's official term. However, coordination power becomes weaker in a lame-duck administration. Committees are either permanent, such as the National Security Council, or created in response to a particular issue. As many government agencies have recently been moved out of Seoul into Sejong city, the need to hold cabinet meetings without having to convene in one place at the same time has been growing, and the law has therefore been amended to allow cabinet meetings in a visual teleconference format.

Croatia

Score 6

The rules of procedure of the Croatian government provide for different kinds of cabinet committees and assign a major role in policy coordination to them. The prime minister and the vice prime ministers form the core cabinet (Uži kabinet vlade). In addition, there are various permanent and non-permanent cabinet committees that focus on particular issues. As there is little ex ante coordination among ministries, controversies are often pushed upwards, with cabinet committees playing an important role in resolving conflicts. However, the quality of coordination suffers from the fact that cabinet committees are absorbed by these disputes and other matters of detail.

Iceland

Score 6

Cabinet committees rarely prepare cabinet meetings, although the Budget Committee and some ad hoc committees are exceptions. However, the majority of items on cabinet meeting agendas are prepared by ministers often with two or more ministers coordinating the cabinet meeting. In the immediate aftermath of the 2008 economic

collapse, cooperation between ministers increased, particularly between the prime minister, the minister of finance, and the minister of commerce. However, this change was temporary and intended only to facilitate the cabinet's immediate reactions to the 2008 economic collapse. In February 2013, new regulations were introduced permitting the prime minister to create single-issue ministerial committees to facilitate coordination between ministers where an issue overlaps their authority areas.

Records must be kept of all ministerial committee meetings, but these are not made public.

The number of ministerial committees to coordinate overlapping policy issues was reduced from seven to three in 2016. These committees included the Ministerial Committee on Public Finances (Ráðherranefnd um ríkisfjármál), with four ministers, and the Ministerial Committee on National Economy (Ráðherranefnd um efnahagsmál), with four ministers. The newly established Ministerial Committee on Coordination of Issues that concern more than one ministry (Ráðherranefnd um samræmingu mála er varða fleiri en eitt ráðuneyti) encompasses the former ministerial committees on Equality, On Solutions for the Debts of Families, on Arctic Affairs, and on Public Health Affairs. During the current period under review, the number has increased to four following the re-establishment of the special Ministerial Committee on Equality.

Citation:

Rules on procedures in ministerial committee meetings. (REGLUR um starfshætti ráðherranefnda. Nr. 166/2013 22. febrúar 2013).

Cabinet committees (Ráðherranefndir), <https://www.stjornarradid.is/rikisstjorn/radherranefndir/>. Accessed 22 December 2018.

Israel

Score 6

The government is authorized to appoint cabinet committees (called ministerial committees) to handle different policy issues. Moreover, it is obligated to appoint a security- and state-focused cabinet that includes the prime minister, the minister of defense, the minister of justice, the foreign minister, the minister of state security and the minister of finance. Currently, 33 ministerial committees work to address a wide range of topics.

Most ministerial committees receive limited attention in the media. The ministerial committee for legislation handles the preparation and the first approval of legislative proposals. The committee's decisions regarding proposals determine how the coalition members will vote on the proposals in the Knesset. The committee has the right to control and delay legislation, and decide when a bill should proceed to a parliamentary vote. In 2016, about 40% of draft bills were delayed, some up to six to seven times.

Ministerial committees in Israel have become more relevant. Under the previous government (2013 – 2015), their decisions accounted for 54% of all governmental decisions. Though the current government has not yet released updated information on this topic, committee decisions appear to have remained relevant through 2015 – 2018.

Citation:

Cabinet committees and their authorities,” the ministry of Justice website 24.6.1996 (Hebrew)

Data proves: Ayelet Shaked is the real prime minister of the State of Israel, June 2018,
<https://www.haaretz.co.il/blogs/tomeravital/BLOG-1.6200567>

Friedberg, Chen, “The Knesset’s Committees – Foretold Failure?,” The Ben-Gurion Law Proposal –Amendments of ‘Basic Law: The Government,’ 2015

‘Decade of Ministerial Committees – comparative study’ – January 2016,
 Citizens’ Empowerment in Israel (Hebrew):
<http://www.ceci.org.il/sites/citizens/UserContent/files/knowledge/govfunction/MinisterCommittees.pdf>

“Ministerial Committees.” PMO’s website (12.11.2015),
<http://www.pmo.gov.il/English/GovernmentSecretariat/Pages/MinisterialCommittees.aspx>

Much housing, little health: the priorities of the government are revealed, The Marker, 2017,
<https://www.themarket.com/news/1.3263480>

Research Institute for the Study of Israel & Zionism (January 2010) (Hebrew)

“The guidelines for government work,” PMO’s website (Hebrew)

Working Plan Book 2017-18, PMO Office, March 2017: <http://www.plans.gov.il/pdf2017/> (Hebrew)

The Ministerial Committee on Legislation postponed the discussion by 40% of the bills, Calcalist, May 2015,
<https://www.calcalist.co.il/local/articles/0,7340,L-3688732,00.html>

‘Transparency in the Ministerial Committee for Legislation’ – February 2016, The Social Guard (Hebrew):
http://fs.knesset.gov.il/%5C20%5CCommittees%5C20_cs_bg_325109.pdf

Japan

Score 6

Government committees exist in a number of important fields in which coordination among ministries with de facto overlapping jurisdictions plays an important role. The most important is the Council for Economic and Fiscal Policy (CEFP), headed by the prime minister. However, this has never been a “ministerial committee” in a strict sense. First, it has only an advisory function. Second, individuals from the private sector – two academics and two business representatives in the current configuration – are included. This can increase the impact of such councils, but it also means they are somewhat detached from political processes.

Prime Minister Abe again strengthened the role of the CEFP and set up the Headquarters for Japan’s Economic Revitalization as a “quasi-sub-committee” of the CEFP that encompasses all state ministers. While the cabinet has to approve considerations developed in the CEFP or in the Headquarters, there is indeed a shift toward first discussing policy redirections in the committees, including discussions of basic budget guidelines.

There are currently four councils operating directly under the Cabinet Office, including CEFP and the Council for Science, Technology and Innovation.

The creation of the National Security Council in 2013 was a similar case in which interministerial coordination was intensified in the interest of asserting the prime minister's policy priorities.

The government structure thus has become more complex, a fact that could lead to some confusion.

Citation:
Cabinet Office, Japan 2016 Revitalization Strategy, Provisional Translation,
www.kantei.go.jp/jp/singi/keizaisaisei/pdf/2016_hombun1_e.pdf

Malta

Score 6 While government officials do organize cabinet committees to assist in clarifying issues prior to full cabinet meetings, these do not necessarily correspond to line ministries but to individual issues. Occasionally ministers form cabinet subcommittees to coordinate policies between ministries. The chair of the subcommittee, however, would not be from the ministry from which the policy originated. Cabinet committees on EU affairs, including on the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy, have been appointed. In addition, an ad hoc cabinet committee oversaw the preparations and running of Malta's presidency of the EU in 2017.

Citation:
Harwood Mark, Malta in the European Union 2014 Ashgate, Surrey

Slovakia

Score 6 The importance of cabinet and ministerial committees has varied over time in Slovakia, with every government modifying the committee structure. Since the parliamentary elections in 2016, there has been only one cabinet committee composed exclusively of ministers, the Council for National Security. Other ministerial committees consisting of ministers and senior civil servants and chaired by the four appointed vice prime ministers or line ministers have played a major role in the preparation of government proposals, and have been quite effective in settling controversial issues prior to cabinet meetings. However, they are still neither formally nor systematically involved in the preparation of cabinet meetings, partly as these bodies usually reside at the line ministries.

Turkey

Score 6

Following the April 2017 referendum and the June 2018 early elections, the governmental system was changed to a presidential model and the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) was abolished. The organization of the new presidential system was regulated by presidential decree in July 2018. The Ministry of Development – previously the primary consultative body for the preparation, implementation, coordination and monitoring of the government program – was abolished by decree in July 2018.

Until the PMO was abolished in July 2018, the Better Regulation Group within the PMO ensured coordination among related agencies and institutions, and improved the process of creating regulations. In addition, the government has created committees – such as the anti-terror commission under the Ministry of Interior, which includes officials from the ministries of Foreign Affairs and Justice, as well as other security departments. These are composed of ministers, experts, bureaucrats and representatives of other bureaucratic bodies (such as those on legislation techniques, legislation management and administrative simplification, and regulatory impact analysis) in highly important policy areas or when important or frequently raised issues were under consideration.

Several coordination committees and boards were attached to the presidency, presidential policy councils or other public institutions on 1 August 2018.

The effectiveness of the system, which is based on centralization and unification in decision-making, should be reviewed in the near future.

Citation:

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Genelgesi 2018/3, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/08/20180802-2.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi 1, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180710-1.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)

K. Gözler, Türkiye'nin Yönetim Yapısı (TC İdari Teşkilatı), Bursa: Ekin Basın Yayın Dağıtım, 2018.

Z.Sobacı et al., Turkey's New Government Model and the Presidential Organization, SETA Perspective No. 45, July 2018.

Austria

Score 5

During the last years of the SPÖ-ÖVP coalition cabinets, there had been no regular (or permanent) cabinet committees. In rare cases, ad hoc committees were established to deal with specific matters. As coalitions are typical in Austria, such committees usually consist of members of both coalition parties in order to ensure an outcome acceptable to the full cabinet. The new ÖVP-FPÖ cabinet has not as yet established regular cabinet committees either.

Chile

- Score 5** Ministerial or cabinet committees are not necessarily central when it comes to decision-making on policy matters. Depending on the topic, ministerial committees are more or less involved in preparing cabinet proposals, especially those of relatively significant strategic or financial importance. These proposals are normally coordinated effectively.

Cyprus

- Score 5** Forming ad hoc interministerial committees is a regular practice. The number of ministries, limited to 11, results in overlapping competencies and a greater need for coordination. The committees' tasks focus on procedural and sector-specific matters that may affect more than one ministry. The formulation of general policy frameworks is also within their purview. They are supported by departments or technical committees mainly from within the ministries; in some cases, contributions from external experts are sought. The scope of work and the degree of efficiency in the committees' coordination are not easy to assess, given their ad hoc character and that their reports are not published.

Citation:

1. Cabinet orders review of crisis management, Cyprus Mail, 31 July 2018, <https://cyprus-mail.com/2018/07/31/cabinet-orders-review-of-crisis-management/>

Czechia

- Score 5** There are about 21 committees whose activities are organized by the Government Office. In addition, there are a further 15 working and advisory bodies managed by individual ministries. Depending on the set of issues they are tasked to address, some are established on a temporary basis while others are permanent. The most important permanent committees include the Council for National Security, Legislative Committee, Committee for the European Union and the Research and Development Council. The committees discuss and approve policy documents, thereby filtering out issues and saving time in cabinet meetings, but they do so in an ad hoc fashion and are not systematically involved in the preparation of cabinet meetings.

Germany

- Score 5** As a rule of thumb, the cabinet functions as an institution that formally ratifies policy decisions that have been made elsewhere. In principle, line ministers are responsible for policies within their own jurisdiction. Therefore, they have a strong leeway to

pursue their own or their party's interests, though each ministry must to some extent involve other ministries while drafting bills.

Formal cabinet committees do not play an important role in policymaking and are rarely involved in the review or coordination of proposals. Instead, the coalition committee is mainly responsible for coordinating policies (see Informal Coordination).

Greece

Score 5 There are cabinet committees tasked with overseeing specific policy sectors. However, these committees meet only when a major policy decision has to be made and are not subject to systematic organization. Substantive policy work is done at the line ministries and by the PMO before issues are presented to the cabinet. A small, informal circle of advisers and ministers close to the prime minister, at the headquarters of the PMO, are primarily responsible for the formulation and coordination of cabinet proposals. Ministerial committees often perform a more symbolic function. During the period under review, the government was running behind schedule on completing the Third Economic Adjustment Program for Greece. In other words, this was a period which hardly allowed for the smooth review of cabinet proposals by committees.

Romania

Score 5 In Romania, ministerial committees, composed of one minister, deputy ministers and public servants, feature prominently in interministerial coordination. By contrast, committees consisting only of ministers or with several ministers are rare.

United States

Score 5 The question for the U.S. system is whether, on major issues, White House advisory processes prepare issues thoroughly for the president, and on lesser issues with interagency implications, whether interagency committees prepare them thoroughly for decision by the relevant cabinet members. The U.S. system of advisory processes varies considerably, even within a single presidential administration, but is largely under control of the president's appointees in the White House. The process is to a great extent ad hoc, with organizational practices varying over time and from one issue area to another, based partly on the personnel involved. Typically, important decisions are "staffed out" through an organized committee process. However, the ad hoc character of organization (compared with a parliamentary cabinet secretariat), along with the typically short-term service of political appointees – resulting in what

one scholar has called “a government of strangers” – renders the quality of these advisory processes unreliable.

President Trump’s White House has thoroughly neglected the role of managing an organized, systematic policy process. Trump selected his third White House chief of staff before the end of his second year in office. Decision processes have been described as chaotic, even by insiders.

Bulgaria

Score 4 No cabinet or ministerial committees coordinate proposals for cabinet meetings in Bulgaria. There are many cross-cutting advisory councils that include several ministers or high-ranking representatives of different ministries and have some coordinating functions. These might thus be seen as functional equivalents to ministerial or cabinet committees. The role of the councils, which often have a rather broad membership, is quite limited in substantive terms.

Poland

Score 4 The number and role of cabinet committees under the PiS government have been limited. However, it set up an Innovativeness Council, consisting of five ministers, in February 2016 and an Economic Committee at the end of September 2016. The latter is in charge of coordinating the implementation of the Strategy of Responsible Development. There is also a cabinet-level Committee for Social Affairs headed by former Prime Minister Beata Szydło. However, conflicts among ministries are ultimately resolved not by cabinet committees, but by PiS leader Kaczyński and his immediate circle.

Estonia

Score 2 Estonia does not have a committee structure within government, or any ministerial committee. Ministers informally discuss their proposals and any other pending issues at weekly consultative cabinet meetings. No formal voting or any other selection procedure is applied to issues discussed in consultative meetings. The creation of cabinet committees was proposed by government in March 2017. However, an amendment to the Act on National Government, which was passed in fall 2018, has not improved strategic coordination within the cabinet.

Switzerland

- Score 2** Not surprisingly, given the small number of ministries, there are no cabinet committees in Switzerland's political system. However, there is considerable coordination, delegation and communication at the lower level of the federal government. Every minister is in a sense already a "ministerial committee," representing the coordination of numerous cooperating departmental units.

Norway

- Score 1** There is little use of formal cabinet committees within Norway's political system. The whole cabinet meets several times a week and generally works together as a full-cabinet committee.

However, there are meetings in subcommittees, such as the subcommittee dealing with security issues. There is also coordination between key officials representing the political parties that form the coalition government. The coalition partners have, for instance, created a subcommittee within the cabinet that coordinates issues on difficult or sensitive topics and a special subgroup for European affairs.

Sweden

- Score 1** There are no standing cabinet committees in the Swedish system of government. Cabinet proposals are coordinated through iterations of sending drafts of bills to the concerned departments. This usually takes place at the middle level of the departments and thus does not involve the political level of the departments.

The cabinet is both a policy-shaping institution as well as the final institution of appeal on a wide range of issues. There is also a requirement that the cabinet must be the formal decision-maker on many issues. This means that the cabinet annually makes more than 100,000 decisions (mostly in bulk).

Indicator

Ministerial Bureaucracy

Question

How effectively do ministry officials/civil servants coordinate policy proposals?

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 = Most policy proposals are effectively coordinated by ministry officials/civil servants.
- 8-6 = Many policy proposals are effectively coordinated by ministry officials/civil servants.
- 5-3 = There is some coordination of policy proposals by ministry officials/civil servants.
- 2-1 = There is no or hardly any coordination of policy proposals by ministry officials/civil servants.

Estonia

Score 10

Formal procedures of coordinating policy proposals are set in the rules of the national government. According to it, all relevant ministries must be consulted and involved in a consensus-building process before an amendment or policy proposal can be brought to the government. In addition to this formal procedure, senior civil servants from the various ministries consult and inform each other about coming proposals; deputy secretaries general are key persons in this informal consultation process.

Finland

Score 10

Cabinet meetings are prepared by ministry officials and civil servants. Findings from a large-scale analysis several years ago into the internal politics and practices of the cabinet and ministries emphasized the existence of a cyclical culture of dependence between ministers and senior officials. One expression of this mutual dependence, according to the same analysis, was that ministers put greater trust in the advice of their subordinate civil servants than in the advice of ministerial colleagues. This pattern extends to all aspects of the cabinet's agenda. At times, civil servants can exercise significant influence. The former state secretary in the Ministry of Finance, Raimo Sailas, was widely considered to be highly influential. With regard to policy programs and similar intersectoral issues, coordination between civil servants of separate ministries happens as a matter of course. In specific matters, coordination may even be dictated. For instance, statements from the Ministry of Finance on economic and financial matters must be obtained by other ministries. On the whole, given the decision-making culture, civil servants in different ministries are expected

to engage in coordination. An unwritten code of behavior prescribes harmonious and smooth activity, and ministers or ministries are expected to subject projects that are burdensome or sensitive to a collective examination and analysis.

Citation:

Jaakko Nousiainen, "Politiikan huipulla. Ministerit ja ministeriöt Suomen parlamentaarisessa järjestelmässä". Porvoo: Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, 1992, p. 128; Eero Murto, Power Relationship Between Ministers and Civil Servants, pp. 189-208 in Lauri Karvonen, Heikki Paloheimo and Tapio Raunio, eds. The Changing Balance of Power in Finland, Stockholm: Santérus Förlag, 2016.

Switzerland

Score 10

The federal government deliberates behind closed doors, and minutes of these meetings are not public. A leading expert on government decision processes has estimated that in most decision-making processes, "either the preliminary procedure or the co-reporting procedure leads to an agreement." The preliminary procedure consists of interministerial consultations at the level of the federal departments. After the departments have been consulted, the co-reporting procedure begins. The Federal Chancellery leads the process by submitting the proposal under consideration as prepared by the ministry responsible to all other ministries. These then have the opportunity to submit a report or express an opinion. A process of discussion and coordination ensues, designed to eliminate all or most differences before the proposal is discussed by the Federal Council.

Two instruments, the large and the small co-reporting procedures, are specifically designed to coordinate policy proposals between the ministries. These processes invite the ministries to take positions on political issues. The co-reporting procedure is largely a process of negative coordination, which highlights incompatibilities with other policies but does not systematically scrutinize the potential for synergy.

Denmark

Score 9

Coordination through the cabinet is collegial, and officials largely carry out interdepartmental coordination through negotiations between their affected ministries, often via interdepartmental committees or working groups. There is a certain degree of congruence between such interdepartmental committees and cabinet committees, with different ministries leading on different issue areas. The PMO plays an important role, especially for issues that involve the parliament. Other important ministries are the Finance Ministry, which prepares the annual budget, the Justice Ministry, which checks the legal aspects of all bills, and the Foreign Ministry, which gets involved in security, defense and development policies.

Citation:

Jørgen Grønnegård Christiansen, Peter Munk Christensen and Mariun Ibsen, Politik og forvaltning. 4. udgave. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag, 2017.

Luxembourg

Score 9 Senior ministry officials and interministerial meetings are important for the preparation of draft bills and for cabinet meetings. There is both formal and informal coordination in the conception of new policy, in policy modification or in the conception of a pre-draft bill. As part of the process, interministerial ad hoc groups are formed. Normally, a pre-draft bill is already the result of consultation with social partners and civil society groups. Once the pre-draft bill is published, official consultation rounds start again.

Citation:

Thomas, Bernard/Schmit, Laurent: "Die Unentbehrlichen: Wieviel Macht haben hohe Beamte?" Forum.lu, September 2013, pp. 33-37. www.forum.lu/pdf/artikel/7693_332_ThomasSchmit.pdf. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Bossaert, Danielle (2008): Die öffentliche Verwaltung, in: Wolfgang H. Lorig/Mario Hirsch (eds.): Das politische System Luxemburgs, Springer VS Verlag, pp. 130 – 142.

New Zealand

Score 9 The cabinet process is overseen by the cabinet office on the basis of clear guidelines. Under the new Labour-NZ First coalition, the so-called Cabinet Office Circular CO (17) 10 provides practical guidance for ministers and departments on implementing the coalition agreement between Labour and New Zealand First and the confidence and supply agreement between Labour and the Green party. Departmental chief executives typically meet with ministers prior to cabinet meetings to discuss the agenda and clarify matters. The amount and effectiveness of policy proposal coordination varies a great deal depending on the policy field. However, there is clearly coordination in the preparation of cabinet papers and demanding processes specified in cabinet office circulars.

Citation:

Cabinet Office Circular CO (17) 10, Labour-New Zealand First Coalition, with Confidence and Supply from the Green Party: Consultation and Operating Arrangements. December 17, 2017. <https://dpmc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2017-12/coc-17-10.pdf>

Portugal

Score 9 There are weekly junior minister meetings, with each ministry represented by one of its junior ministers (known in Portugal as secretaries of state). A key purpose of these meetings is to ensure policy coordination across ministries before proposals reach the cabinet.

These meetings are generally very effective in ensuring policy coordination across government. Furthermore, the work of assessing the various proposals within each ministry is not restricted only to the secretaries of state who attend the meeting, but also include ministerial advisers and, to some degree, senior public administration officials. However, this coordination is not entirely effective.

Australia

Score 8 There is generally a high level of coordination between federal ministry public servants. In most cases, ministries must coordinate with the Department of Finance and the Treasury, since they are responsible for finding the resources for any new policy developments, and such developments must feed into the government's spending and budget cycle. Where there are legal implications, there must be coordination with the attorney general's department. Departments least likely to coordinate their activities across the government portfolio are Defense and Foreign Affairs and Trade, since their activities have the fewest implications across other portfolios.

Coordination is especially effective when the political leadership is driving proposals, but less effective on policy matters initiated at the level of the minister or department, in part reflecting greater uncertainty among civil servants as to the support for the proposal from the political leadership. It also reflects differences in policy priorities and culture across departments, as well as inherent competition between departments for power, relevance and resources.

Canada

Score 8 Many policy proposals are coordinated by line ministries with other line ministries. However, due to issues of departmental mandates and authorities, this process is generally not as effective as the central-agency coordination process. On certain issues, the line department may be unwilling to recognize the role or expertise of other line departments, or have fundamental differences of perspectives on the issue, and hence may fail to consult and/or coordinate a policy proposal with others. The paramount role of central agencies in policy development means that departments have in fact little ability to effectively coordinate policy proposals.

France

Score 8 If a ministry wishes to get its proposals accepted or passed, there are no other options than to liaise and coordinate with other ministries or agencies involved. For instance, the Macron Law on the economy (2015) had to be co-signed by 13 ministers. In case this consultation has not taken place, objections expressed by other ministers or by the Council of State might deliver a fatal blow to a proposal. All ministries are equal, but some are more equal than others: for example, the finance minister is a crucial, omnipresent and indispensable actor. Usually the coordination and consultation process is placed under the responsibility of a "rapporteur," usually a lawyer from the ministry bureaucracy (who is also in charge of arguing and defending the draft bill

before the Council of State whose intervention is crucial and not only in purely legal terms). The dossier is always followed as well by a member of the minister's staff who communicates with his/her counterparts and tries to smooth the process as much as possible. In the most difficult cases (when ministers back up strongly the positions of their respective civil servants), the prime minister has to step in and settle the matter. In contrast to Germany, for instance, sectoral ministers have a limited margin of maneuver.

Latvia

Score 8

The official decision-making process mandates the coordination of policy proposals at the state-secretary level. New policy initiatives are officially announced at weekly state-secretary meetings, after the draft proposals are circulated in a transparent process providing all ministries with an opportunity to review and comment on the issues. The process is open to the public and input from non-governmental entities is welcomed. Ministry responses to draft proposals are collected and ministerial coordination meetings on particular drafts are held to achieve consensus on the substance of the proposals. In cases where consensus cannot be reached, the proposals move to cabinet committee for further consideration at the political level.

Issues can be fast-tracked at the request of a minister. Fast-tracking means that the usual procedures for gathering cross-sectoral and expert input can be circumvented, putting the efficacy of coordination at risk. In 2016, 27% of all issues before the cabinet were fast-tracked, a significant drop from 2015.

At a lower bureaucratic level, coordination occurs on an ad hoc basis. Ministries conduct informal consultations, include other ministry representatives in working groups and establish interministerial working groups to prepare policy proposals. These methods are widely used, but not mandatory.

Citation:

State Chancellery (2015, 2016), Reports (in Latvian), Available at: <https://www.mk.gov.lv/lv/content/gada-publikie-parskati>, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

United Kingdom

Score 8

The interministerial coordination of policy proposals is an official civil service goal. Single Departmental Plans (SDPs) set out departmental objectives and how these will be achieved. SDPs highlight areas of cross-departmental working, including where departments are working together to deliver shared objectives and are overseen by the Cabinet Office and the Prime Minister's Office. There are also some cross-departmental bodies established in response to the identification of specific objectives, such as the Work and Health Unit set up to improve the employability of disabled or ill people.

However, problems of capacity and capability in this area have been revealed by surveys undertaken within the civil service. Examples of civil service disruption are, on the one hand, the Civil Service Reform Plan of 2012 and, on the other hand, the coalition's spending cuts, which have hit parts of the ministerial bureaucracy very hard and led to considerable job cuts. Relations between the civil service and the government have been affected, but the situation does not seem to have had a great impact on the efficiency of policy-proposal coordination. As explained above, the Cabinet Office assures coordination at the level of officials.

There are concerns that the workload required to deliver Brexit will undermine coordination within government.

Chile

Score 7

Ministry staff and civil servants do not always play a dominant role in the drafting of policy proposals before those proposals reach ministerial committees. Depending on the ministry and the importance of the proposal, officials and civil servants are more or less effectively involved in the preparation and coordination process.

Germany

Score 7

Interministerial coordination is typically initiated by the lead unit responsible for preparing a draft proposal, which will be sent to the co-signing ministries (i.e., those ministries whose competences are affected). The co-signing ministerial units read the proposal for negative effects on their own area of competences and only sign once those are eliminated. Ministerial civil servants seek to solve conflicts before involving the higher echelons of the hierarchy. A weekly Monday meeting of administrative state secretaries, preparing the agenda for the upcoming cabinet meeting, serves as the last arbiter.

Ex ante coordination between the line ministries' leading civil servants has not been particularly strong under past German coalition governments. In addition, an entrenched political practice ensures that no ministry makes any proposal that might be postponed or blocked by other ministries. The federal Ministry of Finance must be involved when budgetary resources are concerned, while complicated legal or constitutional issues necessitate the involvement of the federal Ministry of Justice. But generally, every ministry is fully responsible for its own proposed bills. All controversial issues are already settled before being discussed by the cabinet. The dominant mechanism for conflict resolution is the coalition committee, which is composed of the respective heads of the governing parties, sometimes supplemented by higher bureaucrats and/or party politicians. It is the most important and informal decision-making body with comprehensive competences in the governing process.

Iceland

Score 7 Ministry officials and civil servants play an important role in preparing cabinet meetings. Even so, no cooperation between ministries is presumed in cases where the ministers themselves are not involved. As a consequence of the strong tradition of ministerial power and independence, the involvement of too many ministries and ministers has been found to be a barrier to policymaking. Currently, coordination between ministries is irregular. The prime minister has the power to create coordination committees, but the number of active committees is currently low.

Italy

Score 7 Before every Council of Ministers meeting there is a preparatory meeting – the pre-consiglio – where the heads of all legislative ministerial offices filter and coordinate the proposals to be submitted to the Council of Ministers meeting. The head of the Department for Juridical and Legislative Affairs of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers chairs these meetings. Proposals on which there is no agreement will rarely make it to the Council of Ministers. Further informal meetings between ministerial officials take place at earlier stages of drafting. However, the bureaucracies of individual ministries are normally protective of their prerogatives and are not keen to surrender autonomy. Under the new government, the PMO bureaucracy seems to have lost some power for coordination.

Japan

Score 7 The LDP-led government has worked more effectively with the bureaucracy than did the previous short-lived DPJ-led governments. In 2014, the government introduced a Cabinet Bureau of Personnel Affairs tasked with helping the prime minister make appointment decisions regarding the 600 elite bureaucrats in ministries and other major agencies. This significantly expanded the Cabinet Office's involvement in the process and its influence over the ministerial bureaucracy, including the influence of Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga, who has been in office since 2012. There are more political appointees in the ministries than before, and since Abe has been premier since 2012, the average stay of such appointees has become longer, giving them greater expertise and clout in their ministries. After the Lower House election of 2017, Abe again reappointed key allies. There are growing concerns that basing the promotion of senior ministry civil servants on political considerations and personal allegiance may diminish their utility in terms of offering neutral expertise.

Citation:

Walter Sim, Japan's new Cabinet: Key Abe allies stay on as 12 newcomers named, only one woman appointed, The Straits Times, 2 October 2018, <https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/east-asia/japans-new-cabinet-key-abe-allies-stay->

on-as-12-newcomers-named-only-one-woman

Hideaki Tanaka, Should Civil Servants Offer Allegiance or Expertise? Lessons from the Moritomo and Kake Scandals, Tokyo Foundation for Policy Research, 1 May 2018, <http://www.tokyofoundation.org/en/articles/2018/role-of-civil-servants>

Lithuania

Score 7

The process of drafting laws and resolutions requires consultation with the ministries and state institutions affected by the issue. The coordination process is led by the ministry responsible for a given issue area. Coordination takes place at various levels of the administrative hierarchy: coordination at the civil-servant level is followed by that of ministerial representatives (junior ministers and ministerial chancellors) representing the ministries at the government level. The latter meetings, which had been initially discontinued under the Skvernelis government, were later reintroduced in the form of interinstitutional meetings after a change of the government chancellor.

Coordination is a lengthy, well-documented process. Joint working groups are sometimes established, while interministerial meetings are used to coordinate the preparation of drafts and resolve disagreements before proposals reach the political level. All draft legislation must be coordinated with the Ministry of Justice and/or the Government Office. However, the substance of coordination could be improved if the initiators of draft legislation were to use consultation procedures more extensively in assessing the possible impact of their proposals. The importance of coordination should be recognized not only during the planning phase, but also during the implementation, monitoring and evaluation phases of the policy process.

Norway

Score 7

Senior civil servants and political appointees play an important role in preparing cabinet meetings. This process follows fixed procedures, and matters must be appropriately prepared before being presented to the cabinet. This includes the creation of documentation alerting cabinet ministers to the essentials of a proposal, thus allowing cabinet meetings to focus on strategic issues and avoid being distracted by routine business details. Most issues on the agenda have been prepared well before the meeting.

South Korea

Score 7

Civil servants from different ministries regularly coordinate on policies of common concern. This coordination and cooperation among related civil servants across ministries can be either formal or informal, hierarchical or horizontal. Unfortunately, attitudes in the ministries are shaped by a departmentalism that obstructs

coordination. Different ministries use their policies to compete for support and approval from the office of the president. There is also a clear hierarchy delineating the ministries. Civil servants in important ministries, such as the Ministry of Strategy and Finance, consider civil servants from other ministries, such as the Labor Ministry or the Environment Ministry, as being “second tier.” Key issues given a high priority by the president can be effectively coordinated among concerned ministries.

Some attempts to improve coordination among ministries are being made. Various interministerial coordination mechanisms have been implemented on the basis of sector and theme, such as the interministerial coordination system for ODA. Moreover, it is expected that the efficiency of and communication between government agencies will be improved by the introduction of a new records-retrieval system. The National Archives and Records Administration (NIS) has announced that it will establish a search and retrieval service in consultation with the Ministry of Patriots and Veterans Affairs. However, in spite of the Blue House’s political dominance, the Moon government has exhibited numerous cases of coordination failure among relevant ministries.

Citation:

“Korea’s Government 3.0: the Beginning of Open Government Data,” Korea IT Times, February 24, 2016
<http://www.koreaitimes.com/story/58369/koreas-government-30-beginning-open-government-data>

Spain

Score 7

The two most important senior bureaucratic positions in the 17 ministries are the secretaries of state, who play a role much like that of junior ministers but do not formally belong to the government, and the undersecretaries, who are career civil servants who typically act as department administrators. These figures meet every Wednesday in the so-called General Committee of Undersecretaries and Secretaries of State. This committee effectively prepares the Council of Ministers’ weekly sessions, which are held two days later, on Fridays. The deputy prime minister and head of the Government Office (GO) chairs the meetings of this preparatory committee in which all draft bills, all appointments and any other ministerial proposals are discussed and scheduled as a part of the Council of Ministers’ agenda. A provisional agenda is published by the GO a week before the cabinet meeting. The GO also collects and circulates all relevant documents for discussion by the line ministers. On Tuesday mornings, the prime minister’s advisers assess the relative importance of agenda items and identify where there are likely to be divergent positions. Thus, the Wednesday meetings of the preparatory committee perform an important gatekeeping function in returning problematic proposals to the appropriate line ministry and forwarding the remaining proposals to the Council of Ministers.

While policy proposals are efficiently coordinated at the highest level of the bureaucratic hierarchy, the tradition of interministerial coordination at mid-level

administrative bureaucracy means efficiency is weaker here. To be sure, the role of high-ranking civil servants is crucial in the preparation of policy proposals within every line ministry, but their subsequent involvement in horizontal coordination with other ministries is very limited. In fact, and as a consequence of the strong departmentalization, every ministry tends to act within its area of competence or jurisdiction, avoiding proposals which may involve other ministries. Although many administrative interministerial committees formally exist, in practice these committees do not coordinate the drafting of policy proposals or decision-making between different ministries. As administrative committees do not tend to work efficiently, they have fallen by the wayside and now usually simply facilitate the exchange of information or try to settle jurisdictional conflicts

Citation:
Ley 50/1997
Real Decreto 595/2018

Sweden

Score 7

Most of the daily coordination on policy matters does not involve the political level of the departments but is instead handled at the administrative level. However, as soon as coordination takes place on a political dimension, it is “lifted” to the political level.

Coordination within the GO remains a significant problem, although some measures have been implemented to address that problem. Many departments still find it difficult to coordinate policy across departmental boundaries. Departments that were formed through mergers of departments tend to display “subcultures” of the former departments.

Citation:
Jacobsson, B., J. Pierre and G. Sundström (2015), *Governing the Embedded State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Niemann, C. (2013), *Villkorat förtroende. Normer och rollförväntningar i relationen mellan politiker och tjänstemän i Regeringskansliet* (Stockholm: department of Political Science, University of Stockholm).

Austria

Score 6

Austria’s federal bureaucracy is characterized by structural fragmentation. Each federal ministry has its own bureaucracy, accountable to the minister alone and not to the government as such. Each minister and his or her ministry is regarded as having a party affiliation according to the coalition agreement. Policy coordination is possible only when the ministers of specific ministries agree to establish such a specific coordination. As fitting in the government’s ministerial structure of the government, individual ministers fear loss of control over their respective bureaucracies, and thus lasting and open contacts are possible only between the (politically appointed) personal staff of ministers belonging to the same political party.

Because the Austrian bureaucracy is organized along the lines of a (British-style) civil service system, the different ministerial bureaucracies are stable in their political makeup and therefore immune to short-term political influences. Specific ministries are generally dominated by one party over the long term (e.g., the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (social democratic) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment (conservative)).

Nonetheless, by introducing “secretary generals” above the heads of departments in government ministries, the autonomy of civil servants has been reduced by the new ÖVP-FPÖ coalition.

Citation:

The tradition of a civil service system, consisting of professional bureaucrats bound to be loyal to any minister, has always been balanced by the undisputed right of any cabinet minister to decide about the activities of each civil servant in his (her) ministry. But by introducing in all ministries “secretary generals” above the heads of sections, the autonomy of civil servants has been further reduced.

Ireland

Score 6

Responsibility for policy coordination lies with the Prime Minister’s Office (Department of the Taoiseach). However, to be truly effective in this area the office would require greater analytical expertise across many policy areas than it has at present. Despite much rhetoric about “joined-up government,” the coordination of policy proposals across ministries has traditionally been relatively weak, with conflicting policies pursued in different parts of the civil service. For example, employment creation can take precedence over environmental considerations and local planning processes often do not mesh with national housing policies.

While coordination across government is often an up-hill battle, the development of the cabinet committee system has somewhat improved matters. Hardiman et al (2012, p.120) conclude, “perhaps the most significant organizational change aimed at improving cross-departmental coordination has been the growing reliance on the cabinet committee system: “Most of the major policy initiatives – health, environment, climate change, economic renewal – all will have gone through the cabinet committees. So that is a big change in the system of governance ... They provide a mechanism to manage complex cross-cutting issues’ (Interview B, 1 Nov 2009).”

Another source of interdepartmental coordination stems from the practice of cabinet and junior ministers each appointing their own “special adviser.” These advisers meet to debate policy proposals: O’Malley and Martin (2018, p265) comment that “the advisers collectively operate in effect as a lower-level cabinet.”

Citation:

Niamh Hardiman, Aidan Regan and Mary Shayne ‘The Core Executive: The Department of the Taoiseach and the Challenge of Policy Coordination, in Eoin O’Malley and Muiris MacCarthaigh (eds, 2012), *Governing Ireland: From Cabinet Government to Delegated Governance*. Dublin: IPA.

Eoin O’Malley and Shane Martin, ‘The Government and the Taoiseach,’ in John Coakley and Michael Gallagher, *Politics in The Republic of Ireland*. (Routledge, 2018).

Malta

Score 6

Civil servants from a ministry typically coordinate policy proposals with other line ministries before a policy is officially drafted. During the review period, a new system was established. The cabinet director general is in charge of administrative decisions and ensures that cabinet decisions are implemented in the different ministries. On Mondays, the chiefs of staff meet to draft memos for the cabinet. On Tuesdays, the cabinet meets and makes a decision. On Wednesdays, the permanent secretaries meet to decide on how to implement the cabinet's decisions. A commissioner for the simplification and reduction of bureaucracy has been established to implement reforms across government. These have been introduced horizontally (e.g., delegating staff recruitment to departments and agencies) and vertically (e.g., engaging ministries to improve efficiency). The permanent secretaries have requested that all departments examine current processes and consider methods of simplification. One result is the introduction of push service delivery, whereby individuals do not apply for social benefits but rather receive them automatically. Every year a report is published and made available to the public on the simplification systems that have been introduced. In 2017, the first 12 key performance indicators (KPIs) for the public service were put into place. This is a new concept for the public service, and is designed to establish clear objectives that need to be attained within a specific time-frame. A "mystery shopper" for government departments was also introduced, with the aim of identifying shortcomings in service delivery and allowing the situation to be remedied.

Occasionally interministerial committees help coordinate policy before the drafting process is started. This has increasingly become normal practice, with a number of interministerial committees created to support Valletta's campaign to be the 2018 European Capital of Culture, and to prepare for the Commonwealth Heads of State Summit in Malta, an EU-Africa summit, and Malta's presidency of the EU in 2017. These activities have laid stronger foundations for more effective coordination between the ministries and civil servants.

Netherlands

Score 6

Since the 2006 elections, politicians have demanded a reduction in the number of civil servants. This has resulted in a loss of substantive expertise, with civil servants essentially becoming process managers. Moreover, it has undermined the traditional relations of loyalty and trust between (deputy) ministers and top-level officers. The former have broken the monopoly formerly held by senior staff on the provision advice and information by turning increasingly to outside sources such as consultants. Top-level officers have responded with risk-averse and defensive behavior exemplified by professionally driven organizational communication and process management. They have embraced some Dutch variation of New Public

Management thinking and practices. The upshot is that ministerial compartmentalization in the preparation of Council of Ministers meetings has increased. Especially in the Ministry of Justice and Safety, the quality of bureaucratic policy and legislation preparation has become a reason for serious concern.

Citation:

R.B. Andeweg and G.A. Irwin (2014), *Governance and politics of the Netherlands*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

H. Tjeenk Willink, Een nieuw idee van de staat, *Socialisme & Democratie*, 11/12, 2012, pp. 70-78

“Is justitie politiek te managen?”, in *NRC-Handelsblad*, 1 October 2015

De Correspondent, Den Haag bestuurt het land alsof het een bedrijf is. En democratie heeft het nakijken, 29 June 2018

Romania

Score 6

Much of the coordination takes place in interministerial committees, usually presided over by a minister and composed primarily of deputy ministers (political positions) and top civil servants. In the absence of these committees, bills are subject to interministerial consultation by being sent for review to the ministries affected by each act. If ministries do not respond to the review request within five days, the non-response is considered tacit approval. Prior to government meetings discussing a particular legislative proposal, the Secretariat General of the Government organizes working groups between the representatives of ministries and agencies involved in initiating or reviewing the proposal in order to harmonize their views. While these procedures promote coordination, the capacity limitations of many ministries and the short turnaround time allowed for review undermine effective review and hence allow for only superficial coordination in many cases.

Slovenia

Score 6

The government rules of procedure establish clear mechanisms to ensure effective cooperation between the ministries. They require the consultation of all ministries that are concerned before the submission of bills to the cabinet. While senior civil servants are thus heavily involved in the coordination of legislation, the effectiveness of this coordination has suffered from the deteriorating quality and increasing politicization of the upper echelons of civil service. Under the Cerar government, a number of prominent and experienced high-ranking civil servants were replaced by party loyalists with limited administrative experience and even less expert knowledge. The Šarec government’s five-party coalition agreement failed to address the issue.

Belgium

Score 5 While ministries are not significantly involved in preparing cabinet meetings, each minister has a large team of close collaborators and advisers (the ministerial cabinet) to prepare projects, which are first submitted to the minister, and then to the Council of Ministers. For some decisions, responsibilities are shared among several ministers, a situation that happens regularly. In this case, ministerial teams must coordinate their actions in cabinet committee meetings before being able to submit a proposal to receive the approval of each minister. Proposals may be submitted to the ministers' council only at this stage.

The bottom line is that top civil servants do not play a significant role – in most cases, they are at best informed of ongoing discussions and are simply asked to deliver data and information.

Cyprus

Score 5 The constitution's limit of the number of ministries to 11 results in each having a broad area of responsibility that has been extended to new fields since EU membership. While ministry officials and civil servants participate in ad hoc bodies or seek coordination with other ministries, final decisions rest with the ministers themselves, often based on political criteria. Constitutional powers accorded to ministers render ministries fiefdoms, with ministers operating as absolute rulers.

More interministerial interaction was promoted through new units created in the framework of the reform effort. In July 2018, the parliament voted against legislation to establish a coordinating sub-ministry of development and the government dissolved the Unit for Administrative Reform. It reallocated the latter's tasks back to the ministries and, thus, the prospect of institutionalizing much needed consultation and coordination between line ministries on policy matters has been suspended.

Citation:

The Unit for Administrative Reform to be Dissolved, InBusiness, 27 July 2018, <https://inbusinessnews.reporter.com.cy/financials/cyprus/article/191286/dialyetai-i-monada-dioikitikis-metarythmisis> [in Greek]

Czechia

Score 5 As part of the interministerial coordination process, some coordination among line ministry civil servants takes place. Senior ministry officials are generally a crucial link in collecting and discussing comments on proposed legislation. The definition of their roles and responsibilities was improved through the civil service law, which went into effect at the beginning of 2015 and regulates the legal status of state

employees in administrative offices and represents a significant step toward establishing a stable and professional public administration. However, the form in which the civil service law is implemented has not yet led to a clear de-politicization of public administration, and it remains difficult to attract highly qualified workers into public service. In line with its technocratic appeal, the Babiš government has elevated several respected public servants into ministerial positions.

Hungary

Score 5 Given the relatively small number of ministries in Hungary, interministerial coordination has, to some extent, been replaced with intra-ministerial coordination, especially within the Ministry of Human Resources (EMMI), the largest superministry. In addition to policy coordination by the PMO, senior ministry officials meet in order to prepare cabinet meetings.

Israel

Score 5 Over the past decade, the government has sought to improve interministerial cooperation in order to overcome bureaucratic entanglements and political power struggles. In so doing, it has introduced roundtable meetings, director generals and vice-director generals of ministries coordination forums, guidelines and digital information platforms. However, experts say that ministries are essentially territorial in nature, and information sharing between ministries is difficult at best.

This lack of communication results at least partially from the government's highly centralized budget process, which makes public servants defensive of limited and strictly supervised resources. In 2016, a report by the State Comptroller suggested that the lack of communication regarding foreign affairs is a result of the transfer of duties from away from main ministries such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to other ministries. The report also asserted that interministerial disagreements are delaying the publication of regulations necessary for the implementation of laws. A report from 2015 claimed that 175 laws had not been implemented because ministries had not yet established regulations regarding those laws. According to that report, 32% of regulations are not promulgated because of internal arguments between ministries. A report from 2017 shows that this trend had improved, with 148 laws having not been implemented. Regulations under these laws were rescheduled or returned to parliament for further revision and should be resubmitted by the end of 2019.

More so, it seems that in some cases different ministerial offices are responsible for the same topic or field of expertise and that there is no coordination between these offices. This is somewhat deliberate as some of the reforms are reflect the personal interests of the prime minister's agenda. For example, the Office of Strategic Affairs

and the Israeli Office of Foreign Affairs came into conflict regarding BDS movements and the question of which office was responsible, because there was no coordination between offices.

Steps to improve communication issues include the Israeli government's work plan for "open administration" in 2017 – 2018. This indicates that one of the government's reasons for joining the international initiative for open administration is to improve coordination between government offices, and strengthen formal and informal mechanisms.

Citation:

"About: Public sharing," Sharing official website (Hebrew) "Failures of the public sector and directions for change," The committee for social and economical change website (Hebrew)

Barda, Moshe, "Coordination between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense," The Knesset Research Center 2007: <http://www.knesset.gov.il/mmm/data/pdf/m01880.pdf> (Hebrew)

Bar-Kol, Yair, "Appointing a minister for interministerial cooperation," TheMarker 3.4.2013: <http://www.themarker.com/opinion/1.1983509> (Hebrew)

Haber, Carmit, "Managerial culture blocks to implementing open government policy," The Israel Democracy Institute (March 2013) (Hebrew)

Ravid, Barak. "Watchdog: Power Struggles Between Ministries Hindered Israel's Battle Against BDS," 24.5.2016, <http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/1.721284>

Reducing the number of mandatory regulations that have not yet been enacted, Government decision number 2588, PMO, April 2017, https://www.gov.il/he/departments/policies/2017_dec2588

"The committee to investigate the Prime Minister's headquarter," Official state report, April 2012 (Hebrew).

"The division of electronics and technologies," Accountant General website (Hebrew) "The guide for governmental sharing: A model for cooperation between ministries," official state publication, 2013: [http://www.ihaklai.org.il/Portals/0/Documents/articles/הדו"ם%20לדיון%20הוועדה%20על%20הליוועפ%20ויב%20שרש%20ממ%20הלשמה.pdf](http://www.ihaklai.org.il/Portals/0/Documents/articles/הדו) (Hebrew)

The Foreign Affairs Ministry closes the department that handled BDS
<https://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4991405,00.html>

"The Leadership Academy- founding statement," November 2014, Civil Service Commission website: <http://www.csc.gov.il/Tenders/TendersServices/Documents/LeadershipAcademyDoc.pdf>

The Open Administration Work Plan for 2018-2019, Israel's ICT Authority, <http://yoursay.gov.il/cio/File/Index/nap3hebrew/>

Zinger, Ronny. "175 laws are not implanted because ministries didn't set regulation for them" – Calcalist, 25.1.2016 (Hebrew): <http://www.calcalist.co.il/local/articles/0,7340,L-3679237,00.html>

Mexico

Score 5

Traditionally, there was little real distinction in Mexico between civil servants and politicians, though the relationship between them has significantly varied over time. The upper administration overly consists of presidential appointments, with only a limited number of career bureaucrats. Two exceptions are the Ministry of Finance

and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where bureaucratic expertise has always played a major role. The reason for this is the importance of being a competent actor in multilateral arenas given the dominance of the United States and the experience of macroeconomic turmoil due to continuous political interference in economics. Traditionally, the political system has been weighed toward presidential appointments. The cabinet today is much more heterogeneous, however, with some figures personally close to the president and others more independent. The politicization of the cabinet, which has increased under the three recent administrations, is constraining its ability to coordinate policy proposals given the centrifugal tendencies. On the other hand, the previously mentioned independent agencies are often characterized by higher levels of bureaucratic professionalism. Moreover, socioeconomic modernization has, albeit slowly, changed the administrative landscape, with technical expertise increasing in many sectors (e.g., social sectors) and the number of policy experts with an administrative background increasing in the upper administration; It is too soon to say, whether this trend will continue during the current administration of AMLO.

Poland

Score 5

Senior ministry officials play a substantial role in interministerial coordination. All meetings of the Council of Ministers, the Polish cabinet, are prepared by the Council of Ministers' Permanent Committee, which is made up of deputy ministers from the ministries. The Committee for European Affairs, which is in charge of EU coordination, also relies strongly on coordination by top civil servants. In contrast, bureaucratic coordination at lower levels of the hierarchy is still relatively limited, even though the joint administration of EU funds has helped to intensify interministerial exchange. Changes in personnel, especially in the security agencies, have secured the dominance of the government over administration.

Slovakia

Score 5

In Slovakia, senior ministry officials have traditionally been heavily involved in the interministerial coordination process at the drafting stage. In contrast, coordination at the lower levels of the ministerial bureaucracy has suffered from a strong departmentalist culture and the top-down approach taken in most ministries. Under the second Fico government, the role of senior civil servants in interministerial coordination decreased and coordination within the Smer-SD party gained importance. Since coming to power after the 2016 elections, SNS and Most-Híd have weakened the role and independence of the civil service by seeking to provide ministerial positions to party members.

Turkey

Score 5

Undersecretary, deputy undersecretary and central governor cadres were abolished by Decree No. 703 in July 2018, in the wake of the introduction of the presidential system of government.

The new centralized government system consists of offices, councils and ministries formed around the presidency. Under the new system, offices produce projects, councils transform projects into policies and the ministries implement policies. The Department of Administrative Affairs conducts monitoring and the State Supervision Council performs a control function. The new governmental system is an attempt to promote efficiency and coordination in governmental processes, especially in decision-making and implementation. However, the centralization and unification of decision-making in the hands of the president raises doubts about the sustainability of interministerial coordination, in particular.

The effectiveness of the system, which is based on centralization and unification in decision-making, should be reviewed in the near future.

Until July 2018, there was an increasing tendency to draft and adopt legislation without appropriate consultation. The creation of new ministries and agencies and the resulting fragmentation of responsibilities has complicated ministerial coordination, for example in the areas of budgeting and medium-term economic policymaking. Until their abolishment in July 2018, the oversight bodies under the PMO were responsible not only for coordinating and overseeing legal proposals, but are also tasked with monitoring legislative implementation.

Similar observations have been made by the Ministry of Development, the primary policy-coordination body. Accordingly, a serious problem is inefficient coordination due to institutional ambiguity and conflicts.

Citation:

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi 1, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180710-1.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)

K. Gözler, Türkiye'nin Yönetim Yapısı (TC İdari Teşkilatı), Bursa: Ekin Basın Yayın Dağıtım, 2018.

Z.Sobacı et al., Turkey's New Government Model and the Presidential Organization, SETA Perspective No. 45, July 2018.

Y. Üstüner and N. Yavuz, " Turkey's Public Administration Today: An Overview and Appraisal," International Journal of Public Administration, 2017.

TC Başbakanlık 2016 Yılı Faaliyet Raporu, https://www.basbakanlik.gov.tr/docs/KurumsalHaberler/Basbakanlik_2016_Faaliyet_Raporu.pdf (accessed 1 November 2017)

2015 Programının Uygulanması, Koordinasyonu ve İzlenmesine İlişkin Karar, Resmi Gazete, 17 October 2014, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2014/10/20141017-11-1.pdf> (accessed 27 October 2015)

Bulgaria

- Score 4 While a comprehensive framework for coordination between ministry officials and civil servants exists, many issues are actually resolved at the political level. Within the ministries, a departmentalist culture prevails. This is especially true during coalition governments, when coordination between line ministries under ministers from different parties is virtually nonexistent.

Croatia

- Score 4 The direct coordination of policy proposals by ministries is limited. There is no stable and transparent scheme for settling interministerial differences within the bureaucracy. The ministries in charge of drafting proposals rarely set up working groups that include peers from other ministries or government bodies. Deadlines for comments by other ministries are often too abbreviated, capacities for comments are sometimes inadequate, and comments made by other ministries are often not taken seriously.

Citation:

Musa, A., Petak, Z. (2015): Coordination for Policy in Transition Countries: Case of Croatia, in: *Mednarodna revija za javno upravo/International Public Administration Review* 13(3-4): 117-159.

Greece

- Score 4 Greek bureaucracy is over-politicized and under-resourced. Political party cadres rather than civil servants coordinate policy proposals. Civil servants in line ministries often lack modern scientific and management skills. Policy proposals are usually assigned to ministerial advisers, who are short-term political appointees and can be non-academic experts, academics and governing party cadres. Top civil servants contribute to policy proposals by suggesting what is legally permissible and technically feasible, although even on those issues ministers often tend to trust their own legal and technical advisers. The remaining civil servants at lower levels of the bureaucratic hierarchy rarely, if ever, know of, let alone contribute to policy proposals. Moreover, there is little horizontal coordination among civil servants working in different ministries. Ministers assign the task of horizontal interministerial communication to their advisers.

In the period under review, such trends were exacerbated, though officially the government may have intended otherwise. Pressed by the country's creditors, the government began implementing a new law (passed in 2016) which should have enhanced the role of civil servants when formulating and coordinating policy proposals. The senior civil service was supposed to be staffed by personnel selected

based on meritocratic standards (e.g., new appointments were scheduled to be made to the rank of general directors of ministries). The selection process took over a year to complete and was heavily disputed. In practice, little progress was made as the government preferred to turn to its own political appointees for the preparation and coordination of policy proposals.

Citation:

The new law on higher civil service is law 4369/2016.

United States

Score 4

In general, there is an expectation of interagency coordination at various levels of the bureaucracy. The quality of this coordination varies, and as with cabinet-level coordination, it is adversely affected by the short-term service of political appointees, which results in underdeveloped working relationships across agencies. President Trump has failed to appoint or nominate people to occupy a large majority of the important political-appointee positions in the agencies. In addition, permanent staff have been departing. As a consequence, it would be impossible for interagency coordination to operate effectively at this stage of his presidency.

Indicator

Informal Coordination

Question

How effectively do informal coordination mechanisms complement formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination?

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 = Informal coordination mechanisms generally support formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.
- 8-6 = In most cases, informal coordination mechanisms support formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.
- 5-3 = In some cases, informal coordination mechanisms support formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.
- 2-1 = Informal coordination mechanisms tend to undermine rather than complement formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.

Finland

Score 10

Intersectoral coordination has generally been perceived as an important issue in Finnish politics, but rather few institutional mechanisms have in fact been introduced. One of these is the Iltakoulu (evening session). To a considerable extent, then, coordination proceeds effectively through informal mechanisms. Recent large-scale policy programs have enhanced intersectoral policymaking; additionally, Finland's membership in the European Union has of course necessitated increased interministerial coordination. Recent research in Finland has only focused tangentially on informal mechanisms, but various case studies suggest that the system of coordination by advisory councils has performed well.

Citation:

Eero Murto, Power Relationship Between Ministers and Civil Servants, pp. 189-208 in Lauri Karvonen, Heikki Paloheimo and Tapio Raunio, eds. *The Changing Balance of Political Power in Finland*, Stockholm: Santérus Förlag, 2016.

Hungary

Score 10

The strong formal role of Prime Minister Orbán and his Prime Minister's Office is complemented by informal coordination mechanisms. As the power concentration has further increased in the fourth Orbán government, so has the role of informal decision-making. Formal mechanisms only serve to legalize and implement improvised and hastily made decisions by the prime minister. Orbán travels with his personal staff and rules the country by phone calls as a "remote control" that terrifies

medium-level politicians. If the prime minister is not available or not ready or able to decide, issues remain in the air without any decision being made. Orbán regularly brings together officials from his larger circle in order to give instructions. Many decisions originate from these meetings, which subsequently ripple informally through the system before any formal decision is made. These informal coordination mechanisms make rapid decision-making possible. Given the pivotal role of the prime minister, this system encourages anticipative obedience, but also creates a bottleneck in the implementation of decisions and precludes any genuine feedback.

Belgium

Score 9

Belgian governments have typically been broad coalition governments (the current government is more homogeneously right-wing, but still includes four parties), and mechanisms such as the council of ministers were established to enforce effective coordination. It is also important to note that party discipline is strong and party presidents are dominant figures able to enforce coordination both within and across government levels (subnational and national). In addition, some of the larger parties have well-organized study centers that provide extensive policy expertise.

The government agreement, signed at the government-formation stage, operates as an *ex ante* contract that limits possible deviation once the coalition operates. Once the government is formed, decisions are made collegially, and all government officials must defend the decisions made by the council of ministers. Thus, as long as governmental decisions remain within the boundaries of the government agreement, policy proposals are well coordinated.

Importantly, the last elections produced highly asymmetric coalitions at the federal and regional levels. The federal government must be composed of the same number of Dutch and French-speaking ministers. However, only one French-speaking party, the liberal-right MR, is part of that government. The coalition in Flanders is made up of all the Flemish parties in the federal government. In Wallonia, the 2014 – 2019 coalition was initially composed of parties that were in opposition at the federal level, including the Socialist Party (Parti socialiste, PS) and a christian democratic party (Centre démocrate humaniste, cdH) – the socialists were ousted in 2017 and replaced by the liberal Reformist Movement (Mouvement Réformateur, MR). The Brussels government is a six-party coalition with a partial overlap between the federal and regional coalitions. Currently, the capacity to coordinate policy between the federal and the regional governments is thus very limited.

Moreover, the fact that MR is the sole French-speaking party at the federal level puts it in an awkward position, limiting the capacity of the MR prime minister to dictate the policy and behavior of coalition partners.

Japan

Score 9

Informal relations and related agreements, which are very common in Japan, can facilitate coordination but may also lead to collusion. In terms of institutionalized informal coordination mechanisms in the realm of policymaking, informal meetings and debates between the ministries and the ruling party's policy-research departments have traditionally been very important.

Informal, closed-door agreements on policy are again of considerable importance. The leadership has to navigate skillfully between the coalition partners, line ministries and their bureaucrats, and a more inquisitive public. The Chief Cabinet Secretary is a key actor in this regard. Cabinet meetings are essentially formalities, with sensitive issues informally discussed and decided beforehand. Ministries collect and make public few, if any, records of meetings between politicians and bureaucrats as they are supposed to do under the 2008 Basic Act of Reform of the National Civil Servant System.

The general trend toward greater transparency may have even strengthened the role of informality in order to avoid awkward situations. In mid-2018, an internal document produced by METI industry ministry surfaced that asked ministry officials to avoid noting who said what in minutes prepared after meetings.

Citation:

Jiji News, Cabinet minutes show formality, no substance, The Japan Times, 5 October 2015, <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/10/05/national/politics-diplomacy/cabinet-minutes-show-formality-no-substance/>

Enhancing government accountability (Editorial), The Japan Times, 13 August 2017, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2017/08/13/editorials/enhancing-government-accountability/>

Tadashi Kobayashi and Taiji Mukohata, Japan trade ministry told employees to obscure meeting records, The Mainichi, 30 August 2018, <https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20180830/p2a/00m/0na/004000c>

Luxembourg

Score 9

There are many opportunities for informal coordination, given Luxembourg's small size, its close-knit society and government administration. Those in public administration responsible for early policy research and formulation, are well familiar with representatives of social organizations and members of civil society research institutions. In such a small state, there are many opportunities for informal contact between public servants and experts from research institutions, business and civil society. Senior civil servants are simultaneously responsible for various projects, have an enormous workload and represent the government within different bodies, boards and committees.

Citation:

“Participations de l’Etat.” Trésorerie de l’Etat. 2017. www.te.public.lu/fr/participations.html. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.
Bossaert, Danielle (2008): Die Modernisierung der öffentlichen Verwaltung und des öffentlichen Dienstes im Großherzogtum Luxemburg in: Wolfgang H. Lorig (ed.): *Moderne Verwaltung in der Bürgergesellschaft*, Nomos Verlag, pp. 298 – 312.

New Zealand

Score 9

In addition to formal coordination, there are a number of informal channels between coalition partners, government and legislative support parties (parliamentary rather than extra-parliamentary), and ministers and their parliamentary advisers. Although media commentary tends to not draw a distinction between formal coalitions (e.g., Labour/NZ First 2017-present) and non-coalition support parties (e.g., Greens 2017-present), the Cabinet Manual seeks to at least formally clarify which procedures should be used as a guideline in case of informal coordination. It is important to mention, however, that the coordination process is largely limited to party leadership and excludes the extra-parliamentary wing of the party (i.e., party members, activists and officials).

Citation:

Cabinet Office Circular CO (17) 10, Labour-New Zealand First Coalition, with Confidence and Supply from the Green Party: Consultation and Operating Arrangements. December 17, 2017. <https://dpmc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2017-12/coc-17-10.pdf>

Switzerland

Score 9

Given the small size of the federal administration and the country’s tradition of informal coordination, there is a continuing presence of strong and effective informal coordination. According to Mavrot and Sager, informal coordination not only takes place among administrative units in the seven departments, but also between the respective administrations at the different federal levels.

Citation:

Mavrot, Céline, and Fritz Sager (2018). Vertical epistemic communities in multilevel governance. *Policy & Politics*, Volume 46, Number 3, pp. 391-407.

United Kingdom

Score 9

Informal coordination was a hallmark of the Labour governments under Tony Blair (1997 – 2007). However, informal coordination was reduced during the Labour government of Gordon Brown (2007 – 2010) and largely abolished under the coalition government (2010 – 2015), because of the need for avoiding tensions within the coalition. Having returned to one-party government in May 2015, it was

expected that informal forms of coordination would become more common again.

Cabinet committee discussions are regularly preceded or accompanied by bilateral meetings of relevant ministers supported by senior officials across government. These will often be chaired by the chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster or by other senior ministers.

The divisions within the governing Conservative Party, including among senior ministers, over the United Kingdom's future relations with the European Union could complicate informal coordination, but – as examples of informal interministerial groups on subjects as diverse as flooding or the 2018 Commonwealth Summit show – it is working reliably in other areas.

Citation:

Collaborative Civil Service: <https://civilservice.blog.gov.uk/2016/04/28/a-model-for-a-more-collaborative-civil-service-the-estate-strategy-in-action/>

Australia

Score 8

Information coordination procedures exist at the level of the party, where informal consultations on policies take place on a regular basis to make sure that the party leadership supports the government's direction. This occurs regardless of which party is in office. The federal system and the division of responsibilities between the federal government and the state and territory governments means that informal coordination is always an important component of any policy that may involve the states. These procedures are ad hoc, and take place at two levels, among ministers from different jurisdictions, and at the level of senior public servants.

Chile

Score 8

Informal coordination plays an important role in settling issues so that the cabinet can focus on strategic-policy debates. Existing informal mechanisms might be characterized as “formal informality,” as informal coordination mechanisms are de facto as institutionalized as formal ones in daily political practice.

Denmark

Score 8

The Danish administrative system is a mix of formal rules and norms and more informal traditions. As a few examples, officials hold informal talks in the halls of government, over lunch and during travel to and from Brussels. The informal mechanisms can make formal meetings more efficient. Of course, important decisions must be confirmed in more formal settings. At the political level, informal

mechanisms are probably more important than formal ones among officials. The fact that most governments have been coalition governments (and often minority governments) has increased the importance of information coordination mechanisms.

Citation:

Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen, Peter Munk Christiansen og Marius Ibsen, *Politik og forvaltning*, 4. udgave, Hans Reitzels Forlag, 2017.

France

Score 8

A crucial factor and essentially an invisible coordination mechanism is the “old-boy network” of former students from the grandes écoles (École nationale d’administration (ENA), École Polytechnique, Mines, ParisTech and so on) or membership in the same “grands corps” (prestigious bureaucracies such as Inspection générale des Finances, Diplomatie, Conseil d’Etat and so on). Most ministries (except perhaps the least powerful or those considered as marginal) include one or several persons from this high civil servant super-elite who know each other or are bound by an informal solidarity. These high civil servants (especially “énarques” from ENA) also work in the PMO or the president’s office, further strengthening this informal connection. The system is both efficient and not transparent, from a procedural point of view. It is striking, for instance, how much former President Hollande relied on people who trained with him at ENA and to whom he offered key positions in the political administration – ranging from ministerial positions or the chair of the central bank to many other high offices. President Macron has maintained these informal links.

Greece

Score 8

Most coordination mechanisms are informal and complement the more meager formal coordination mechanisms, such as the infrequently convened cabinet and ministerial committees. Most informal mechanisms are ad hoc meetings among ministers convened at the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO). Such meetings are followed up by person-to-person contacts between staff members of the PMO and advisers to ministers. In the review period, under pressure to complete the Third Economic Adjustment Program for Greece, informal coordination was frequent and organized by close associates of Prime Minister Tsipras (e.g., ministers without a portfolio) working at the PMO. Since the last cabinet reshuffle of August 2018, there are at least three ministers who are given such successive informal coordination roles. Overall, the trend of informal coordination has increased over time.

Ireland

Score 8

All governments in Ireland between 1989 and 2016 have been coalition governments. The 2016 general election produced a Fine Gael-led minority government with nine independent deputies, a government which is dependent on the

abstentionism of the main opposition party, Fianna Fáil, in votes relating to confidence and supply.

The impression conveyed by accounts of cabinet meetings is that the agenda is usually too heavy to allow long debates on fundamental issues, which tend to have been settled in various ways prior to the meeting. On the whole these informal coordination mechanisms appear to work effectively (see also Ministerial Bureaucracy on the importance on ministers' special advisers).

During the 2011 to 2016 coalition government, the need for tight coordination was greater given that this government had to deal with the economic and financial crisis. An Economic Management Council (EMC) was introduced as a kind of “war cabinet.” It was composed of four key cabinet members: the taoiseach and tanaiste (the two party leaders) and the two key economic portfolios, the minister for finance and the minister for public expenditure (one from each party). The EMC also included these four ministers' top officials and advisers, about 13 in total. The EMC was an inner cabinet that took key decisions – a level of formal tight coordination not previously seen in Ireland. Partly because the crisis had mainly passed, the EMC was discontinued after the 2016 election.

Citation:

The two most recent Annual Reports on the Programme for Government are available here:

http://www.taoiseach.gov.ie/eng/Publications/Publications_2014/Programme_for_Government_Annual_Report_2014.pdf

http://www.taoiseach.gov.ie/eng/Publications/Publications_2015/Programme_for_Government_Annual_Report_2015.pdf

Poland

Score 8

Informal mechanisms of coordination have played an important role under the PiS government. PiS Chairman Jarosław Kaczyński has served as the gray eminence behind the scene. He makes many important decisions himself, and government ministers' standing strongly depends upon their relationship with him.

South Korea

Score 8

Most interministerial coordination is both formal and informal in Korea. Informal coordination is typically, if not always, more effective. There is also a clear hierarchy structuring the ministries. Staffers at the newly created Ministry of Strategy and Finance see themselves as the elite among civil servants. However, the leading role of the Ministry of Strategy and Finance is defined by the president's mandate.

In addition, informal coordination processes tend to be plagued by nepotism and regional or peer-group loyalties, particularly among high-school and university

alumni. There has been both cooperation and competition between the ministries. Informal networks between the president and powerful politicians work very effectively in forwarding specific policies. However, these practices can also lead to corruption and an inefficient allocation of resources. For example, the recent Choi Soon-sil scandal took advantage of the prevalence of informal coordination and meetings.

Citation:

Seungjoo Lee and sang-young Rhyu, "The Political Dynamics of Informal Networks in South Korea: The Case of Parachute Appointment" (2008), *the Pacific Review*, 21(1): 45-66.

Spain

Score 8

The relative weakness of formal coordination among ministry civil servants in Spain is to some extent compensated for by helpful informal procedures. When interministerial problems cannot be solved informal contacts, or meetings between officials of the various ministries involved are organized. Many policy proposals can in fact be coordinated in this fashion. As senior civil servants are clustered into different specialized bureaucratic corps, informal mechanisms rely often on the fact that officials involved in the coordination may belong to the same corps or share a network of old colleagues. Nevertheless, the existence of specialized corps tends to aggravate administrative fragmentation, since every corps tends to control a department according to its specialization. In this sense, the administration seems to follow a "silo" structure, in which each ministry, department, agency, organism or public entity follows its own operating logic. Within the cabinet, these informal mechanisms are less necessary, since the stable experience of single-party governments with strong prime ministers has up to this point required less coordination than would coalition cabinets.

Citation:

Círculo de Empresarios (2018), *La calidad de las instituciones en España*. <https://circulodeempresarios.org/app/uploads/2018/04/Calidad-insti-CdE-WEB.pdf>

Sweden

Score 8

Informal mechanisms of coordination among civil servants and higher-ranking politicians alike are common and important in the Swedish system, although they may not always be effective. And yet, informal contacts between departments and agencies are believed to be integral to the efficiency of the politico-administrative system. Informal coordination procedures effectively filter many, but not all, policy proposals.

Citation:

de Fine Licht, J. and J. Pierre (2017), *Myndighetschefernas syn på regeringens styrning* (Stockholm: Statskontoret).

Canada

Score 7 Some policy proposals are coordinated through informal mechanisms with government members or across levels of government.

It is worth noting that Canada's federal system has no formal provisions that deal specifically with federal-provincial coordination. Pressing federal-provincial issues and other matters that require inter-governmental discussions are usually addressed in the First Ministers' Conference, which includes the prime minister, provincial premiers and territorial leaders, along with their officials. These meetings are called by the prime minister and have typically been held annually, but there is no formal schedule. The lack of any requirement for the conference to be held regularly is cause for concern, as it is critical for first ministers and the prime minister to engage in face-to-face discussions or negotiations, given the many policy areas that demand federal-provincial coordination. The previous prime minister, Stephen Harper, called the last First Minister's Conference in 2009, but it was a further six years before Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, following the election in 2015, meet with provincial leaders again.

To promote provincial-territorial cooperation and coordinate provincial-territorial relations with the federal government, provincial premiers and territorial leaders have met at the Council of the Federation twice a year since 2003.

Estonia

Score 7 Informal coordination has played an important role in ensuring efficient policymaking. In addition to contacts between high-ranking civil servants in ministries, the coalition committee and governing bodies of political parties have been key players in this regard. Getting support from coalition partners is generally the first step in successfully passing legislation.

Iceland

Score 7 There is evidence that informal cooperation between ministers outside of formal cabinet meetings is increasing. These cooperative ministerial clusters were referred to in the Special Investigation Committee's 2010 report as "super-ministerial groups." The SIC report pointed out that examples of such cooperation immediately after the 2008 economic collapse demonstrated a need for clear rules on reporting what is discussed and decided in such informal meetings.

The SIC report also identified a tendency to move big decisions and important cooperative discussions into informal meetings between the chairmen of the ruling

coalition parties. In March 2016, revised regulations on the procedures for cabinets were introduced but this only addresses formal cabinet meetings and not informal ministerial meetings. Therefore, we can conclude that the SIC report's call for clearer regulation has been addressed in part. However, informal meetings continue without proper reporting.

Citation:

The SIC report from 2010. Chapter 7. (Aðdragandi og orsakir falls Íslensku bankanna 2008 og tengdir atburðir (7). Reykjavík. Rannsóknarnefnd Alþingis).

Reglur um starfshætti ríkisstjórnar. Nr. 292/2016. 18. mars 2016. (Rules on procedures in cabinets).

Latvia

Score 7

A coalition council that represents the political parties forming the governing coalition meets for weekly informal consultations. Despite its regular meetings with formal agendas, the council is not a part of the official decision-making process. Given that cabinet meetings are open to the press and public, coalition-council meetings provide an opportunity for off-the-record discussions and coordination. The council plays a de facto gatekeeping function for controversial issues, deciding when there is enough consensus to move issues to the cabinet. The coalition council can play both a complementary role, creating an enabling environment for consensus-building, and a destructive role, undermining the legitimacy of the official decision-making process.

Nevertheless, the secrecy surrounding the coalition council has made it a controversial institution. “Who Owns the State?” – a populist party that won the third largest share of the vote in the 2018 parliamentary election – promised to eliminate the coalition council. Indeed, the government coalition formed in January 2018 no longer has a coalition council to coordinate its political work. Instead, a new collaboration council, with similar functions, has been created.

Citation:

I made some additions to the text.

Lithuania

Score 7

Formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination still dominate the decision-making process, despite the emergence of new informal coordination mechanisms and practices at the central level of government. Political councils are created to solve political disagreements within the ruling coalition. In addition, the leadership of political parties represented in the government is often involved in the coordination of political issues. Informal meetings are sometimes called to coordinate various issues at the administrative or political level. Since the Skvernelis government decided at the end of 2018 to make all government meetings public

(government sessions had already been public before this decision), cabinet ministers are likely to meet informally on a more regular basis on Mondays.

Furthermore, the 2012 to 2016 government planned to develop a senior civil service stratum, which could actively engage in policy coordination at the managerial level. However, these politically sensitive provisions were later withdrawn from subsequent drafts of the Civil Service Law. A new civil service reform adopted in 2018 did not establish a higher civil service.

Malta

Score 7

The government tendency toward informal coordination mechanisms has increased since Malta joined the European Union in 2004. Many directives from Brussels cut across departments and ministries, and this encourages ministries to talk to each other and work more closely together. Preparations for the EU presidency in January 2017 and the actions taken during the presidency itself raised this informal coordination to unprecedented levels. Currently, the PMO has begun exercising an expanded coordinating role that has advanced progress on a number of domestic issues and policies. Increased overview of ministries by the PMO's Principal Permanent Secretary and the PM's own team has enhanced coordination further. Overall, this has resulted from the establishment of the Ministry for European Affairs and Implementation of the Manifesto.

Netherlands

Score 7

Very little is actually known about informal coordination at the (sub-)Council of Ministers level regarding policymaking and decision-making. The best-known informal procedure used to be the "Torentjesoverleg," in which the prime minister and a core members of the Council of Ministers consulted with the leaders of the political parties supporting the coalition in the Prime Minister's Office ("Het Torentje"). Although sometimes considered objectionable – as it appears to contradict the ideal of dualism between the executive and the legislative – coalition governments cannot survive without this kind of high-level political coordination between the government and the States General. Given the weak parliamentary support of the Rutte I and II councils of ministers (October 2010 – February 2017), such informal coordination is no longer limited to political parties providing support to the governing coalition.

Under the present conditions, in which civil servants are subject to increasing parliamentary and media scrutiny, and in which gaps in trust and loyalty between the political leadership and the bureaucracy staff are growing, informal coordination and the personal chemistry among civil servants are what keeps things running. Regarding interministerial coordination, informal contacts between the senior staff

(raadadviseurs) in the prime minister's Council of Ministers and senior officers working for ministerial leadership are absolutely crucial. Nonetheless, such bureaucratic coordination is undermined by insufficient or absent informal political coordination.

Citation:

R.B. Andeweg and G.A. Irwin (2014), Governance and politics of the Netherlands. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 154-163, 198-203, 220-228.

S. Jilke et al., Public Sector Reform in the Netherlands: Views and Experiences from Senior Executives, COCOPS Research Report, 2013

RTL-Z, Rutte wacht zwaar debat: is de premier nog te vertrouwen

Norway

Score 7 Cabinet ministers meet frequently and keep in close touch with one other on issues of policy. Efforts have been made to encourage cross-ministerial relationships on the level of lower officials as well. There is extensive informal coordination between cabinet and parliamentary committees and party organizations.

Portugal

Score 7 Informal coordination mechanisms are central to government functioning and coordination. The horizontal informal links between ministries help compensate for the absence or rigidity of formal horizontal linkages. Informal coordination became even more important as the Socialist Party government depends on the PCP and BE to pass legislation in the parliament.

Slovakia

Score 7 Informal coordination has played a significant role in policy coordination since the 2016 parliamentary elections. The new coalition decided to establish a complex system of coalition councils. The coalition council, which coordinates the work of various sub-councils and consists of the chairmen of the three parties in government, meets at least once a month and adopts decisions unanimously. After the coalition crisis in August 2017, the leaders of the coalition partners agreed on measures for better communication, including regular Monday meetings, disclosing their proposals to each other no later than 24 hours before the cabinet session and forming a working group for improving communication between the three parties at the local and regional level. In April 2018, the system was further refined, when Peter Pellegrini, the new prime minister, and Andrej Danko, the leader of the SNS, agreed to hold additional bilateral meetings every Thursday. Until March 2018, there was another form of informal coordination in that Prime Minister Fico continued to capitalize on his weakening, but nonetheless strong role as leader of Smer-SD, the leading party in government.

Citation:

N.N. (2018): Pellegrini and Danko agree on better communication, in: The Slovak Spectator, April 19 (<https://spectator.sme.sk/c/20808014/pellegrini-and-danko-agree-on-better-communication.html>).

Slovenia

Score 7

Slovenia's tradition of coalition governments has meant that informal coordination procedures have played a significant role in policy coordination. Under the Cerar government, the leaders of the three coalition parties met frequently, making major decisions at coalition meetings that were often also attended by the ministers and from time to time also by the leaders of parliamentary majority groups and coalition members of parliament. In press conferences and public statements after these meetings, very little information about the decisions made was provided to the public. The dominant role of the party leaders within their parties also meant that a considerable amount of policy coordination took place in party bodies. The Šarec government has so far followed this style.

United States

Score 7

The U.S. government is highly prone to informal coordination, relying on personal networks, constituency relationships and other means. As with formal processes, the effectiveness of such coordination is adversely affected by underdeveloped working relationships resulting from the short-term service of political appointees. The overall or average performance of informal coordination mechanisms has not been systematically evaluated. The Trump administration's lack of experienced personnel in key agency positions leads to an increased role for informal coordination, often based on various personal networks, such as people connected with Trump's family or businesses. These arrangements, however, are not sufficiently developed to make up for the lack of personnel and organization in the departments and agencies. The executive branch under Trump has seen calamitous failures of coordination – for example, in the failure to provide timely disaster assistance after a devastating 2017 hurricane in the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico, and the failure to provide effectively for the humane custody of more than 2,000 children seized in 2018 from asylum-seeking parents at the Mexican border. These failures of coordination, however, largely reflect general problems of understaffing and lack of competent leadership in the departments and agencies in the Trump presidency.

Austria

Score 6

Previous coordination mechanisms – like weekly informal meetings within each cabinet faction and the cabinet as a whole, as well as the regular informal meetings between the chancellor and vice-chancellor – were sufficiently effective. They did not guarantee a smooth decision-making process based on consensus, but did allow the cabinet to make a realistic assessment of what collective decisions were possible

or impossible. Informal coordination mechanisms were used to negotiate a compromise when a proposal from one party's minister was unacceptable to the other coalition party.

The most effective form of informal coordination within the new government seems to be regular, but not formalized meetings between the chancellor and vice-chancellor. During 2018, the first year of the new coalition government, this pattern obviously worked given that no conflicts between the two coalition partners or between different ministers became public.

Czechia

Score 6

Informal coordination mechanisms have featured prominently in Czech political culture. The Sobotka and the Babiš government alike have rested on coalition agreements which have included agreements on policies as well as coordination rules. Fundamental issues are addressed at the level of the chairmen of the coalition parties or the coalition council. The most important body is the coalition council. It consists of the chairpersons of the coalition parties and a maximum of three other representatives of the respective coalition parties. Coordination mechanisms at the level of parliamentary and senatorial clubs are also important. Coalition parties also have their expert commissions. The expert commissions of the individual coalition parties communicate among themselves primarily while preparing legislative proposals. Because the Babiš government relies on support from the Communist Party (KSČM), it must also take the latter's reactions into account.

Germany

Score 6

There are a number of informal mechanisms by which government policy is coordinated. The most important of these is the coalition committee, which comprises the most important government actors (i.e., the chancellor, the deputy chancellor, the chairpersons of the parliamentary groups and the party chairpersons) within the coalition parties. According to the recent coalition agreement from 2017, the coalition committee is expected to meet regularly or can be convened at the request of any of the coalition partners. Effectively, the coalition committee does not meet regularly except in a crisis situation. In 2018, during the escalating conflicts between the minister of the interior, building and community, Horst Seehofer (CSU), and Chancellor Angela Merkel, the coalition committee was unable to resolve the intense political conflicts and to develop coordinated policy responses. For everyday business, the coalition committee typically decides on the basis of the lowest-common-denominator.

Mexico

Score 5 A number of informal mechanisms for coordinating policy exist, and given the lack of “formal” coordination capabilities within the Mexican administration, informal coordination often functions as a substitute. This is normal in a presidential system where only a few cabinet secretaries have independent political bases. Ministers retain their positions, for the most part, at the will of the president. It is important to note, however, that some cabinet secretaries are more equal than others. The Finance Ministry, and Ministry of the Interior and Police have assumed hegemonic roles under President Peña Nieto. The finance secretary, José Antonio Meade, resigned in November 2017 to run for the presidency as candidate of the incumbent PRI, but lost. Moreover, toward the end of a presidential term, the congruence of formal and informal coordination mechanisms tends to diminish, as has been the case in 2018.

Turkey

Score 5 Informal bodies, which are usually made up of senior party members and their personal networks, are typically used to sketch the framework of an issue in consultation with experts, while civil servants develop proposals, and finally the upper administrative echelons finalize policy. The higher levels of the ruling party in particular, in cooperation with ministers who have considerable experience in their fields, continue to form a tight network and contribute significantly to policy preparation.

Informal coordination between the PMO and the presidency allegedly became more relevant once President Erdoğan assumed office, and especially once Binali Yildirim became prime minister. Though the PMO has since been abolished following the transition to a presidential system. Erdoğan regularly meets with line ministers and with the “small cabinet” to coordinate government policies. This type of informal coordination, however, cannot be considered constructive, as it has the potential to replace formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.

The new presidential governmental system, introduced after the April 2017 referendum and the June 2018 elections, is an attempt to promote efficiency and coordination in governmental processes, especially in decision-making and implementation. However, the centralization and unification of decision-making in the hands of the president raises doubts about the sustainability of interministerial coordination.

The effectiveness of the system, which is based on centralization and unification in decision-making, should be reviewed in the near future.

During the review period, President Erdoğan (who is also chairman of the ruling AKP) decided to hold the April 2017 referendum and the June 2018 elections,

following an informal agreement with the head of the Nationalist Movement Party (MHP). As part of the agreement, AKP and MHP campaigned together in the subsequent elections. By doing so, informal politics fundamentally sidelined legitimate forms of decision-making and policymaking, and runs counter to executive politics.

Citation:

Z.Sobacı et al., Turkey's New Government Model and the Presidential Organization, SETA Perspective No. 45, July 2018.

M. Turan, "Türkiye'nin Yeni Yönetim Düzeni: Cumhurbaşkanlığı Hükümet Sistemi," Social Sciences Research Journal, 7(3), 2018: 42-91. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/524784> (accessed 1 November 2018)

Croatia

Score 4 Informal coordination both between the coalition partners and between different party factions in the HDZ has played an important role in interministerial coordination under the Plenković government. The strong reliance on decisions in coalition meetings or party bodies has helped maintain the tradition of keeping strategic decisions and policy coordination largely within the political parties' ambit, preventing the development of more formal and transparent mechanisms of policy coordination or a strengthening of the public administration's role.

Cyprus

Score 4 A practice of informal meetings exists but is infrequently utilized. During the post-2010 economic difficulties, more formal meetings took place than before. In the period under review, a very small number of ad hoc formal meetings took place. The crisis caused by the collapse of the Cooperative Bank in mid-2018 prompted various meetings searching for solutions that end with the adoption of new rules.

Romania

Score 2 In addition to the formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination, there has been an informal coordination of the government's work by PSD chef Liviu Dragnea, the "éminence grise" of the government. Barred from becoming prime minister himself by a criminal conviction, Dragnea has been keen on preventing prime ministers to act in too independent a manner. In January 2018, he toppled Prime Minister Mihai Tudose, barely seven months after his predecessor Sorin Grindeanu had suffered the same fate. Thus, the informal coordination within the governing party has tended to undermine rather than complement the formal coordination mechanisms within government.

Indicator **Digitalization for Interministerial Coordination**

Question **How extensively and effectively are digital technologies used to support interministerial coordination (in policy development and monitoring)?**

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 = The government uses digital technologies extensively and effectively to support interministerial coordination.
- 8-6 = The government uses digital technologies in most cases and somewhat effectively to support interministerial coordination.
- 5-3 = The government uses digital technologies to a lesser degree and with limited effects to support interministerial coordination.
- 2-1 = The government makes no substantial use of digital technologies to support interministerial coordination.

Estonia

Score 10 The Estonian government has pioneered a large-scale use of information technologies. An Information System for Legal Drafts (Eelnõude infosüsteem, EIS) is used to facilitate interministerial coordination and public consultations online. EIS allows users to search documents currently under consideration, participate in public consultations and submit comments on draft bills. Draft bills are submitted to the government and parliament via EIS. Policymaking and policy monitoring are further supported by an interoperable data exchange platform X-Road, an integrated system that facilitates the exchange of data between different organizations and information systems. Over 900 enterprises and organizations use X-Road daily. X-Road is also the first data exchange platform in the world that allows data to be exchanged between countries automatically. Since June 2017, an automatic data exchange capability has been established between Estonia and Finland.

Denmark

Score 9 According to the European Commission's Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI), Denmark is the most advanced country in the European Union when it comes to using digital technologies. The index is based on connectivity, human capital, use of internet services, integration of digital technology, digital public services, the EU ICT sector and its R&D performance, and research and innovation.

Public services are highly digitalized in Denmark, including e-government and e-health care services.

At the beginning of 2018, the Danish government presented a strategy for Denmark's digital growth that included 36 initiatives, many of which were geared toward the economy, including SMEs and e-commerce, but also strengthening computational thinking in elementary schools.

Although these reports and strategies do not focus on interministerial coordination as such, there is no reason not to assume that digital technologies are also increasingly used to facilitate interministerial coordination.

Citation:

European Commission, "The Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI), <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/desi> (Accessed 4 October 2018).

Ministry of Industry, Business and Financial Affairs, "Strategy for Denmark's Digital Growth," file:///C:/Users/Finn/Downloads/Digital%20growth%20strategy%20report_UK_WEB.pdf (accessed 4 October 2018).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "The Danish Government presents 'Digital Growth strategy,'" <https://investindk.com/insights/the-danish-government-presents-digital-growth-strategy> (Accessed 4 October 2018).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Denmark once again the most digital country in the EU," <https://investindk.com/insights/denmark-once-again-the-most-digital-country-in-the-eu> (Accessed 4 October 2018).

Per Byrge Sørensen, *Forvaltningsret med et digitalt perspektiv*. København: Karnov, 2017.

Finland

Score 9

Finland is a global leader for information and communications technology, and the digitalization of public services is a key project in Sipilä's government program. In line with this ambition, the government has set out to digitalize internal administrative processes. Finland is ranked in the top three in the European Union's Digital Economy and Society Index (2018). In terms of digital public services, Finland ranks first. The government administration department within the Prime Minister's Office, which has a central role in interministerial coordination, has a special Information Management and ICT Division.

Citation:

"Programme of Prime Minister Sipilä's Government", <https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/sipila/government-programme>
 "Digital Economy and Society Index", <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/desi>

New Zealand

Score 9

The New Zealand government has identified a coordinating unit for ICT deployment at the center of government, developed a strategy (2015 ICT strategy) for coordination across government levels in order to improve effectiveness, and introduced new bodies in charge of leading the digital transformation. In 2017, the

portfolio of minister for government digital services was created. The government chief digital officer (GCDO) is the government functional lead for developing and improving digital infrastructure across government. The GCDO is supported by the Digital Government Partnership, which is a partnership of stakeholders from agencies across government to support the goal of a coherent, all-of-government digital system. It helps the GCDO and government chief data steward (GCDS) to develop and improve the digital and data system across government; ensures government is aligned with the government ICT strategy; and reviews and informs the strategy. The partnership is made up of a leadership group and four working groups that support the strategy as well as a chairs' group, which bring together experts from across the different focus areas to provide support and advice to the leadership group. However, it is not absolutely clear how effective the use of digital technologies really is, especially with regard to interministerial coordination.

Citation:

<https://www.digital.govt.nz/digital-government/leadership-and-governance/digital-government-partnership/>

<https://www.digital.govt.nz/dmsdocument/4-government-ict-strategy-2015>

<https://www.digital.govt.nz/>

Norway

Score 9

Government ministries use similar digital platforms and share a digital platform for publishing information online. Ministries use digital technologies to coordinate activities, but the specific digital platform used depends on the specific security needs. Governance in Norway is highly digitized, which creates efficiencies. However, there is growing awareness of and sensitivity to managing cyber risks and ensuring secure ICT systems.

South Korea

Score 9

The South Korean government utilizes e-government software (the Policy Task Management System) to monitor the implementation of policies in real time. In the UN E-Government Survey 2018, Korea was ranked at 3rd place internationally for the implementation of e-government.

Citation:

UN E-Government Survey 2018, <https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Reports/UN-E-Government-Survey-2018>

Lithuania

Score 8

Lithuanian authorities use digital technologies frequently and quite effectively to support interministerial coordination during policy development and monitoring. Various document management systems track the execution of activities set out in the Government Program's Action Plan and other documents, while the MIS (Monitoring Information System) supports the preparation of strategic (action) plans

and budget programs. There are two systems and IT tools for monitoring the implementation of EU-financed and national interventions (the Structural Funds' MIS and MIS). Also, there is a special information system that enables online cooperation among state institutions and external stakeholders in the negotiation of EU legislation, while a new system for the coordination of systemic projects is under development within the framework of managing government priorities.

Although Lithuanian authorities rely strongly on IT systems during interministerial coordination, the application of collaborative knowledge management tools (e.g., shared spaces and collaborative learning) is underdeveloped. New IT solutions are being developed centralizing support services in a newly established National Center of Shared Services that will provide accounting and personnel management services to more than 100 institutions associated with the central government. Digital technologies do support policy coordination, but their potential is not exploited for jointly improving policy content during policy formulation nor taking corrective management actions during policy monitoring.

Spain

Score 8

Spain ranks 14th out of the 28 EU Member States in the EC 2017 Digital Economy and Society Index. The performance of Spain is especially remarkable in the area of Digital Public Services. Law 18/2015 on data reuse and data transparency has promoted a culture of open data within the public administration, and the public sector is quickly progressing with regard to the integration of digital technologies. In recent years, a number of laws have been updated and procedures improved with the aim of exploring the potential of digital technologies and structures. Moreover, shared interdepartmental platforms (such as the CI@ve platform) and shared services have been developed. According to the Digital Transformation Plan for the General Administration and Public Agencies (ICT Strategy 2015 – 2020), all ministries are required to draft digital-transformation action plans. These are to include means of simplifying inter-departmental working procedures, the electronic exchange of information between administrative units, the issue of information classification, and the implementation of standards for the exchange of information. The secretary of state for digital progress at the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism is responsible for the implementation of the Digital Agenda for Spain.

Spain's decentralized structure has created challenges in establishing a coherent and nationwide interministerial e-government coordination plan. However, the ICT Strategy 2015 – 2020 and the Law on Common Administrative Procedures have together created a strategic framework for inter-administrative compatibility and coordination.

Citation:

EC (2017), Europe's Digital Progress Report, Country Profile Spain,

Spanish government (2015), ICT STRATEGY 2015-2020

United Kingdom

Score 8

The Government Digital Service (GDS), established in 2012, established standards for new digital services and promotes the government's digital-by-default approach. GDS is also responsible for providing common technologies and services to departments for their digital services (e.g., the gov.uk platform, and cross-government payments and notifications services). All government departments now have digital technology teams, which in some departments are also responsible for internal IT services for officials.

Use of digital technologies for policy coordination is evolving. A standard set of email and office software (either Microsoft Office or Google Suite) is used, and video conference facilities are also increasingly employed. However, submissions to ministers are generally still handled in paper form once the official has supplied it to their private offices, although some ministers do read electronic copies on their official laptop, tablet computer or smartphone.

The Cabinet Office has introduced the "Better Information for Better Government" program in response to Sir Alex Allan's Review, which examined the government's approach to recordkeeping in the digital age.

An assessment by Daniel Thornton of the Institute for Government gives qualified support to government efforts to achieve more digital coordination.

Citation:

Alex Allan review:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/589946/2017-01-18_-_Better_Information_for_Better_Government.pdf

<https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/head-of-ddat-final.pdf>

United States

Score 8

The U.S. government invests heavily in technology, although it is not a world leader in e-government. The multiple intelligence agencies are sometimes criticized as prone to hoarding intelligence information, rather than sharing it within the intelligence community. Reforms adopted in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks have increased the sharing of information among the intelligence agencies.

Apart from intelligence issues, problems of coordination generally arise from political forces that promote agency autonomy and response to specialized constituencies, not from deficiencies in communication technology.

Australia

Score 7 Government departments and agencies have historically developed information systems independently to meet their own particular needs. There has, however, been growing emphasis on interoperability, recognizing the efficiency gains in implementing policy and more generally running government, and the benefits of cross-agency data sharing. Notable in this regard is the Digital Transformation Agency, which was established in 2015 to help government departments and agencies undergo digital transformation, and now has central oversight of the government's ICT agenda.

Common standards for data security have been developed by the Australian Signals Directorate, although not all agencies are (yet) fully compliant with these standards.

Citation:

Digital Transformation Agency: <https://www.dta.gov.au/>

Information Security Manual: <https://cyber.gov.au/government/publications/australian-government-information-security-manual-ism/>

Belgium

Score 7 The Federal Public Service for Information & Communication Technology (FEDICT) is responsible for defining and implementing an e-governance strategy. However, this agency focuses primarily on government-to-citizen (G2C) and government-to-business (G2B) communication, while government-to-government (G2G) interactions seem to be largely overlooked. Furthermore, the federal structure of the state does not help the sharing common IT programs or platforms, as every government level is responsible for its own digital infrastructure.

However, although there is still much to improve, Belgium fares comparatively well internationally. The U.N. E-Government Survey 2016 ranked Belgium 19 out of 193 U.N. member countries in its list of e-government leaders.

Citation:

[https://d9db56472fd41226d193-](https://d9db56472fd41226d193-1e5e0d4b7948acaf6080b0dce0b35ed5.ssl.cf1.rackcdn.com/events/forum/2004/panel_handouts/fedict.pdf)

[1e5e0d4b7948acaf6080b0dce0b35ed5.ssl.cf1.rackcdn.com/events/forum/2004/panel_handouts/fedict.pdf](https://d9db56472fd41226d193-1e5e0d4b7948acaf6080b0dce0b35ed5.ssl.cf1.rackcdn.com/events/forum/2004/panel_handouts/fedict.pdf)

<https://digitaldashboard.belgium.be/fr>

<https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/reports/un-e-government-survey-2016>

<http://workspace.unpan.org/sites/Internet/Documents/UNPAN97453.pdf> (page 111)

Bulgaria

Score 7 The 2014 – 2020 e-government strategy and the State e-Government Agency, established in 2016, aim to improve interministerial communication through the use of digital technologies. The necessary infrastructure for electronic document flows and communication between ministries exists and is increasingly used. However, digital technologies are primarily used for coordinating technical issues.

Chile

Score 7 The president's advisory ministry (Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Segpres) and the Division for Digital Government support line ministries and respective services with digitalization, facilitating instruments and providing advice regarding the implementation of digital services. The implementation of the Digital Agenda 2020, released in 2015, has been continued by the current government of Sebastián Piñera. In general, and especially in comparison with other Latin American countries, the level of digitalization regarding public information and services in Chile is quite advanced.

Citation:

<https://digital.gob.cl/>

<http://www.agendadigital.gob.cl/#/>

Ireland

Score 7 The government uses digital technologies in most cases and this appears to provide effective interministerial coordination.

Luxembourg

Score 7 Initial attempts have been made to use interministerial platforms. Since 2015, there has been a platform in the Ministry of the Interior for the subjects of a land-use plan, ("Plan d'aménagement general" or "Flächennutzungsplan," PAG), a sub-development plan ("Plan d'aménagement particulier" or "Teil-Bebauungsplan," PAP) and environmental studies. This platform is used by representatives of various ministries (including the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry for the Environment and a monument protection authority). An evaluation is still pending.

Citation:

<https://guichet.public.lu/de/entreprises/urbanisme-environnement/construction-amenagement-site/construction-transformation-demolition/plan-amenagement-general.html>. Accessed 12 Nov. 2018.

<https://guichet.public.lu/de/entreprises/urbanisme-environnement/construction-amenagement-site/construction-transformation-demolition/plan-amenagement-particulier.html>. Accessed 12 Nov. 2018.

"Noch viel Platz in Luxemburg," *Tageblatt*, 11 September 2017. <http://www.tageblatt.lu/headlines/noch-viel-platz-in-luxemburg/> Accessed 11 Nov. 2018.

Malta

Score 7 The use of digital technologies in Malta to support interministerial coordination, as well as for client use, has now become widespread. This process is managed by the Malta Information Technology Agency (MITA), the government's internet agency, and supported by private-sector experts. Individual government ministries can access policies by other ministries that may touch on their own policy formulation, as well as any policies that come from the cabinet. In 2017, a total of 21 mobile apps for

government services were launched; moreover, the servizz.gov.mt website went live, offering access to about 800 services and the associated forms. The publicservice.gov.mt website was also launched to disseminate information and news about the country's public services.

Citation:

<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20161003/local/malta-ranks-first-in-europe-for-egovernment-services.626864>

<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20171210/business-news/Microsoft-highlights-Malta-s-eGovernment-as-a-case-study.665311>

<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20171106/local/e-government-service-platform-wins-international-award.662430>

Slovenia

Score 7

In 2016, the Cerar government transferred competences for information society and electronic communication from the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport to the Ministry of Public Administration, in order to better coordinate the digitalization of public administration with digital transformation in general. The reorganization of responsibilities has led to a more appropriate organization for the implementation of the 2016 “Digital Slovenia 2020” strategy and a more efficient use of the existing ICT infrastructure. One of the goals of the strategy is to further strengthen the use of digital technologies to support interministerial coordination.

Citation:

Government of Slovenia (2016): Digital Slovenia 2020: Development strategy for the information society until 2020. Ljubljana (http://www.mju.gov.si/fileadmin/mju.gov.si/pageuploads/DID/Informacijska_druzba/pdf/DSI_2020_3-2016_pic1.pdf).

Switzerland

Score 7

The Federal Council has developed a strategy for information and communication technology in the federal administration. It uses digital technologies effectively to support interministerial coordination. The development and use of IT in the federal administration has, however, experienced challenges with regard to efficiency and the appropriate use of fiscal resources. For example, the development of a software for use in tax policy and administration has been heavily criticized by the Swiss Federal Audit Office.

As for the cantons, Schmid et al. developed a digitalization index for each canton and found that a high level of e-government and digitalization can be found in cantons with strong financial resources (i.e., wealthy inhabitants and a strong economy). The cantons of St. Gallen, Aargau, Zug and Neuenburg score highest in this index.

With regard to general e-government, Switzerland receives medium to low scores in international comparisons.

Citation:

https://www.efd.admin.ch/efd/de/home/themen/Digitalisierung/e-government-schweiz/fb-e-government_schweiz.html

Schmid, J., Urben, M., & Vatter, A. (2018). Cyberföderalismus in der Schweiz: Befunde zur Digitalisierung kantonaler Verwaltungen. *Yearbook of Swiss Administrative Sciences*, 9(1), 12–24. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/ssas.116>

Canada

Score 6

The effective control exercised by cabinet over the ministries mostly obviates the need for elaborate technical means of coordination. That said, the government created Shared Services Canada (SSC) in 2011, which is mandated to provide a unified IT infrastructure for the federal government that is modern, secure and reliable. SSC delivers email, data center, network and workplace technology device services to all government departments and agencies in a consolidated and standardized manner. The common IT program and platform naturally enables improved and secure information, and data sharing across all government agencies.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the consolidation of IT infrastructure through SSC has not gone smoothly, and the department has been criticized for slow service delivery and for putting some federal agencies at risk. Statistics Canada's chief statistician resigned in 2016, stating that the decision to create SSC has compromised Statistics Canada's ability to fulfil its mandate. In 2017, RCMP Commissioner Bob Paulson criticized SSC for outages, arguing that the one-size-fits-all government-wide service package does not recognize the unique needs of a national police force and has negatively impacted police operations.

The federal government has been unsuccessful in the implementation of two major digital technologies, the Phoenix pay system and the [canada.ca](https://www.canada.ca) government-wide email re-organization. These failures cast serious doubt on the ability of the federal government to make effective use of digital technologies.

Citation:

Shared Services Canada, Departmental Report 2017, available at <https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ssc-spc/documents/2016-17-Departmental-Results-Report-EN.pdf>

France

Score 6

In 2011, an interministerial Directorate for State Information Systems and Communication was established. In 2014, in order to strengthen its capacity to steer and influence the sectoral administrations, the directorate was placed under the authority of the prime minister. A further impulse has been given to the directorate by the Macron administration's emphasis on the dimensions of the technological revolution. A secretariat of state was created in May 2018 (Secrétariat d'État au

Numérique) tasked with boosting initiatives and development in the private and public sector and setting up a 100% state digital platform by 2022. Similarly, the president's economic advisor was asked to present proposals on how to spend the €5 billion so-called Investments of the Future fund. The president's adviser suggested allocating nearly €10 billion to the digitalization of public services (with half of this sum for the health care system). In parallel, a report of the Court of Accounts, in support of past actions, recommended a major effort to improve investment and personnel training. The new secretariat is building on these actions with the view of providing users with a single number that would provide access to all public services. Several experiences have already been quite successful. For example, the digitalization of tax declarations, processes and payments has been so successful that for most taxpayers the use of printed documents is no longer possible. Various efforts to improve coordination between administrations have been implemented. For instance, public procurement processes, which involve several administrations, have been streamlined and private companies can access the system using their registration number. While there is a lack of systematic international comparisons, it seems that France currently has less invested than the United Kingdom and Germany in digitalization, and the process in some sectors (e.g., the management of Defense Ministry staff) has suffered major failings in past years.

Hungary

Score 6

The second and third Orbán governments did not pay much attention to the digitalization of government activities in general and of interministerial coordination in particular. The entry of the fourth Orbán government might represent a turning point. As the government has sought to enhance the competitiveness of the Hungarian government through technical modernization, the newly created Ministry of Innovation and Technology (ITM) has set more ambitious goals with respect to digitalization.

Citation:

Hajnal, G., K. Kádár, É. Kovács (2018): Hungary, in: N. Thijs, G. Hammerschmid (eds.), *Public Administration Characteristics and Performance in EU28*. Luxemburg: European Union, 426-459, 455-456 (<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ae181e42-9601-11e8-8bc1-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>).

Israel

Score 6

In 2017, the Knesset Parliamentary Oversight Coordination Unit (abbreviated in Hebrew to “Katef”) was established to monitor government work and the application of laws passed by the parliament. While this body is not a digital one per-se, it does publish reports and articles online for the public and government officials. With this, the Israeli parliament hopes to better monitor and support government activities.

The Marker 2013 (Hebrew): <https://www.themarker.com/technation/1.2185272>

The ICT Authority Strategic Work plan for 2016-2018, <http://mag.calltext.co.il/storage/95/vzPm3XOxT0gj4vrpikuV.pdf>

The Government Coordination Guide, Version 1, 2013, <http://ihaklai.org.il/Portals/0/Documents/articles/%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%93%D7%9C%20%D7%9C%D7%A9%D7%99%D7%AA%D7%95%D7%A3%20%D7%A4%D7%A2%D7%95%D7%9C%D7%94%20%D7%91%D7%99%D7%9F%20%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%A8%D7%93%D7%99%20%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%9E%D7%A9%D7%9C%D7%94.pdf>

Latvia

Score 6

In 2013, the Cabinet of Ministers approved the Information Society Development Guidelines 2014 – 2020, which is the current National eGovernment Strategy. The guidelines were elaborated to ensure continuity of existing policies, and to determine priorities in the area of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for the European Union Structural Funds Programming period 2014 – 2020. One of the key goals identified in the document was the creation of centralized platforms for all governmental actors, ensuring more efficient public administration and emphasizing inter-institutional and cross-sectoral government cooperation.

In 2015, the government supported the proposal of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (VARAM) to fully implement the Public Administration Document Management Systems Integration Environment (DIV) in public administration from 1 September 2017. However, even though many of the ministries have introduced the system, the system's use remains uneven. For example, State Chancellery, the Cabinet of Ministers and several ministries still use the previous DAUKS system (State Chancellery's document circulation and task control) to exchange documents, although the platform's use is limited and deemed ineffective by VARAM. In addition, some documentation is still circulated in paper form.

Nevertheless, VARAM has emphasized that more work will be put into mainstreaming shared platforms for document exchange. VARAM's latest research shows that ministries are moving toward completely digitized document handling processes and the use of electronic signatures is becoming more common, even if progress is not as rapid as hoped.

The State Audit Office has evaluated collaboration between state institutions as being generally well organized, but fragmented. Although approximately € 69 million of the annual state budget is invested in the development and maintenance of ICT, the impact of this investment was deemed to be limited in the State Audit Office's 2017 report.

Citation:

1. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (2013), Guidelines for Development of Information Society 2014-2020, Available at: http://www.varam.gov.lv/eng/darbibas_veidi/e_gov/?doc=13317, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

2. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (2017), Report on the circulation of electronic documents in ministries and their subordinate institutions (in Latvian), Available at: http://www.varam.gov.lv/in_site/tools/download.php?file=files/text/Dokumenti/pol_doc/elietas/MK_171017_InfoZinojums.pdf, Last assessed: 06.01.2019.

3. State Audit Office (2017), Report: Is public administration handling the accumulated information effectively?, Available at: http://www.lrvk.gov.lv/uploads/reviziju-zinojumi/2016/2.4.1-12_2016/zinojums.pdf, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

Mexico

Score 6

The Mexican government has adopted a National Digital Strategy and established a Change Management Plan in order to guide agencies in the development of projects. In July 2018, Mexico launched an online platform to track progress toward achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. However, as often in Mexico, implementation of digitalization is falling behind schedule, especially on the subnational level. This reflects the heterogeneity of digitalization within the broader Mexican society.

Citation:

SDG 2018. Mexico's SDG Portal Brings Functionality to Reporting. <http://sdg.iisd.org/news/mexicos-sdg-portal-brings-functionality-to-reporting/>

Poland

Score 6

The PiS government has been eager to increase the level of digitalization in the country. Upon coming to office, it established a separate Ministry of Digital Affairs and a Committee of the Council of Ministers for Digitalization. However, digitalization has been complicated by changes in leadership. Anna Streżyńska, the first minister of digital affairs, who was broadly regarded as very competent but was not a party member, was recalled on 9 January 2018. After some haggling, the previous secretary of state in that ministry, Marek Zagórski, became her successor in April 2018. Zagórski is the deputy chairman of Deputy Prime Minister Jarosław Gowin's Agreement party, which accounted for the hesitation in nominating him. Digital technologies have been used to improve interministerial coordination.

Citation:

Plucinska, J. (2017): In the line of fire: Poland's digital ambitions, in: Politico, November 22 (<https://www.politico.eu/article/anna-strezyńska-in-the-line-of-fire-polands-digital-ambitions/>).

Portugal

Score 6

There is a unit responsible for providing technological support to the government, the Centro de Gestão da Rede Informática do Governo (Ceger).

This has a central remit to manage the government's IT network (Rede Informática

do Governo, RInG). The (outdated) information on Ceger's website indicates that there were 33 people working in this service in 2012.

Ceger's services involve basic IT support (e.g., government email, internet access, data protection).

It also has as a remit to provide technological support for cabinet and junior minister meetings, while decree-law 16/2002 stipulates that it should develop common information networks and decision support systems for government.

However, the actual implementation of the latter is ongoing. The existing evidence is anecdotal, but suggests that the full potential of these technologies is as yet unrealized for policy development and monitoring. An indicator of this is that it is not uncommon for ministers to use their own devices (or not to use any device at all) at cabinet meetings.

Sweden

Score 6

The digitalization of the Swedish public sector has come a rather long way. One exceptional example is the budget process (one of the key mechanisms to support coordination among government departments), where documents are digitally shared and simultaneously developed among various departments. The government also uses digital services to coordinate interdepartmental responses to communications from the EU. Overall, however, digitalization is mainly used to support intraorganizational processes such as drafting documents and only to a lesser extent to support interdepartmental coordination.

The Swedish government now communicates all new legislation and regulations (SFS) digitally, with digital versions given legal precedence over printed versions as they are the most current versions of legislation.

Digitalization has been implemented more extensively at the agency level. For instance, there is now a joint service center (SSC) that manages back-office functions for a growing number of agencies. Also, statistical material and maps are shared digitally among agencies.

Turkey

Score 6

Turkey is a member of the e-Europe+ initiative, while the e-Transformation Turkey Project was introduced by a prime ministerial circular of December 2003. In 2004, e-government applications were introduced into public administration following the adoption of e-signatures. In 2008, a prime ministerial circular stated that the electronic document management standards and Registered Electronic Mail (KEP) projects were being implemented. Turkey developed an Information Society Strategy

and Action Plan 2006 – 2010. The subsequent 2015 – 2018 Information Society Strategy and Action Plan focuses on economic growth and employment, and includes 72 actions in eight axes, including horizontal issues.

KAYSİS is an information system that covers the organizational structure of public institutions, public services, documents used by public services and all elements incorporated in public administration. Furthermore, the system integrates all e-government applications to promote a small-state government.

The KAYSİS system includes: DETSİS, a central registry of state organization; HEYS, a system in which public services (provided to citizens, businesses, non-governmental organizations or other public institutions) are determined at the operational level, and defined in the electronic environment by Service Inventory Number and national process maps; Public Legislation System (KMS), a system in which all legislation is registered and made publicly available; Service Standards Management System (HSYS), a system which monitors the standardization of services provided by public institutions; State Document Management System (DBYS), a system in which the names of requested documents are standardized by the State Document Number and samples are recorded electronically; Standard File Plan Management (SDYPS), a system which defines the subject of an article and the retention times of archive codes; Public Satisfaction Survey (KMA), a smart survey system which reports citizens' satisfaction ratings for public services for use in determining strategies for public administration.

MERSİS is one of the most important projects of the e-transformation process in Turkey. The project has four basic databases: the Central Population Administration System (MERNİS), National Address Database (UAVT), Land Registry and Cadastre Information System (TAKBİS), and Central Registry System. Additional e-government applications include POLNET (police network and information system) and UYAP (national judiciary informatics system).

The e-government portal in Turkey is estimated to be used by about 30 million people. No recent analysis of the use of e-government applications by ministries is available.

Citation:

TC Ulaştırma ve Altyapı Bakanlığı, 2015–2018 Bilgi Toplumu Stratejisi ve Eylem Planı, <http://www.edevlet.gov.tr/2015/10/13/2015-2018-bilgi-toplumu-stratejisi-ve-eylem-planı/> (accessed 1 November 2018)

E. Tamtürk, "Kamu Yönetiminde Elektronik Belge Yönetim Sistemi," *Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(3), 2017: 851-862. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/325152> (1 November 2018)

E. Sezgin et al., "The Perception of Electronic Document Management Systems (EDMS) as a Transformational Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for Public Institutions in Turkey," Y. K. Dwivedi et al. (eds), *Public Administration Reformation Market Demand from Public Organizations*, Routledge, 2014, 279-300.

K. Abacı, "Electronic Document Management System in the Turkish Public Sector and Recommendations," *The Russian Academic Journal*, 31(1), 2015: 23-26.

Y. Üstüner and N. YAVUZ, "Turkey's Public Administration Today: An Overview and Appraisal," *International Journal of Public Administration*, 2017.

Czechia

Score 5 Digitalization features as one of the priorities in the manifesto of the Babiš government. However, progress has been relatively slow. As the Supreme Audit Office (NKÚ) has drawn attention to several times, digital technologies have been purchased and developed without a thorough needs analysis and in a highly fragmented manner. Moreover, the isolated character of the existing systems has complicated data sharing between public bodies. As for interministerial coordination, digital technologies have played only a limited role.

Germany

Score 5 In German government, interministerial coordination is generally low due to the principal of ministerial responsibility. In day-by-day politics and policies, every ministry pursues its own policies and only in rare cases does interministerial coordination take place. Overall, collective policies of the government are rare. In general, Germany is a country with a slow take-up of e-governance. A special digital strategy for interministerial coordination and thus for better policies is not yet visible. However, some Länder governments, such as Baden-Wuerttemberg and Brandenburg, took the initiative and started to digitalize their interministerial coordination.

Netherlands

Score 5 Digital technologies are not abundantly used in Dutch inter-ministerial coordination. Like in ICT use across government in general, different departments use different systems whose interoperability is low or absent. Although the Legis project aspires to a more integrated ICT approach in the Dutch legislative system, results have been poor. For example, it is impossible as a non-insider to trace progress in legislative work on a particular bill, let alone to have an overview of all bills in preparation. Digitalization in legislation and interministerial coordination in the Netherlands clearly lags behind that in the United Kingdom or Finland.

Citation:

W. Voermans et al., 2012. Legislative processes in transition. Comparative study of the legislative processes in Finland, Slovenia and the UK as a source of inspiration for enhancing the efficiency of the Dutch legislative process, Leiden University ((open access.leidenuniv.nl, accessed 31 October 2018)

Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2014-5, 33 326, nr. 5, Eindrapport onderzoek naar ICT projecten bij de overheid (accessed 4 November 2018)

Austria

- Score 4 After 10 months of the present government being in power, nothing specific is known about the government's approach to digitalization for interministerial coordination. But as digitalization is very much discussed in public and in government circles, it is likely that a policy on digitalization for interministerial coordination is in the making. It is to be seen whether such an approach to coordination (which could become reality very soon) will run contra to the "message control" policy of the chancellor and his deputy – or whether it can be used by both to improve their control over the government's public agenda.

Croatia

- Score 4 The digitalization of public administration is an undisputed goal of the government, but has not proceeded smoothly. The Croatian government established the Central State Office for the Development of the Digital Society in 2016. One of the basic tasks of the Office has been to bundle the existing 28 different digitalization strategies within an umbrella strategy that allows for the co-funding of initiatives from EU funds in the next Multiannual EU Financial Framework for the years 2021-2027. As it stands, the effective use of digital technologies in government and administration is hindered by fragmentation, siloization and bureaucratization. As a result, digital technologies do not play a major role in interministerial coordination.

Cyprus

- Score 4 The use of digital technology covers a small spectrum of government work and activities as well as relations and interactions with citizens on public services. Some common IT programs aim at assisting government and interministerial coordination in a limited number of activities. They include payments by the Treasury and administration, preparing some parts of the budget, keeping track of payments, and assessing progress for projects funded by EU structural funds.

Citation:

On a system of digital archiving and exchange of documents, in Greek, <http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/dits/dits.nsf/All/D63B85881EA64743C2257D700026084B?OpenDocument>

Greece

- Score 4 In Greece, there is little formal coordination of policies across and within ministries. Thus, it is difficult to envisage the digitalization of interministerial coordination. To the extent that such coordination takes place, it is not horizontal, but vertical – flowing from the PMO to line ministries through the political appointees and

personal secretaries of the ministers. Policy coordination exists only with regard to the implementation of a few transversal policies, such as public procurement. The latter is now effected through a national system of public procurement (EAADHSY). This system functions through an appropriately developed digital platform for tenders and applications from suppliers of goods and services interested in serving the public sector.

Citation:

The digital platform for public procurement, covering all ministries and agencies of the public sector, is available at <http://www.eaadhsy.gr/>

Japan

Score 4

Digital technologies designed for inter-ministerial coordination and broader government-to-government (G2G) services are not at the core of Japan's e-government initiative. Rather, the focus of e-government policies is on the creation and use of e-platforms that enable citizens to interact with the various levels of government more effectively and efficiently (G2C). This approach was confirmed in the Digital Government Action Plan released in January 2018, in which G2G models do not play a prominent role.

Recent public discussion has focused on how to properly use official email services and other features such as shared folders. Quite a few civil servants, including senior ones, consider such technologies to be cumbersome. More importantly, these critics seem concerned that emails will be stored as public documents, a fact that might result the emergence of unwelcome evidence in the case of scandal, based on the requirements and disclosure rules of the Public Records and Archives Management Act and the Information Disclosure Law. Given this perspective, it is doubtful that G2G technologies will gain much momentum among senior ministry officials.

Citation:

Jiji, Japan Government Aims to Digitize All Administrative Services (News), Nippon Communication Foundation, 16 January 2018, <https://www.nippon.com/en/genre/society/110724/>

N. N., Bureaucrats reveal that most official emails are not kept properly, The Mainichi, 15 January 2018, <https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20180115/p2a/00m/0na/017000c>

Slovakia

Score 4

Slovakia ranks 20th out of the 28 EU Member States in the European Commission's Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI) 2018, having made progress on previous years, but all in all belonging to the low-performing cluster of countries. In October 2017, the "Detailed Action Plan on the Digitisation of Public Administration" was published. It aims at developing an e-government system for citizens, public administration, businesses and academia. In November 2017, an amendment to the

Act on e-Government became effective which has introduced a central delivery system for official documents. As it stands, however, digital technologies play only a limited role in interministerial coordination.

Citation:

European Commission (2018): Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI) 2018. Country Report Slovakia. Brussels (<https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/scoreboard/slovakia>).

Italy

Score 3 There seems to be no substantial use of digital technologies to support interministerial coordination.

Romania

Score 3 The 2014 National Strategy on Digital Agenda for Romania explicitly called on the public sector to embrace and optimize the use of digital technology for improving effectiveness in governance. This commitment was further buttressed through the establishment of a Government Chief Information Officer within the chancellery. However, the role which digital technologies have actually played in interministerial coordination has been limited so far. In July 2018, the government announced plans to spend €45 million on the development of a government cloud framework to be used by all public institutions in the country. However, similar plans were announced in 2014 and 2017 but have yet to deliver much in the way of results.

Citation:

Ministry for the Information Society (2018): National Strategy on Digital Agenda for Romania. Bucharest (<https://www.trusted.ro/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Digital-Agenda-Strategy-for-Romania-8-september-2014.pdf>).

Iceland

Score 2 No digital technologies are used to support policy coordination across or within government ministries. In the Prime Minister's Office, there is a department called Office of Policy Matters (Skrifstofa Stefnumála), which to some extent coordinates key issues between ministries. This office also coordinates national economic and monetary policy, manages labor market communications, and monitors cabinet policy, future developments and the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals.

Citation:

Organization (Skipulag), <https://www.stjornarradid.is/raduneyti/forsaetisraduneytid/skipulag/>. Accessed 22 December 2018.

Address | Contact

Bertelsmann Stiftung

Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256
33311 Gütersloh
Germany
Phone +49 5241 81-0

Dr. Christof Schiller

Phone +49 5241 81-81470
christof.schiller@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Dr. Thorsten Hellmann

Phone +49 5241 81-81236
thorsten.hellmann@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Pia Paulini

Phone +49 5241 81-81468
pia.paulini@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de
www.sgi-network.org