



Strategic Capacity Report

Strategic Planning, Expert Advice

Sustainable Governance Indicators 2019

©vege - stock.adobe.com

Indicator

Strategic Planning

Question

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

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

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

Denmark

Score 9

Government policies have traditionally been consensus driven. This applies both to parliament, as most governments have been minority governments, and in relation to negotiations involving organizations and the political system, most notably in relation to labor market issues.

Major reforms in Denmark are usually prepared through committees or commissions established to produce reports outlining issues and options. In recent years, commissions have played an essential role in the policy formation process, including Strukturkommissionen (infrastructure commission), Velfærdskommissionen (welfare commission), Arbejdsmarkedskommissionen (labor market commission), Skattekommissionen (tax commission), Produktivitetskommissionen (productivity commission) and Dagpengekommissionen (unemployment insurance commission). In addition, it is quite common to appoint expert groups to prepare inputs for important policy discussions and reforms. The members can be experts, representatives of organizations or civil servants. Moreover, professionalism in ministries has increased.

A tradition has developed in formulating overarching strategic policy plans (usually with a horizon of about 10 years), such as the government's 2010, 2015, 2020 and (most recently) 2025 plans. The 2025 plan was presented by the previous Liberal minority government in August 2016 and subsequently reaffirmed by the current three-party government in May 2017. The plan sets policy targets for, among other areas, fiscal sustainability and living standards.

There has been a continuous effort to modernize the public sector to make it more efficient. Economic policy plans have included expectations on productivity

increases in the public sector, although there are obvious measurement problems in assessing the outcome of such initiatives. As a sign of the ongoing process, the new coalition government includes a minister responsible for public innovation. Reforms of the tax authority have been criticized for being excessively focused on cost savings, which results in less effective tax administration and reduced control over tax compliance.

Citation:

Niels Ejersbo og Carsten Greve, *Modernisering af den offentlige sektor*. Copenhagen: Børsen, 2005.

DK2025 - et stærkere Danmark. August 2016. http://stm.dk/publikationer/DK2025_web/index.htm (Accessed 17 October 2016).

The Danish Government, "Vækst og velstand 2025," <https://www.regeringen.dk/2025/> (Accessed 16 October 2017)

"Afhøringer i skandalesag om udbytteskat for milliarder indledes," <https://www.berlingske.dk/politik/afhoeringer-i-skandalesag-om-udbytteskat-for-milliarder-indledes> (Accessed 7 November 2018).

Finland

Score 9

Strategic planning has considerable influence on government decision-making. The strategic goals contained in the government program are recorded in specific government-strategy documents. These strategy documents cover a one-year period and include a plan for pursuing priority goals, a notice of intent for upcoming key decisions and indicators for evaluating government performance. The implementation of the government program is assessed by a report halfway through the cabinet's tenure, which defines how strategic goals should be attained through the rest of the cabinet's time in office. The Prime Minister's Office assists the prime minister and the government in their work and is responsible for the planning of social policy legislation that does not fall within the competence of any other ministry. The government often launches policy programs to ensure its key objectives are met. Meanwhile, the preparation and monitoring of programs is delegated to ministerial groups. In addition, the Committee for the Future deals with future-related matters. As a former entrepreneur, Prime Minister Sipilä has given the government program an even more strategic turn. For some of its policy objectives, the government utilizes trial projects to assess reform impacts. The basic income trial project, which was run with 2,000 participants nationwide in 2017 and 2018, is an example of this kind of new strategic evidence-based planning. The initial results of a scientific assessment of the experiment will be available in spring 2019. The analysis will include a register-based study, and a survey of experimental and control group participants.

Citation:

Basic income experiment; <http://www.kela.fi/web/en/basic-income-experiment-2017-2018>

Canada

Score 8 Neither the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) nor the Privy Council Office (PCO) has an official planning unit. In 1997, Policy Horizons Canada was established under the PCO with a mandate to provide analysis and help the federal public service anticipate emerging policy challenges and opportunities, in order to support medium-term policy development. Its budget is small, however, and this unit has not reported through the PCO since 2007. Nevertheless, there are thousands of public servants employed by the PCO, the Department of Finance and the Treasury Board (close to 3,000 individuals in all) who have no specific program responsibility. Their purpose is to manage politically sensitive files and to plan. Therefore, some argue that the planning capacity of the government of Canada is as strong as that of other Western countries, and in some cases even stronger.

The Trudeau government has made ample use of special advisory groups to provide information and consultations on a number of policy areas (e.g., economic growth, cultural policy and issues relating to young people).

Latvia

Score 8 In December 2011, Latvia established a central government planning unit, the Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, PKC). The PKC's mandate was to develop a long-term strategic approach to public policymaking, while also monitoring decision-making to ensure that public policies are effective. The PKC also monitors ministries' progress toward meeting the government's stated goals, as outlined in the government declaration.

To date, the PKC has produced the National Development Plan, monitored progress toward the Latvia 2030 framework and established an active role for itself in decision-making, contributing to policy debates on a range of cross-sectoral issues such as demographics and income disparities. The PKC reviews all proposals discussed by the cabinet and provides weekly briefings for the prime minister on substantive issues pending discussion by the cabinet. In 2015, the PKC's mandate was expanded to include a coordinating role in the management of state-owned enterprises.

In addition to the PKC's core role and a reduction in departmental units and staff numbers, most ministries have retained some independent planning capacity. The PKC has been criticized for becoming mired in the details of policy planning, effectively duplicating the work of ministries while failing to provide the cross-sectoral, meta-approach expected of it.

The effectiveness of the PKC is not limited by its ability to provide quality analysis and evidence-based arguments, but rather by its inability to carve out a position of

authority and influence within the decision-making process. Analysis provided by the PKC to politicians is easily tossed aside when political expediency dictates. The PKC itself sees its role as providing much-needed analysis, but not necessarily ensuring that these evidence-based arguments are respected in the decision-making process.

Citation:

The Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre, Information Available at (in Latvian): <https://www.pkc.gov.lv/lv/par-pkc/kas-ir-pkc>, Last assessed: 06.01.2019

Lithuania

Score 8

Lithuania's strategic-planning system was introduced in 2000 and has been updated several times since. At the central level of government, the planning system involves all stages (planning, monitoring and evaluation) of managing strategic and operational performance. The main strategic documents include the long-term Lithuania 2030 strategy and the medium-term National Progress Program, which is in turn linked to short-term strategic-performance plans and budget programs. The planning system in general is well-institutionalized; its functioning is supported by a network of strategic-planning units within each ministry and a governmental Strategic Committee that was re-introduced in 2013 by the 2012 to 2016 government. However, the strategic planning system suffers from unnecessary complexity. About 250 strategic documents exist, while strategic action plans include 1,800 monitoring indicators. The 2016 to 2020 government developed guidelines and an action plan for restructuring strategic planning and the budget formulation system to focus more on results and ensure fiscal sustainability. The current government also introduced so-called change baskets, channeling more financial resources to the implementation of government priorities and other significant legislative commitments (e.g., poverty reduction and national defense). For instance, financial support for children will be increased from €30 per child in 2018 to €50 per child in 2019.

A State Progress Council composed of politicians, public and civil servants, academics, business leaders, and other representatives of Lithuanian society was established to help design the Lithuania 2030 strategy and monitor its implementation. The council's composition was updated after the 2012 to 2016 government came to office and meetings were held on a regular basis until 2016. Although the 2016 to 2020 government was initially reluctant to employ this governance arrangement, after almost two years of putting Council activities on hold it decided to update its composition. It remains to be seen if the Council will resume its role as the prime minister appears increasingly driven by pre-election incentives, disregarding strategic priorities.

More generally, though these strategic and advisory bodies take a long-term approach and offer viable policy solutions, their influence on governmental decision-

making varies by policy issue. There is a certain gap between the long-term policy aims contained in various strategic documents and the actual practices of individual public-sector organizations. In addition, politically important decisions are sometimes made without due consideration of strategic priorities and performance-monitoring, with strategic-planning documents and performance reports often playing little role in daily decision-making processes or the activities of street-level bureaucrats.

New Zealand

Score 8

New Zealand has unique constitutional arrangements resulting in a significant concentration of power in the cabinet and a highly cohesive system of cabinet government. The core executive in New Zealand is organized according to new public-management approaches and methods. Most importantly, contracts are negotiated between ministers and chief executives. With the large number of government departments and ministers (26, with a further three undersecretaries), most of whom are responsible for several portfolios, taking a whole-of-government approach to policy development can be complex and time-consuming. Recent governments have reacted to concerns about fragmentation by recentralizing the steering capacity of the core executive. The most important government departments involved in strategic planning and policy formation are the central agencies of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC), the State Services Commission (SSC) and the Treasury. All contracts (performance agreements and departmental statements of intent) support a cooperative and whole-of-government policy approach, though evaluation of the performance assessment of chief executives has a strong focus on departmental achievements.

The prime minister can draw on only moderate strategic-planning capacity (in the form of a policy-advisory group) vis-à-vis ministers. Ad hoc groups, often including some outside expertise, are increasingly used to complement government agencies' policy-advisory function.

In 2014, prompted by evidence of widespread inconsistency in the quality of policy advice being produced across agencies, the New Zealand government launched the Policy Project. This deployed analytical tools and frameworks to investigate current practice in policy design to improve the quality of policy advice across the whole of government. Through collaborative methods, the Policy Project identified and codified what quality policy advice looks like and the skills and processes needed to produce it. The Policy Project has produced a number of policy improvement frameworks, which were launched by the prime minister of New Zealand in 2016.

The unprecedented character of the Labour-NZ First coalition, with support from the Green party, constitutes new challenges in terms of strategic capacity because of a lack of experience on the government's side. Only three of the Labour Party's ministers and two of the NZ First members of parliament have previously held ministerial office. The Green party, which holds three ministerial positions outside of cabinet, has no member with previous ministerial experience.

Citation:

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

Sweden

Score 8

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

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

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

The center-right government (2006 – 2014) invested considerable energy to increase coordination among government departments and improve steering of the executive agencies.

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

Citation:

Zetterberg, K. (2011), "Det statliga kommittéväsendet: En del av den svenska modellen," *Svensk Juristtidning* 8:753-763.

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

Garsten, C., B. Rothstein and S. Svallfors (2015), *Makt utan mandat: de policyprofessionella i svensk politik* (Stockholm: Dialogos).

Australia

Score 7

Probably the most important government body for encouraging long-term strategic policy development is the Productivity Commission, which notionally provides advice to government on microeconomic policy, but which increasingly is asked to provide advice in other policy areas. The Productivity Commission conducts reviews and inquiries as directed by government, and also independently produces research reports. All advice and reports are released publicly in a timely fashion.

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

The coalition government rationalized the number of government departments and agencies shortly after coming into office in September 2013. The Community and Public Sector Union estimated that 18,000 public sector jobs were cut in the subsequent period as a result, reducing the strategic planning capacity of the public service. The implications for strategic planning are not likely positive.

Citation:

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

<http://www.cpsu.org.au/news/why-re-elected-turnbull-government-bad-your-job>

<http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/paul-keating-australia-lacks-a-foreign-policy-to-negotiate-the-rise-of-china-20160830-gr4y70.html>

Productivity Commission: <https://www.pc.gov.au/>

<https://www.pc.gov.au/research/ongoing/trade-assistance>

<https://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-protectionism>

Austria

Score 7

The strategic capacity of the Austrian executive is limited by the lack of clear majorities in the federal parliament and in most of the state (provincial) parliaments. With some exceptions, no party can claim to have the mandate to implement a set of

policies agreed to by a majority of voters and members of parliament. Rather, coalitions must be formed, a process with clear advantages and clear disadvantages. On the one hand, executive responsibility is blurred, as the presence of too many veto players prevents the development of consistent strategic capacity. On the other, coalitions enable a more inclusive government. Political decision-making in Austria is still characterized by a tendency to prefer a maximum of consensus, even at the price of postponing necessary decisions and shying away from taboos identified with the interests of special groups (such as public service unions or organized agrarian interests). Inter- and intra-party veto players have significant influence, and undermine strategic capacity.

Strategic-planning units and bodies consisting of public officials do exist within the ministries. The Federal Chancellery can be considered the principal strategic-planning unit, as it is responsible for coordinating the government's various activities. However, it lacks the specialized personnel that would enable it to work as a comprehensive strategy unit and has no power to give instructions to other ministries.

In 2017 the coalition between SPÖ and ÖVP collapsed due to a change of leadership within the ÖVP. Consequently, the general election scheduled for 2018 had to be moved to October 2017. The outcome of the election resulted in a new coalition agreement, negotiated between the ÖVP and FPÖ. However, the formation of a new coalition will not change the inbuilt weaknesses of a coalition government based on partners with conflicting interests.

The ÖVP-FPÖ coalition government, formed at the end of 2017, continued the strategy of centralizing the bureaucracy within the ministries by establishing "secretary generals" above the traditional structure. A secretary general is only answerable to the minister, placing them above heads of departments. This structure, in some cases established before 2017, has become the overall principle within the whole government. The intention is to give the respective minister (through the secretary general) direct control over the ministry.

Belgium

Score 7

Each minister works closely with a team of collaborators in each ministerial cabinet. Each cabinet is usually large, with as many as 30 to 40 senior staff and experts. Meetings take place often, and the team designs policies in line both with the minister's objectives and the government agreement. The minister and the advisory team are then responsible for drafting bill projects which are then submitted to the government in weekly meetings.

In terms of long-term planning, the knowledge accumulated by a minister's collaborators can be lost at the end of a legislative period, as the ministerial team

changes with the minister. Moreover, the frequency of staff rotation is generally high. In contrast, public administration is run by civil servants with longer tenures of office, but these groups do not generally take part in strategic ministerial decisions. Long-term planning (beyond a legislative term) is therefore made difficult. The main rationale for relying on the minister's team instead of civil servants is that the former are the minister's (and the party's) close aides and tend to be more flexible in terms of working hours and availability for emergency situations.

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

Chile

Score 7

The president has the ability to ask for and ensure strategic planning, whether through formal or informal channels. Line ministries, most notably the Ministry of Finance, and the president's advisory ministry (Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Segpres), have considerable influence in strategic-planning processes. Meetings between strategic-planning staff and the head of government are held frequently. However, no long-term view of policy challenges and viable solutions is necessarily presented – these are either limited in scope or depth of impact depending on the topic. Strategic planning, policy planning and regulatory reforms, budget planning, and ex ante evaluation of government policies and public-investment programs are carried out by specialist units and departments inside the various ministries. While there is no explicit multi-year budget planning process in place in Chile, this takes place implicitly due to the fiscal rule that (by law) links overall government expenditure to forward-looking estimates of long-term government revenue, based on growth trends and copper-price projections. These forecasts are provided in a transparent way by specialist budgetary commissions comprised of academic and private-sector experts (mostly professional economists).

Estonia

Score 7

The supporting structures of the government in Estonia are mainly located in the line ministries. The Government Office (GO) is quite limited in this respect, though there is a Strategy Unit within the GO, which mainly has a consulting function. Its main tasks are to support the composition of strategic-development plans, to coordinate and draw up the government's action plan, and monitor the implementation of the above-mentioned policy documents. The Strategy Unit employs 11 staff. Since 2014, an ambitious program to improve the quality of policymaking has funded various activities (e.g., impact assessments, future scenario, legal analysis and engagement projects). The human capacity of the Strategy Unit has been enhanced by various expert groups and task forces established within this ambitious program.

In addition to the Strategy Unit, there is also a Prime Minister's Bureau, comprised of experts in various policy areas who advise the prime minister. Different from the Strategy Unit, this body is closely linked to the prime minister's political party and its members change with each new prime minister.

In 2017, a Foresight Center was established by the parliament to carry out long-term social and economic analyses, and draft development scenarios. The center consults parliamentary committees, but has only an implicit linkage to the executive.

Ireland

Score 7

There is some evidence that Irish policymakers improved their strategic-planning capacity since the period in the immediate aftermath of the crisis. The annual reports on the Programme for Government detail a more coherent strategic approach to policymaking and increased use of advisory bodies.

However, independent advice is not always followed. Popular pressures for increased spending and tax reductions influenced government decisions in the 2016 budget, reflecting the proximity of a general election. The Fiscal Advisory Council and the Economic and Social Research Institute have urged the government to devote more of the revenue gains arising from the recent economic improvement to a faster reduction of the budget deficit, at the expense of lower taxes and increased spending. However, the imposition of limits on mortgage lending during 2015, intended to moderate the rise in home prices, is a welcome example of unpopular but prudent strategic thinking.

During the 2011 to 2016 government and current minority government, detailed reports were published by the government monitoring annual progress on implementing the Programme for Government.

Israel

Score 7

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

A number of steps have been taken as a consequence, with the most prominent of these being the annual publication of the Governmental Plan Book. The sixth book, published in February 2018, offers a review of strategic planning units on the Israeli government. As a continuation of the 2017 book, Israel used different consultants to

define and achieve its goals for 2018. According to the book, connections between government ministries, and various professional and business experts were achieved and have improved policy outcomes. In addition, the book continues to use different markers, measurement indicators and compares the strategic goals of last year's report to those of 2018.

The government is also conducting a series of “roundtables” in which government offices consult different professionals. Since 2008, there has been a series of policy planning initiatives called the policy planning roundtable. This started as a PMO initiative and brought together experts from the public, private and third sectors. These meetings allow the government to ask for advice from different experts. Although at the time of writing, no information was available on meetings after 2017.

In addition, in 2018, as part of reforms introduced over recent years in the field of public and professional consultation, the connection between the government and strategic planning units was tightened. For example, the Israeli government ICT authority, which is responsible for the improvement of services and public outreach, conducted a series of consultations with academic and business professionals, and public consultants and strategic planning groups in order to improve services and optimize results.

Citation:

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

Arlozorov, Merav, “Serious, Ambitious, and Improving: Some Good Words on Netanyahu’s Government,” The Marker, 5.3.2017, <https://www.themarker.com/news/1.3903271>

Loten, Tomer, “The Governmental Planning Reform is Now Complete: Now is the time for an Implementation Reform.” The Marker, 27.3.2017, <https://www.themarker.com/opinion/1.3954484>

“Policy departments – auxiliary tool for navigation,” the Reut institute 11.6.2008. (Hebrew)

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

“Government releases 2017-2018 work plan,” Ynet reporters, 03.05.2017, <https://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4930776,00.html>

Government ICT Authority, Action Plan for years 2018-2019 (Hebrew), yoursay.gov.il/cio/File/Index/NAP3Comments/

Working Plan Book 2018-2019, PMO Office, February 2018 (Hebrew), <http://www.plans.gov.il/pdf2018/index.html#14>

Policy Planning round tables, PMO office, June 2016 (Hebrew), <http://www.pmo.gov.il/policyplanning/shituf/Pages/roundtable.aspx>

Cross Sector round Table, Ministry of Education, 2018 (Hebrew), <http://sheatufim.org.il/subject/cross-sector/education/>

Malta

Score 7

Each government ministry has a director and unit responsible for strategy and planning. These are strongest in the Ministry of Finance, the Malta Planning Authority, the Malta Transport Authority, the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs, and the Education Ministry. In 2015, a new unit focused on information and the implementation of standards was introduced in the office of the prime minister to facilitate coordination between various stakeholders when implementing projects. Strategic planning has been boosted by the government's efforts to reduce public debt. The National Statistics Office has also been reformed. Over the last year, the influence of strategic planning units over fiscal and education policy has increase. The success of Malta's EU presidency, supported by a four-year program that upgraded coordination vertically and horizontally across government entities, has shown the substantive improvements that have been achieved. A Budget Implementation unit also monitors the implementation of policies with relevance to the budget.

Within ministries, the permanent secretary is responsible for developing strategy, including identifying key performance indicators, and determining timeline and budgets. Strategic plans normally run over three-, four- or five-year cycles and are often developed in the course of consultation with internal and external stakeholders. Internationally recognized benchmarking methodologies are used to track progress. These plans typically include strategic priorities, strategic actions, core commitments and deliverables. In some cases, ministries employ consultants to produce reports on current policy issues, a practice that may be regarded as forward planning. The Management Efficiency Unit coordinates separate ministry plans and the Malta Information Technology Agency (MITA), which reviews government IT requirements, also assists. Usually when a policy is to be reformed or updated a strategic plan is released for consultation. It has been proposed that the annual government budget be instead shifted to a multi-year time frame to ensure a greater degree of continuity and long-term planning.

A plan to develop special strategies for disadvantaged regions is being established. Government-allied Member of Parliament Glenn Bedingfield has been tasked with spearheading a soon-to-be launched strategy for Cottonera. The strategy will seek to improve environmental and social standards in this inner-harbor area, and will include short- and long-term restoration goals.

Citation:

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20150823/local/malta-keeps-a-rating-deficit-is-down-economy-stronger.581555>

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20151002/local/dbrs-confirms-maltas-long-term-rating-at-a-stable.586719>

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20151004/business-news/ey-predicts-malta-gdp-growth-of-39-in-2015-29-in-2016.586905>

<http://www.politico.eu/article/maltas-eu-presidency-how-did-it-go/>

<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20170701/local/eu-presidency-a-fantastic-experience-has-come-to-an-end-pm.652048>

Caleja Ragonesi I., Maltese Presidency aims to make the ordinary extraordinary. Europe's Word January 2017

Strategic Plan 2017-2020 Academy for disciplined forces Malta
 Mobile Government Strategy 2017-2018ffddddd
 Ufficju tal - prim Ministru, Rapport Annwali 2015
<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20181017/local/79-of-budget-2018-measures-were-fulfilled.691830>

Mexico

Score 7

The Mexican president is required by law to produce a strategic plan in his first year in office. At a lower level, there are quite a few planning units within the Mexican government, though they do not all have decisive input in the policymaking process. Longer-term, Mexico has committed itself to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and created a specialized technical committee involving 25 federal agencies, which will collect the statistical information required to monitor progress.

Strategic planning was most prominent in the 1960s, 70s and 80s; in the latter decade no fewer than three former planning ministers moved up to the presidency of Mexico. In more general terms, a “passion for planning” stems from the origins of the Institutional Revolutionary Party regime and its corporatist structures within a mixed economy. Mainly as a consequence of market-oriented reforms, the role of planning entities has declined since the late 1980s. This was partly the result of Mexico becoming an export-oriented economy, but also because planning itself was a failure during this period, with Mexico too bound to international economic trends to successfully implement planning decisions.

Planning has seen a resurgence in popularity in recent years. The major challenge to planning in Mexico, and Latin America more generally, consists in creating sufficiently tight links between the agencies responsible for planning, the implementing agencies and powerful interest groups. The implementation of several highly significant recent reforms have put Mexico’s planning skills to the test. This includes the implementation of anti-corruption laws and reforms in the social sector, education reform as well as in energy and telecommunications.

The current Mexican president has faced historically low approval ratings in the final year of his term. Combined with the challenge of the incoming presidency, this has made the president a “lame duck.” Additionally, the incoming president has announced that he will repeal several reforms, such as the education reform. This will limit the chance of successfully implementing strategic plans at the beginning of the new president’s term. It remains to be seen, however, to what extent the new government will be able to plan and implement a coherent sustainability strategy with strong priorities.

Netherlands

Score 7

The Dutch government has four strategic-planning units. All of these are formally part of a ministry, but their statutes guarantee them independent watchdog and advisory functions.

The Scientific Council for Government Policy (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, WRR) advises the government on intersectoral issues of great

future importance and policies for the longer term and weak coordination of the work plans of the other strategic planning units. It is part of the prime minister's Department of General Affairs and is the only advisory council for long-term strategic-policy issues. In 2018, WRR advice focused on shifting long-term health care policy priorities from decreasing health differences to increasing health potentials for the whole population, and massively increasing the (super)diversity of people living in the Netherlands. Linked to CBS reports on the future demographic dynamics, members of parliament have called for an ad hoc advisory commission on long-term population growth.

The Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (Centraal Planbureau, CPB) is part of the Department of Economic Affairs. It prepares standard annual economic assessments and forecasts (Centraal Economisch Plan, Macro-Economische Verkenningen), and cost-benefit analyses for large-scale infrastructural projects. In election years, it assesses the macroeconomic impacts of political parties' electoral platforms. For more than 200 days after the March elections in 2017, while the cabinet was being formed, the CPB was an important background advisor in calculating the financial scope for new policy initiatives, for example, a major policy strategy in the Climate Agreement and a more flexible (individualized) pension system.

The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (Sociaal-Cultureel Planbureau, SCP) is part of the Department of Public Health, Welfare and Sports. The SCP conducts policy-relevant scientific research on the present and future of Dutch social and cultural issues – for example, political engagement and participation of citizens, media and culture, family and youth, care, housing. Jointly with CPB, PBL, and CBS the SCP in 2018 initiated 'Monitor Integrated Prosperity' ("Monitor Brede Welvaart") to move away from narrowly economic indicators, and systematically inform policymakers about a much broader set of indicators for prosperity in the Netherlands.

The Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving, PBL) is part of the Department of Infrastructure and Environment. It is the national institute for strategic policy analysis for the environment, nature and spatial policies. During the 2017 cabinet formation process, the influence of the PBL and high-level civil servants was visible in the long list of energy transition policy initiatives. In 2017 – 2018, the PBL focused on issues of energy transition (given that gas exploitation is being scaled back) and the circular economy.

Long-term steering capacity has traditionally been strong in water management and is increasingly strong in climate change adaptation.

In 2016, the Dutch Association for Public Administration called for the mobilization of more strategic knowledge and steering capacity in national governance. In 2018, evidence that this call has been heeded has accumulated. Translation to cabinet decision-making, however, appears to be lagging.

Citation:

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

P. 't Hart, De opgave centraal. Festival Bestuurskunde, 13 September 2016 (platform overheid.nl, consulted November 8 2016)

P. Bloem et al., 2018. Designing a century ahead: climate change adaptation in the Dutch Delta, in *Policy & Society* <https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2018.1513731>

CPB, CBS, SCP, PBL, Verkenning en Monitor Brede Welvaart (<https://www.cpb.nl/sites/default/files/omnidownload/PBL-CPB-SCP-Verkenning-Brede-Welvaart-2018.pdf>)

Universiteit Leiden, Wollige troonrede reflecteert brede coalitie, (<https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/2018/09>)

Elsevier, Kamerleden willen onderzoek naar bevolkingsgroei, 20 September 2018

Norway

Score 7

Significant strategic planning takes place in the course of governmental decision-making. The Ministry of Finance is a key actor in the long-term planning process, and also presents views during the annual budget cycle on how best to cope with long-term economic challenges and the financing of the welfare state.

The typical procedure for major decisions or reforms entails the following steps: First, the government appoints an ad hoc committee tasked with delivering a detailed report on a particular issue. Some of these committees are composed exclusively of experts, while others have a broader membership that includes politicians and representatives of interested parties such as unions, business confederations and other non-governmental organizations.

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

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

There is an established procedure for the approval of the annual budget. Activity starts a year in advance, when the government holds three conferences on the budget proposal. The finance minister presents an initial proposal to parliament in the first week of October. A parliamentary committee plays an active role in the budget process, making concrete proposals for the distribution of resources. This proposal becomes the basis of parliamentary discussion. After the parliament approves a

proposal for the allocation of resources, it becomes binding for subsequent, more detailed discussions that take place in various parliamentary committees. By December 15, this work is concluded and the final budget is approved by the full parliament.

The shortcomings in governance that were revealed in the course of the July 22 terrorist attacks and their aftermath have resulted in a general downgrade in the scores associated with executive capacity. However, these shortcomings have been mostly rectified in the past several years.

In addition to these procedures, it is customary that long-term reforms are agreed in the coalition government's negotiating platforms. However, in these negotiations, political ideas and visions are more prominent than evidence-based assessments.

South Korea

Score 7

Strategic planning remains an important factor in South Korean governance. The office of the president includes a senior secretary and two secretaries for the president for state affairs. President Moon launched the State Affairs Planning Advisory Committee in May 2017. This commission is comprised of key departments specializing in policy and administration, the economy, diplomacy and security, and policy planning. A total of 30 members play an advisory role in assisting the new government in reviewing the structure, function and budget of each government organization. Commission members also help to identify key policies that the government will pursue, and help develop medium and long-term plans to carry out the policies. The plan submitted by the State Affairs Planning Advisory Committee contains policy recommendations to be pursued over the next five years of the Moon administration. The plan includes a national vision of "a Nation of the People, a Just Republic of Korea," along with 100 concrete policy goals. However, key policies recommended by the committee have not been successful, and its public presence has declined.

Citation:

Korea.net. Policy Roadmap of the Moon Jae-in Administration. July 19, 2017.

Korea.net. President Moon Unveils Five-year Policy Agenda. July 19, 2017. <http://www.korea.net/NewsFocus/policies/view?articleId=148013>

Korea.net. President Launches Advisory Committee on State Affairs. May 22, 2017. <http://www.korea.net/NewsFocus/policies/view?articleId=146390>

Spain

Score 7

The idea of reinforcing long-term thinking and smarter policymaking has drawn increasing political attention in Spain during the crisis. Several key areas including economic policy (structural reforms), security and external action, are addressed through strategic documents that receive annual evaluations. However the political

instability of the PP minority government (2016 – 2018) and of the subsequent PSOE minority government has undermined the government's strategic-planning capacities.

During 2018, sectoral strategies have been published or announced in the areas of foreign policy, cybersecurity, the pensions system, poverty reduction and gender equality. The Prime Minister's Office, which is the central actor for the government strategic planning, has been reinforced and new policy units (the High Commissioner for Combating Child Poverty and the High Commissioner for the Agenda 2030) have been established, helping to bolster the government's priorities and expertise. In July 2018, the Council of Ministers approved the Action Plan for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda: Towards a Strategy for Sustainable Development, in which all ministerial departments, regions, local authorities and civil society organizations participated.

Citation:
Government (2018), Implementation of the 2030 Agenda:
https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/203295182018_VNR_Report_Spain_EN_ddghpbrgsp.pdf

United Kingdom

Score 7

Although the United Kingdom has one of the most centralized political systems and is one of the long-established liberal democracies in the world, the resources directly available to the prime minister are relatively limited compared with those available to other heads of government. Formally, there is no prime ministerial department to provide strategic planning or advice, although the Cabinet Office provides an important coordinating role across government and its head, the cabinet secretary, attends cabinet meetings. The cabinet secretary is also the head of the civil service, after the two roles were separated under the previous coalition government, and chairs the quarterly Projects Commissioning Board. In 2014, the post of chief executive of the civil service was created with the incumbent becoming a permanent secretary of the Cabinet Office in 2015. The Projects Commissioning Board works closely with the Economic and Domestic Affairs Secretariat (EDS), established in summer 2015, which fosters future and innovative projects. A substantial effort has been made since 2010 to modernize the civil service, including its strategic capacity, with a cabinet-level minister taking the lead. A civil service reform plan was launched in 2012 and led by the Cabinet Office. Establishing policymaking as a profession is one of the stated goals, a task that will have potentially long-term consequences for steering capability and strategic capacity.

At a political level, a special advisory unit has supported all recent prime ministers. George Freeman, Conservative member of parliament for Mid Norfolk, has led the current unit, the Prime Minister's Policy Board, since shortly after Theresa May became prime minister in July 2016, but it was disbanded in the wake of the 2017 general election. Special advisers and civil servants staff these advisory units. The

remit of the Number 10 Policy Unit is defined by the prime minister but tends to focus on strategic political and policy decisions. In 2012, the prime minister and deputy prime minister established a dedicated Implementation Unit within the Cabinet Office, charged with driving implementation in areas deemed to be of high priority and now reinforced by the creation of implementation task forces to oversee the delivery of policy initiatives. All government departments have been required by the new government to produce single departmental plans, which serve both to define their strategic objectives and to enable them to be monitored more effectively.

However, political uncertainty has made strategic planning harder. After Theresa May lost the Conservatives' parliamentary majority in the 2017 general election, she has led a minority government dependent on a "confidence-and-supply" agreement with the DUP, a Northern Irish unionist party. In addition, Conservative members of parliament – from both extremes of the Brexit spectrum – keep attacking their own government's plans.

Two of the prime minister's most vocal opponents in cabinet, David Davis (Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union) and Boris Johnson (Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs), resigned in protest to the so-called Chequers agreement on the Brexit negotiations, while two more (Raab and McVey, also from the euro-skeptic faction within the cabinet) resigned in November 2018. The cabinet's collective ability to make strategic decisions continues to be weakened by Brexit-related in-fighting.

Citation:

https://civilservicelearning.civilservice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/twelve_actions_report_web_accessible.pdf

Institute for Government (2014) Whitehall Monitor 2014 A data-driven analysis of the size, shape and performance of Whitehall (<http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/IFG%20-%20Whitehall%20Monitor%202014.pdf>)

Japan

Score 6

Under the central-government reform implemented by the Koizumi government in 2001, the role of lead institutions was considerably strengthened. The unit officially in charge of "policy planning and comprehensive policy coordination on crucial and specific issues in the cabinet" is the Cabinet Office (Naikaku-fu), which assists the prime minister and his cabinet. It is supported by a well-staffed Cabinet Secretariat (Naikaku-kanbō). The Cabinet Office also coordinates a number of policy councils including the Council on Economic and Fiscal Policy. While there is a certain amount of overlap between councils concerning strategic issues, and thus the danger of fuzzy demarcations of responsibility, the councils have at least contributed to informing the governmental and public discourses in a constructive manner. While individual line ministries have strategic-planning units staffed with mid-ranking officials, their actual influence on long-term planning seems to be limited compared to the clout of bureau chiefs and more senior officials such as administrative vice-ministers. Policy-planning units tend to have very few staff members.

Citation:

Kotaro Tsuru, Where Has the Growth Strategy Gone? Working style reform is the way to go, Article translated by RIETI from Nihon Keizai Shimbun of November 10, 2015, 10 February 2016, <http://www.rieti.go.jp/en/papers/contribution/tsuru/30.html>

N. N., Abe seeks to undermine tripartite system in labor policymaking process, Japan Press Weekly, 8 August 2016, <http://www.japan-press.co.jp/modules/news/index.php?id=9838>

Bulgaria

Score 5

The most important systematic strategic-planning process is related to the requirements of EU membership and the necessity of preparing strategy and programs within the EU framework. These include the convergence program, the reform program as a part of the European Union's 2020 strategy, and concrete strategical considerations justifying the setting of priorities for EU funds absorption. Under the macroeconomic imbalances procedure of the European Union, which categorizes Bulgaria as a country with imbalances, Bulgaria is obliged to integrate specific European Commission recommendations into the development of policy strategies.

There are national strategies on security, energy, governance and development of water resources, development of scientific research, Roma integration, physical education and sport, which serve for some long-term orientation. These strategies have been prepared in coordination with various ministries and on the basis of extensive discussions with the relevant expert communities. They are overseen by the line ministries and parliamentary committees responsible for these policy areas. Presently, the Council of Ministers' portal for public consultations lists 165 "active" strategic documents relating to the national level, more than 20 of which have a term that reaches beyond 2020.

Citation:

Strategic documents at the national level (a list of documents in Bulgarian), available at: <http://strategy.bg/StrategicDocumentsHandler.ashx?lang=1&type=1>

Croatia

Score 5

Since joining the EU in 2013, strategic-planning capacity in Croatia has increased substantially, in part due to the learning process that took place during the accession period, but also thanks to Croatia's inclusion in the EU strategic-planning exercise organized within the framework of the European Semester. The Plenković governments have taken the drafting of the annual national reform programs, as required by the European Commission, rather seriously. Despite the introduction of these institutional and procedural arrangements, policymaking in Croatia continues to be dominated by short-term political interests. Strategic decisions are still very often made pro forma, lack political support and end up being shelved. Also, in

numerous cases, strategies are inconsistent and lack some of the elements that strategic documents should contain. In his October 2018 report on the government's activities in the past year, Prime Minister Plenković did not mention the issue of strategic planning when talking about public administration. However, strategic planning has become a relatively strong tool of some local and regional self-government units. Having realized that success in drawing EU funds largely depends on the quality of strategic planning, they have started using this tool in their policy planning.

Citation:

Petak, Z. (2018) Policy-Making Context and Challenges of Governance in Croatia, in: Z. Petak, K. Kotarski (eds.), *Policy-Making at the European Periphery: The Case of Croatia*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 29-45.

Czechia

Score 5

While the institutional infrastructure for strategic planning in Czechia remains relatively weak, a number of strategic frameworks exist, partly resulting from EU pressure. In April 2017, the government approved the strategic framework *Czechia 2030*, setting long-term priorities for the development of the country. The document, which built on the 2010 Strategic Framework for Sustainable Development, sets out the direction of development for the next decade in order to help the country achieve development which is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable and to improve the quality of life for the Czech population in all regions. However, it has played a limited role in guiding the planning activities of the different ministries, and Prime Minister Babiš has paid little reference to the strategic framework so far. A medium-term perspective is provided by the government's policy manifesto, which is presented to the Chamber of Deputies for a vote of confidence. In addition, the government prepares action plans for individual policy fields in cooperation with interest groups and academic and other experts.

France

Score 5

French governments commonly refer to ad hoc committees tasked with providing information on crucial issues. In some cases, a report is requested from a single individual. Committee members are mainly high-level civil servants, former or active politicians and academics, and often are chosen on the basis of their sympathy to the government in office at the time. Some reports are made public but others remain unpublished, in particular when the report's proposals appear too provocative to be accepted by social partners. This situation raises the concern that opportunism may prevail over real strategic planning.

The only bodies that take a long-term view in terms of strategic planning are bureaucratic departments such as those that are part of the finance or foreign affairs

ministries. The committee of economic advisers attached to the prime minister's office produces reports on its own initiative or at the office's request. Its impact on actual policymaking is limited, however.

France Stratégie, an interesting think tank attached to the prime minister, has recently developed into a body of strategic planning and policy evaluation, although its impact on governmental policy is uncertain for the time being. OECD reports are not part of national strategic planning, but they are rather influential as they compare countries' performances and capacities to adjust to future challenges.

Germany

Score 5

Since September 2017, the government has been led by Germany's two largest political parties: the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU) and the Social Democratic Party (SPD). The previous CDU/CSU-SPD government demonstrated little interest in improving the strategic planning of the Chancellery or federal government. However, the new government has rearranged the organizational structure of the Chancellery and introduced a new section ("Abteilung 6") for political planning, innovation and digital politics, thus expanding the number of sections from six to seven. The head of the new section is Eva Christiansen, who is also a media adviser to Chancellor Angela Merkel.

The new head of the Chancellery, Helge Braun, previously coordinator for the relations between the central government and the Länder, has the status of a minister without portfolio, strengthening his position vis-à-vis the minister-presidents of the federal states and heads of the federal ministries. The Chancellery is constantly expanding and it currently employs 600 people. In spite of the new planning section in the Chancellery, planning is not a well-integrated part of the politics and policies of the new government nor is it a high priority for the federal government.

One handicap for developing a strategic policy approach is that the government is strongly influenced by party considerations, with all major political decisions determined in negotiations between the heads of the governing parties. Consequently, most governmental decisions are negotiated between the three heads of the parties that make up the current government (the CDU, CSU and SPD) and not between members of the government. This practice results in "party politicization" of the government, which undermines strategic planning. In addition, Chancellor Merkel's leadership style can be described as time-oriented reactivity which is precluding goal- and future-oriented planning.

Italy

- Score 5** The concept of strategic planning is not particularly developed in Italian governmental and administrative culture. This is in part due to the fact that governments have been predominantly preoccupied with coalition problems and that the administration is still very much guided by a legalistic culture. Nevertheless, some progress has been made with recent governments. Recent government programs have been more detailed, and become significant instruments for organizing and planning government activity. Within the government office (called the Presidency of the Council of Ministers, or Presidenza del Consiglio), a special department guided by a minister without portfolio has been created to oversee the implementation of this program. This department produces regular reports on the program's implementation status.
- Given the political weakness of the new prime minister, Conte, relative to the two deputy prime ministers (and coalition party leaders), it is likely that the strategic planning of this cabinet will be downplayed.
- The financial aspect of strategic planning is in general more developed, as the treasury has to implement rigorous budgetary stability goals and works within a triennial perspective. However, the minister of finance has a weaker role under the new government compared to the previous Gentiloni government.

Poland

- Score 5** Motivated by EU demands, as well as by the objective of improving the country's absorption and use of EU funds, the planning capacities of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister (Kancelaria Prezesa Rady Ministrów, KPRM) were expanded following EU accession. The PiS government has relied on this framework, and has developed its own long-term Strategy for Responsible Development. This program was presented by the then-serving Minister of Development Mateusz Morawiecki in February 2016, and has since been refined. Ultimately, however, policymaking under the PiS government has been guided by the visions and inspirations of PiS party leader Jarosław Kaczyński.

Portugal

- Score 5** There have been virtually no changes with regard to strategic capacity. While there are strategic planning bodies in most ministries, their impact remains limited. The prime minister's advisory cabinet is more influential, but it has to deal with a number of day-to-day demands in addition to offering a long-term view on policy challenges and viable solutions. Immediate issues tend to gain precedence over long-term policy planning. The government's minority status, which makes it dependent on the

parliamentary support of three other parties in the parliament, has not contributed to an increase in strategic planning.

Switzerland

Score 5

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

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

Strategic planning is the task of the Federal Chancellery, the central coordinating body of the federal administration. With the new chancellor, Walter Turnheer, elected in 2016, strategic planning has been given more weight as part of the new public management model implemented in the federal administration. In November 2017, the Federal Council announced its strategic goals for 2018.

Turkey

Score 5

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

Ministries have established strategic-planning units, creating the need for inner- and interministerial coordination and cooperation on present and future tasks and problems. In general, the Prime Minister’s Office, the Ministries of Finance, Development and Interior, the Turkish Grand National Assembly, the Turkish Court of Audit, and the Board of Internal Audit are the primary institutions involved in the process of strategic planning. The High Planning Board of the Ministry of Development was reorganized and is now the Presidential Board of Economic Policies, which is in charge of coordinating development plans and annual programs, and determining investment and export incentives. Under the current system of government, the Head of Strategy and Budget is affiliated with the Presidential Office.

Strategic management within the Turkish public administration faces several challenges. Public institutions in general have insufficient strategic-management capacity. Strategic plans, performance programs, budgets and activity reports are prepared with little if any coordination. Although a total of 890 internal auditors are employed across 382 public institutions, the Turkish public administration as a whole has failed to develop an effective internal-audit system. There is no relationship between political strategy documents and lower-level policy materials, and little coordination between associated institutions. Difficulties in gaining access to relevant information within public administrative bodies and insufficient human resource capacities are additional major contributors to this failure. There are also no cumulative statistics on the frequency of meetings between strategic-planning staff members and government heads. In general, these meetings are held once a year and during budget negotiations. However, there is no harmony between strategic plans and governmental decisions.

During the review period, the 2016 – 2019 National e-Government Strategy and Action Plan was prepared. The plan envisages an integrated, technological, participatory, innovative and high-quality Effective e-Government Ecosystem, and takes into account national and international considerations. Following the June 2018 early elections, a new medium-term program and the 2019 Annual Presidential Program was also announced. Under the new governmental system, the coordination of strategic planning will be a major focus.

Citation:

European Commission Turkey Report 2018, <https://ec.europa.eu/.../sites/.../20180417-turkey-report.pdf>, (accessed 27 October 2018)

TC Kalkınma Bakanlığı, Kamuda Stratejik Yönetim Çalışma Grubu Raporu, Onuncu Kalkınma Planı (2014-2018), 2015.

<http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/zel%20htisas%20Komisyonu%20Raporlar/Attachments/264/Kamuda%20Stratejik%20Y%C3%B6netim%20C3%87al%C4%B1C5%9Fma%20Grubu%20Raporu.pdf> (accessed 7 November 2016)

Kamu İdarelerince Hazırlanacak Stratejik Planlara Dair Tebliğ, Resmi Gazete, 30 April 2015, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2015/04/20150430-10.htm> (accessed 1 November 2018)

TC Hazine ve Maliye Bakanlığı, Yeni Orta Vadeli Program, Dengeleme- Disiplin- Değişim, 2019-2021, <http://www.bumko.gov.tr/Eklenti/11246,yeni-ekonomi-programipdf.pdf?0> (accessed 27 October 2018)

2019 Yılı Cumhurbaşkanlığı Programı, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/10/20181027M1-1.pdf> (accessed 27 October 2018)

Sait Aşgın ve Kemal Yaman, “Türkiye’de Bakanlıkların Stratejik Plan Uygulamalarında Mevcut Yapı ve Sürecin Değerlendirilmesi,” *International Journal of Academic Value Studies*, 4(19), 2018: 449-466.

United States

Score 5

The U.S. government has multiple units that analyze policy issues, and that make long-term projections as part of the assessment of current options. The Executive Office of the president has multiple staffs and analytic agencies. On the legislative side, the Congressional Budget Office analyzes the 10-year fiscal impact of all bills with budget implications. Expertise about long-term considerations is available in abundance, in the agencies, Congress and the White House.

In most areas of government and policy, President Trump has shown virtually no interest in long-range planning, professional expertise or even organized, careful deliberation. Economists are notably absent among his high-level economic advisers and appointees. In national security policy, he has favored senior military officers, but often relied on his own untutored preferences and impulses. His White House has featured essentially no conventionally organized advisory and decision-making processes.

In Congress, the Republican leadership has sought to overcome popular resistance to its major policies on health care and taxes by avoiding public hearings or bipartisan discussion of any kind. Instead, bills are drafted in secret within Republican task forces and brought to a vote with the expectation of strict party voting. Republican leaders have tried to prevent the ten-year budget effects “scoring” of bills normally provided by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The vast majority of government departments and agencies have witnessed devastating losses of high-level staff, both because the Trump White House has failed to make political appointments to many positions and because long-serving civil service experts have left agencies due to pressure or discouragement.

Cyprus

Score 4

Reforms launched in 2014 began integrating strategic planning into the country’s administrative practices, a key omission over previous years. To this effect, the competences of the Planning Bureau, renamed “Directorate General for European Programs, Coordination and Development” (DGEPCD) were extended to include planning, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation. However, the intended tasks have been drastically reduced, with decisive powers remaining with the Ministry of Finance.

The law on fiscal responsibility was adopted in 2014 aiming to enable the government to identify goals and design policy actions based on strategic planning. Its implementation has stalled as attempts to enhance the capacity and planning of personnel have been constrained by the absence of political will. Planning is fragmented between ministries, capacity levels remain low and not all services are involved. A central coordination body and planning with broader participation are missing. As a result, planning is dominated by the budgetary and fiscal considerations of the Ministry of Finance. Additionally, efforts for coherent strategic planning are likely to be compromised by ad hoc policies, such as the citizenship-by-investment scheme.

Citation:

1. The Cyprus Investment Programme, or Citizenship by Investment, <http://www.moi.gov.cy/moi/moi.nsf/All/0A09FCB93BA3348BC22582C4001F50CF>

Greece

Score 4

Strategic planning has long proved difficult for the central government in Athens thanks in large part to the archipelago-like character of governance involving conflicting political interests, clientelism and a highly formalistic administrative culture that fosters segmentation. Weak horizontal coordination within and among ministries, government agencies and state-owned companies make matters worse.

Strategic planning was included, at least for the period from 2015 to 2018, in the Third Memorandum of Understanding signed between Greece and its creditors. Progress was noted in August 2018 upon completion of this memorandum. For example, the Independent Public Revenue Authority was established and the authorities made progress in adopting a General Transport Master Plan, covering all transport modes (i.e., road, railway, maritime, air and multi-modal), including logistical aspects. This requisite strategic planning, however, did not hold in policy areas not covered in a binding manner by the memorandum, such as public order, education, culture and sports. In these policy areas, instead of strategic planning, there remains much experimentation and improvisation on the part of the government.

In early 2018, the government released a post-bailout development strategy (entitled “Greece: A Growth Strategy for the Future”). The strategy was revised twice by the European Commission before its public presentation and is divided into five chapters: Fiscal Viability, Sustainable Development, Structural Conditions for Growth, Just Development Without Exclusion, and Funding of Development. The strategy has been criticized by the opposition as more of a wish list than an integrated plan for the country to regain its footing. According to the document, the monitoring and assessment of the strategy “will be conducted by a high-level political committee under the prime minister’s control” while at the technical level the monitoring of reforms will be undertaken by the General Secretariat for Coordination.

Citation:

A brief official description of the Third Economic Adjustment Program for Greece, up to August 2018, is available by the Council of the European Union, at <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/financial-assistance-eurozone-members/greece-programme/>

Greece: A Growth Strategy for the Future <http://www.mindev.gov.gr/greece-a-growth-strategy-for-the-future/>

Luxembourg

Score 4

The country’s small size and consequently small size of its administration, does not allow for sufficient strategic planning. Only a few public bodies offer simulations, such as the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies Luxembourg (STATEC) and the General Inspectorate of Social Security (Inspection Générale de

la Sécurité Sociale, IGSS). The State Economic and Social Council (Conseil économique et social) and the merged public research institute LISER offer more qualitative analyses. The research department of the central bank (Banque Centrale du Luxembourg) and the general inspectorate of the financial sector (Commission de surveillance du secteur financier, CSSF), focus on economics and finance planning. While these institutions are state-financed, they are nevertheless insufficiently equipped to offer long-term planning activities. For instance, State Economic and Social Council reports are partially written by civil servants from the relevant ministry departments. Strategic planning is mostly performed by institutions abroad, which offer the advantage of independence and guidance via international standards. Once a report is submitted, negotiations begin between the minister and promoters; the final compromise is a draft of the project, designed abroad.

Citation:

“Autres acteurs.” Le portail des statistiques du Luxembourg. www.statistiques.public.lu/fr/acteurs/autres/index.html. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Banque centrale du Luxembourg. <http://www.bcl.lu/fr/statistiques/index.html>. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Commission de Surveillance du Secteur Financier. www.cssf.lu/en/ Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Conseil économique et social. www.ces.public.lu/fr.html. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research. www.liser.lu. Accessed 23 Oct. 2018.

Slovakia

Score 4

The institutional capacity for strategic planning in Slovakia is weak. Capacities for planning in the ministries are limited, and there is no central policy planning unit in the Government Office. The fragmented nature and the rigid departmentalism of public administration in the country have complicated strategic planning. So has the high degree of staff turnover which, driven as it is by a politicized public administration, limits the continuity of institutional expertise. The strengthening of the expertise of the Government Office and the creation of the Council for Solidarity and Development (an advisory body established under the second Fico government) have failed to improve planning capacities in any substantial way. The council has been a facade for dialog, primarily used by Prime Minister Fico, who chaired it, for exposing his political plans. Since the government reshuffle in March 2018, the institutional capacity for strategic planning has remained unchanged.

Slovenia

Score 4

The institutional capacity for strategic planning in Slovenia is rather weak. Capacities for planning in the ministries are limited, and there is no central policy-planning unit in the Government Office. After assuming office, the Cerar government announced that it would expand planning capacities but achieved little progress. In December 2017, however, the government finally adopted the Slovenian

Development Strategy 2030, a strategic framework for policymaking in the country. Preparation of the strategy started in June 2016 and involved more than 200 experts and government officials. The strategy sets five strategic goals: an inclusive and safe society; an education system that supports lifelong learning; a productive and equitable economy that creates added value for everyone; the preservation of Slovenia's natural environment; and a cooperative, competent and efficient system of governance.

Citation:

Government of the Republic of Slovenia (2017): Slovenian Development Strategy 2030. Ljubljana (http://www.vlada.si/fileadmin/dokumenti/si/projekti/2017/srs2030/en/Slovenia_2030.pdf).

Hungary

Score 3

The Orbán governments have subordinated all political actions to the goal of consolidating their power and have reacted to problems and challenges on a day-to-day basis, without reference to an over-reaching plan. The economic and fiscal priorities have frequently shifted, and not much effort has been invested in building institutional capacities for strategic planning. After the 2014 local elections, Orbán promised to elaborate a long-term development strategy for the country but has failed to do so thus far. In late 2016, the government announced the adoption of the third Széll Kálmán Plan, a new plan for economic development in the tradition of two strategic documents adopted in 2011 and 2012. Instead of drawing up such a plan, however, the Orbán government became increasingly preoccupied with the campaign for the parliamentary elections in April 2018 and switched to a “campaign government” modus in fall 2017. Since the 2018 elections, the government has begun preparing a long-term technocratic modernization project to be managed by the newly created Ministry for Innovation and Technology (ITM).

Iceland

Score 3

Long-term strategic planning in Iceland is often vague, with comparatively weak execution, supervision, and revision of plans. When specific objectives are established in the policy planning phase, a lack of sufficient incentives or institutional mechanisms typically limits their realization. As a result, the government can delay or change strategic plans. For example, parliament approves a strategic regional policy every four years (Stefnumótandi byggðaaætlun), but – as this plan has the status of a parliamentary resolution and not legal status – the government has no binding obligation to implement the plan. Consequently, only certain aspects of these four-year plans have ever been implemented.

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

Citation:

Special Investigation Committee (SIC) (2010), Report of the Special Investigation Commission (SIC), report delivered to parliament 12 April.

Stefnumótandi byggðaaætlun 2018-2024. <https://www.byggdastofnun.is/is/verkefni/byggdaaaetlun/byggdaaaetlun-2017-2023>. Accessed 22 December 2018.

Romania

Score 3

While EU membership has forced the Romanian government to produce regular strategic documents, policymaking in Romania has long suffered from a lack of strategic planning. Subsequent governments have emphasized their commitment to strengthening planning. In addition to a strategic planning calendar, Government Emergency Ordinance 49/2017 proposed a novel link between public institutions' strategic plans and the country's annual budgetary process. Romania's 2018 National Reform Program has declared strategic planning a key priority for the government, highlighting recent improvements in the implementation of the Annual Working Plan of the Government as well as plans for the establishment of a new Strategy Unit through World Bank assistance. Most recently, in June 2018, the Senate adopted a draft bill for "Romania 2040," which outlines plans for the development of a long-term national strategy through a multi-stakeholder commission that would direct government policy for years to come, a move which has prompted criticism from the National Liberal Party (PNL). As it stands, however, these moves have so far done little to improve strategic planning in practice.

Citation:

Romanian Government (2018): National Reform Program 2018. Bucharest (<https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/2018-european-semester-country-report-romania-en.pdf>).

Indicator

Expert Advice

Question

Does the government regularly take into account advice from non-governmental experts during decision-making?

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

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

Switzerland

Score 9

In the Swiss political system, the drafting of bills takes place primarily within extra-parliamentary and parliamentary committees. As of November 2018, 118 of these extra-parliamentary committees existed, with government-selected members that included academics, representatives of interest groups and parties, individuals with particular expertise and other such experts. While there are multiple criteria for selecting members, the government seeks a balanced representation of language groups, political parties and ideologies and other societal interests. Academics are selected on the basis of academic profile, but their allegiance to political parties or other societal interests may also be taken into account.

Thus, while expert commissions and their members do have a dominant influence on governmental decision-making, the influence of academics per se is much more limited than is the influence of the politically constituted groups as a whole. In addition, the share of academics on these commissions is rather limited, amounting to about 11% of all seats. However, the combined total of academics and high-level federal and canton civil servants (who usually have academic training) accounts for about half of all commission seats.

In Switzerland, public policies are regularly assessed by evaluators who have had academic training. According to a 2016 study by Pleger et al., about 50% of these evaluators felt influenced or pressured by stakeholders; about the same level as in the United States, but considerably less than in Germany and the United Kingdom (about 80%).

This finding underscores the importance of evaluations for policymaking. A 2017 large-scale cooperative research project by Sager et al. concluded that policy evaluations not only play an important role for policymaking in the executive-administrative nexus but also contribute to decision-making in parliament and to a lesser degree in direct-democratic decision-making.

Citation:

Lyn Pleger, Fritz Sager, Michael Morris, Wolfgang Meyer, and Reinhard Stockmann 2016: Are Some Countries More Prone to Pressure Evaluators Than Others? Comparing Findings From the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Switzerland, *American Journal of Evaluation*, DOI: 10.1177/1098214016662907

Sager, Fritz (2017). "Evaluation and democracy: do they fit?" *Evaluation and Program Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.08.005>

Sager, Fritz, Thomas Widmer und Andreas Balthasar (Hg.) (2017). *Evaluation im politischen System der Schweiz – Entwicklung, Bedeutung und Wechselwirkungen*. Zürich: NZZ Verlag, Reihe „Politik und Gesellschaft in der Schweiz“.

Canada

Score 8

Canadian government departments and agencies effectively tap into expertise of academics and other experts outside the government in multiple ways. Many government departments and agencies have advisory committees, which can have considerable influence but rarely dominant policymaking. Government departments and agencies often commission experts to organize research projects on high-profile issues.

In addition, a number of government departments and agencies appoint academic experts to advisory positions or chairs within the organization for a one-to-two-year period. Examples of this type of position – and hence of the influence of experts on policy – include the Clifford Clark Visiting Economist Chair at the Department of Finance and the Simon Reisman Visiting Fellowship within the Treasury Board Secretariat. Similar posts exist at the Competition Bureau and the Bank of Canada, among others. In recent years, these positions have often been vacant for long periods. Finally, external academic experts are frequently asked to meet with senior government officials, either on a one-on-one basis or as speakers at departmental retreats.

In September 2017, Mona Nemer was named Canada's new Chief Science Officer. Nemer's task is to integrate scientific evidence into government decision-making and make that evidence publicly available.

Chile

Score 8

Technocratic institutions and practices play an important role in government decision-making. Experts from academia, NGOs, partisan think tanks and the private sector are very influential in the preparation of government (presidential) programs and the development of policy reform proposals by presidential or ministerial

technical commissions. These technical commissions, which are charged with proposing policy reforms in specific areas (education, pension, social and wage policies, minimum wage policy, fiscal rule, etc.) or for singular policy challenges (e.g., corruption), tend to have significant impact on government legislation. Commissions are largely comprised of experts, and to a minor extent of representatives of interested parties, and cover a wide political spectrum. This kind of technical input into the policymaking process belongs to the technocratic tradition in Chilean politics. As a political practice, this can be described as institutionalized, as both the former and the current coalition followed this tradition. The main policies of government programs tend to be elaborated and accompanied by expert commissions. Some reform initiatives in the education and environmental sectors, for example, have been accelerated or even blocked due to ideological differences within the commissions dealing with the issue. Experts (economists in particular) are a key factor in drafting the reform proposals submitted to the president or to ministers.

Denmark

Score 8

Denmark's political administration draws to some extent on in-house expertise. For most policy areas, however, policymakers rely on advising councils or expert committees. On a more permanent basis, the Danish Economic Council plays an important role as an independent institution, as politicians heed its recommendations. Since 2007, the number of chairmen of the Economic Council have increased from three to four and the responsibilities of the chairmen have been expanded. They now also head the Environmental Economic Council and the productivity council (meeting EU requirements), and act as the fiscal watchdog (related to the new budget law). The chairmen prepare reports that are then discussed by members representing unions, employers, the central bank and the government. The reports typically garner media attention. The chairs are non-partisan and usually serve for several years before returning to academia.

Citation:

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

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

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

Norway

Score 8

There is a significant degree of academic influence on policymaking in Norway. Economic and social research helps guide policy to a significant degree. Academics are regularly involved in government-appointed committees for the preparation of legislation. On a more informal level, various departments regularly consult academic experts from a range of academic disciplines. Academics are active in

public debate (e.g., by writing newspaper articles) and their views often prompt replies and comments from senior politicians. Increasingly, the parliament also arranges hearings, and invites experts to provide advice and recommendations.

Sweden

Score 8

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

There are some positive signs, however. The 2006 to 2014 government increased the number of boards or advisory groups where scholars (often, but not always, bona fide sympathizers of the ruling parties) could offer input and advice. There is a similar pattern among agencies that set up scientific councils to provide advice. There also appears to be a trend among agencies to organize hearings and public debates to bring in a variety of views on current issues. This can be seen not least in the context of administrative reform where commissions and agencies like the Swedish Public Management Agency frequently organize these kinds of meetings.

Overall, the government department staff solicits advice or other contacts with external actors less frequently than in the past. Communication is today managed in detail and there are disincentives to open up to external actors at sensitive stages of the policy process. The extent to which the government remains open to scholarly advice depends much on how politically salient the issue is. When policymakers seek scholarly advice, it is in most cases ad hoc and selective.

A recent study by Garsten, Rothstein, and Svallfors argues that “policy professionals” – networks of non-elected but highly influential policy experts – have significant influence on policymaking and policy design.

Citation:

Garsten, C., B. Rothstein and S. Svallfors (2015), *Makt utan mandat: de policyprofessionella i svensk politik* (Stockholm: Dialogos).

United Kingdom

Score 8

Non-governmental academic experts played an important role in conducting independent reviews of central government policy or strategy during the post-1997 Labour governments. They have worked on the economics of climate change (Sir Nicholas Stern), the future of the pension system (Lord Turner), a review of health trends (Sir Derek Wanless) and fuel poverty (Sir John Hills). Established academics

have also served in decision-making bodies such, as the Monetary Policy Committee of the Bank of England since 1997 when the Bank of England was made independent of government. These academics have thus been given substantial influence over core decisions. Most government departments solicit external studies on policy-relevant issues and are supported in doing so by a new Cabinet Office team called Launchpad. The reports are subject to normal procurement rules, typically with a restricted call for tenders.

When the previous coalition government (2010 – 2015) took power, the change altered the political orientation of the experts consulted by government. However, a further shift in practice was due to the commitment to what is known as open policymaking (OPM), under which policymakers are called on to actively seek broader inputs into the policymaking process. The traditionally strong influence of think tanks has continued, but those of the left-leaning variety (e.g., the Institute for Public Policy Research and Policy Network) have been replaced by more conservative-minded ones (e.g., the Resolution Foundation and the Centre for Policy Studies). The interactions are transparent, but occur at various stages of the policymaking process and are often initiated by the think tanks themselves. What appears to have changed is the underlying approach to OPM, which has increasingly sought not only to emphasize evidence-based policymaking, but also to identify more appropriate policy solutions. A “what works” team in the Cabinet Office facilitates this process and government departments publish details about their areas of research interest. The Government Office for Science is a unit dedicated to bringing scientific evidence to bear on decision-making. In November 2018, five new business councils, covering major export-sector clusters, were established to advise on how to create the best business conditions in the United Kingdom after Brexit.

There are also many informal channels through which government consults or is briefed by individual academics who have expertise in specific areas. These channels are often more influential than more formal consultation processes. One recent example was the review of the balance of competences between the EU and the national level, in which several government departments made very extensive attempts to engage with academics. Civil servants are routinely involved in academic events, and benefit from professional policy training and the Trial Advice Panel. The Trial Advice Panel, which consists of experts from within government and academics, supports civil servants to design experimental and quasi-experimental assessments for programs and interventions.

Citation:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/government-office-for-science/about>

Estonia

Score 7

The extent and impact of academic consultation is framed by the overall pattern of government decision-making. Limited strategic capacity in the center and a tendency to pass policy-formulation initiatives to the line ministries makes the overall picture fragmented. Final reports of the research projects are made publicly available on the websites of the governmental institutions that requested the study. However, 25% of these studies are not made public, and the remaining ones are difficult to find due to the varying web architecture maintained by the ministries and agencies. The majority of the studies (63%) were commissioned simply to obtain overviews of problems. The use of studies for policy decision-making purposes was clearly proven in the case of 46% of those reviewed.

Other forms of non-governmental expert consultations (e.g., roundtable discussions and workshops) are rather widespread. Preparation of the long-term “Estonia 2035” strategy started with a seminar in which executives, experts and opinion leaders from more than 130 public, private and third sector organizations discussed the objectives and framework of the strategy.

Citation:

National Audit Office (2015). Activities of the state in commissioning studies. <http://www.riigikontroll.ee/tabid/206/Audit/2345/Area/1/language/et-EE/Default.aspx> (accessed 02.10.2015)

Finland

Score 7

The government predominately organizes the collection of scholarly advice informally, for example, by consulting scientific experts on committee report drafts. Some formal bodies, such as temporary working groups, ad hoc committees and permanent councils, also exist. In general, various permanent and non-permanent committees play an important role in structuring scholarly advice in government decision-making. An example of a permanent group that advises the government and ministries in research and technology matters is the Research and Innovation Council. A government resolution on a comprehensive reform of state research institutes and research funding, which aims to make the use of sectoral research in governmental decision-making more efficient and focused, was adopted in 2013, and implemented between 2014 and 2017. The Prime Minister’s Office makes a yearly plan for realizing strategic research objectives and calls for the systemic use of research projects and data for decision-making, steering, and operating procedures. Projects under the government’s strategic research goals are managed by the Strategic Research Council at the Academy of Finland.

Israel

Score 7

The government has several means of interacting with experts and academics. In 2017, the PMO published “Instructions for Public Participation Guide” to support government offices and public officials cooperate with external experts, and improve collaboration between government offices and the public.

Overall, experts can sit on independent public committees to examine the causes and consequences of a specific event or incident, such as the Trajtenberg Committee that was formed following the 2011 social justice protests. They can also serve in permanent committees that consult with the government on a regular basis, such as the National Economic Council in the PMO or be summoned by parliamentary committees to present opinions or to offer a different perspective on a certain issue. In addition, think tanks and research institutes act as a brokers between the academic world and politics, advocating and offering information on current events and policy issues.

On security and other issues such as foreign policy, the government tends to consult experts from the military rather than academics. Ministers often appoint an external advisory committee to assist with specific issues. One significant example is the Shashinsky Committee, appointed by the minister of finance to examine government fiscal policy on oil and gas. Israeli ministers also often consult informally with academic experts, primarily to receive guidance that is not influenced by political interests. In 2018, a new national program for climate control was introduced to bring the government together with environmental NGOs and ecological experts was formed.

Citation:

Blockchain Technology Takes Hold in Israel: Expert Take, Cointelegraph, 2018 (Hebrew):
<https://cointelegraph.com/news/blockchain-technology-takes-hold-in-israel-expert-take>

“Conclusions of the committee for the examination of the fiscal policy with respect to oil and gas resources in Israel,” State of Israel official publication, 2011 (Hebrew):
http://www.financeisrael.mof.gov.il/FinanceIsrael/Docs/En/publications/02_Full_Report_Nonincluding_Appendixes.pdf

Hever, Shir, “The Privatization of Security,” 2012, Van Leer Institute

OECD (2015), “Scientific Advice for Policy Making: The Role and Responsibility of Expert Bodies and Individual Scientists,” OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers, No. 21, OECD Publishing, Paris.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5js3311jcpwb-en>

Government decision number 2025 on rural development, 2015 (Hebrew):
https://www.gov.il/he/Departments/policies/2014_des2025

Government Decision number 4079, “Israel’s preparations for adaptation to climate change: implementation of the recommendations to the government for a strategy and a national action plan,” 2018 (Hebrew):
https://www.gov.il/he/Departments/policies/dec4079_2018

PMO Office 2017, Instructions for Public Participation, 2017 (Hebrew):
<http://www.pmo.gov.il/policyplanning/shituf/Documents/all%20web.pdf>

Luxembourg

Score 7 Luxembourg's main research institutions were founded only recently. For instance, the national university was founded in 2003. Three additional national research centers (CRP-Gabriel Lippmann, CRP-Henri Tudor, CRP-Santé) were founded in 1999, which were later combined into two research centers: the Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology (LIST) and Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research (LISER).

For major policy reform projects, the government mostly consults highly reputable institutions abroad. This has the advantage that scholarly advice from institutions abroad allows for independent analysis. Considering the country's small size, links between government and national research facilities are strong.

However, there are also areas where researchers cannot make themselves heard, such as in the school system and state planning ("Raumplanung"). In those areas, advice from, for example, members of the University of Luxembourg is insufficiently heard. With regard to heritage protection, the government held a hearing with civil society organizations between 2013 and 2015. These hearings, however, did not produce any results. This ultimately led to frustration and was a topic in the 2018 election campaign.

Citation:

"Alles nützt. Alles? In ihrem zweiten Bericht zur Innovation in Luxemburg stellt die OECD vor allem fest, dass es noch immer keine Strategie dafür gibt." <https://www.list.lu/en/media-centre/press/alles-nuetzt-alles/>
Accessed 15 Dec. 2018.

New Zealand

Score 7 In terms of frequency and intensity of policy advice, the relevance of external academic experts for governmental policymaking depends on the subject area. Non-governmental academics with technical expertise can have a significant role in policy areas such as health, energy, social policy and tertiary education. In general, the importance of scholarly advice is increasing. The most recent initiatives in this regard include the establishment of a Māori Language Advisory Group and an expert panel tasked with overseeing the overhaul of Child, Youth and Family, a service agency subordinate to the Ministry of Social Development. One of the innovations of the Labour-NZ First coalition government was the creation of the Interim Climate Change Committee in April 2018. The ICCC is an independent ministerial advisory body created to explore how New Zealand transitions to a net zero emissions economy by 2050. It will be superseded and replaced by an independent Climate Change Commission under the Zero Carbon Act in May 2019. Another government initiative was the formation of a Tax Working Group, which reported back in support of the introduction of a capital gains tax in February 2019.

Citation:

<https://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/media/Legislation/Cabinet%20paper/interim-climate-change-committee-tor.pdf>

Spain

Score 7

There is no formalized and systematic connection between the government and external thinking. Policymakers do not rely on specialists for advice on matters of political strategy, although university scholars, think tank analysts and practitioners are often consulted by ministries on legal, economic, welfare and international issues – particularly at the beginning of any legislative process to prepare the draft bill and to assess its impact. The deep political and economic crisis may also have facilitated the government’s willingness to ask for external advice when engaged in institutional redesign (e.g., two panels of external experts were created in recent years to advise the Popular Party government in its pension- and education-system reforms). Some recent trends, such as the emergence of several think tanks, may over time strengthen the influence of external experts. In addition, the parliamentary committee tasked with studying Spain’s current territorial model and preparing a report for a constitutional reform organized numerous hearings with experts. The new Pedro Sanchez government appointed a number of scholars and technical experts to high-level positions in the public administration, and increased the overall number of government advisors.

Citation:

20 minutos, Sánchez nombra a 66 altos cargos y asesores más que Rajoy en 2011

<https://www.20minutos.es/noticia/3382734/0/gobierno-sanchez-mas-asesores-altos-cargos-rajoy/>

Australia

Score 6

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

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

Despite these formal mechanisms, academic influence on government decision-making is relatively limited, particularly in the economic and social policy domains.

Australian governments accept advice on technical issues, but much less so on political and economic issues. The notable exception is the Productivity Commission, which draws on expert advice when conducting inquiries and reviews.

Belgium

Score 6

Consultation with non-governmental academic experts depends on the subject matter; their actual influence on eventual decisions is quite limited most of the time, and certainly marginal when compared to the influence of experts who are attached full-time to ministerial cabinets (see below). The government and/or the parliament do consult full-time academic experts with independent views, but not in a systematic way (this is left to the initiative of parliamentary committees), and not necessarily to generate genuine scientific debate. However, in Belgium's neo-corporatist system, representatives of the social partners (employers' organizations and trade unions) are systematically summoned for participation when a strategic decision is to be made on socioeconomic issues. In other politically sensitive areas (e.g., tax reform) academic and international expertise has had very limited influence.

There are still some potential exceptions, such as the National Committee for Pensions, which is composed of three subcommittees. The first is composed of the traditional social partners. The second is made up of government experts from the various institutions involved in pension funding, an innovation that should enhance coordination in the typical Belgian web of institutions and shared responsibilities. The third subcommittee is composed only of academic experts. This subcommittee is the direct heir of the Commission for Pension Reforms set up by the previous government. However, a key reform aimed at ensuring long-term sustainability was blocked by the first subcommittee. Another exception is the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Center.

Citation:

Pension experts' negative assessment: <https://www.rtb.be/info/article/detail?id=9447107>

Minister's

reaction:

http://www.lecho.be/economie_politique/belgique_federal/Les_reformes_diminuent_le_risque_de_pauvrete_des_pensionnes.9827735-3154.art?ckc=1&ts=1478889661

<https://kce.fgov.be/en/about-us/what-is-the-kce>

Czechia

Score 6

In Czechia, there are several permanent or temporary advisory bodies and a number of public research institutions that are closely linked to certain ministries and the Government Office and partly depend on state funding. Within the cabinet, there is a unit consisting of consultants and advisers to the prime minister, whose task is to evaluate the substantive content of legislative materials and to prepare a strategic agenda for the government. Under Prime Minister Babiš, the number of official

external advisers has fallen sharply, but there are still respected scientists, former ministers and representatives of the business sphere among them. As with the previous Sobotka government, however, their actual role and impact are not very transparent.

Germany

Score 6

The federal government increasingly calls on experts' and consultancies' services. The budgets for expert advice have expanded dramatically in recent years. Over the last five years, the government has spent a minimum of €16 million on external advice. The Ministry for Defense spent the most on expert advice, followed by the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of the Interior. On the one hand, the level of activities indicates a strong role for expert advice, which may foster the quality of legislation. On the other hand, it raises issues of cost efficiency, transparency and an inappropriate influence from outside the legislature.

In some policy fields, expert commissions advise policymakers on a regular basis. Most of their members are appointed by the government or by respective ministries. In addition, ad hoc commissions are created to provide scientific advice regarding major reforms that involve complex issues. There are other established expert advisory bodies providing the government with expertise and advice, such as the German Council of Economic Experts (Sachverständigenrat zur Begutachtung der Gesamtwirtschaftlichen Entwicklung) and the German Advisory Council on the Environment (Sachverständigenrat für Umweltfragen), which produce regular reports on current policy problems (the former at least once a year, the latter every four years).

Most ministries maintain external academic or legal advisory bodies. However, the impact of experts is often less visible and policymaking is heavily influenced by party positions. Nevertheless, while advisory reports do not have an immediate impact, they do bear some influence on political debates within the government, the parliament and among the general public because they are made publicly accessible.

Summing up, there seems to be a current shift from academic experts toward consultants. Scholarly advice is available on high levels, but day-by-day policies are decided upon on low levels of external and internal expertise because party politicization of the policymaking process dominates executive decision-making. In addition, engaging expert commissions or other scientific advice often seems to be used not to politically decide but to procrastinate.

Citation:

www.spiegel.de/wirtschaft/soziales/bundesregierung-zahlte-2017-rund-146-millionen-euro-fuer-externe-berater-a-1217561.html

<https://www.sueddeutsche.de/news/politik/verteidigung-716-millionen-euro-in-fuenf-jahren-fuer-regierungsberater-dpa.urn-newsml-dpa-com-20090101-181211-99-170590>

Greece

Score 6 Non-governmental academic experts are consulted as advisers by the government. Most of the ad hoc committees formed by ministers on public policy reforms are staffed by academic experts. Qualified academics often serve as experts across all sectors of the economy and administration, where they also act as administrative elites, which simply do not exist in Greece's highly politicized civil service. Moreover, the size and quality of policy thinktanks vary significantly and they often offer little alternative to ad persona advisory inputs.

In the period under review, as in the past, the government regularly consulted experts or academics selected primarily because of their loyalty to Syriza or ANEL (the two government coalition partners). The fact that the selected experts were committed to their advisory tasks did not compensate for their frequent lack of familiarity with management or policymaking.

Iceland

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

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

Foreign experts are occasionally called upon. In 2017, four teams of foreign economists were asked to evaluate Iceland's monetary policies and prospects.

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

in Iceland. According to Gallup, a market research firm in Iceland, public confidence in the University of Iceland dropped from 90% in early 2008 to below 80% after the 2008 economic collapse and has since remained around 75% in the Gallup polls (74% in 2018).

Citation:

Gallup, <https://www.gallup.is/nidurstodur/thjodarpuls/traust-til-stofnana/>. Accessed 20 December 2018.

Japan

Score 6

The Japanese government is assisted by a large number of advisory councils. These are traditionally associated with particular ministries and agencies, with some cross-cutting councils chaired by the prime minister. Such councils are usually composed of private sector representatives, academics, journalists, former civil servants and trade unionists. The question is whether advisory boards truly impact policymaking or whether the executive simply uses them to legitimize preconceived policy plans. The answer may well vary from case to case. In 2018, the government set up an advisory panel tasked with reexamining Japan's defense guidelines, a move intended to expedite the process. In some instances, LDP-led governments have used outside expertise to overcome opposition to policy changes and reform. Think tanks, most of which operate on a for-profit basis, play only a limited role in terms of influencing national policymaking.

Citation:

Sebastian Maslow, Knowledge Regimes in Post-Developmental States: Assessing the Role of Think Tanks in Japan's Policymaking Process, *Pacific Affairs* 91 (2018), 1: 95-117.

Kyodo, Advisory panel in works to speed up review of Japan defense guidelines, *The Japan Times*, 26 August 2018, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2018/08/26/national/politics-diplomacy/advisory-panel-established-step-defense-guideline-review/>

Latvia

Score 6

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

Most ministries have developed good practices in the area of public consultation. For example, ministries often seek expert advice by inviting academics to join working groups. Some government planning documents, such as the National Action Plan for Open Government by the State Chancellery, have been drafted in cooperation with NGO experts, following public discussions.

However, the government lacks the finances to regularly commission academic input. Consequently, expert engagement is given voluntarily, without remuneration.

The number of NGOs participating in working groups and consultative bodies increased in 2014. However, the number of NGOs that submitted comments on draft laws or actively participated in public consultation processes declined.

The tax reform in 2017 saw a wide array of international and domestic experts propose and debate reforms across a broad spectrum of government committees, public discussions, TV and radio debates, and op-ed columns. A similar process was carried out with reforms to the health care system. This has increased the status of non-governmental academic experts and government transparency.

Citation:

State Chancellery (2014), Report, Available at (in Latvian): http://www.mk.gov.lv/sites/default/files/page/attachments/gada_parskats_2014.pdf, Last assessed: 07.01.2019.

Lithuania

Score 6

Lithuanian decision-makers are usually quite attentive to the recommendations of the European Commission and other international expert institutions. They are also receptive to involving non-governmental academic experts in the early stages of government policymaking. The governments led by Andrius Kubilius and Algirdas Butkevičius set up expert advisory groups (including the so-called Sunset Commission, which involved several independent experts). For instance, experts commissioned by the Ministry of Social Security and Labor drafted a new “social model,” which contained a comprehensive set of proposals for the regulation of labor relations and the development of a more sustainable state social-insurance system. This package was approved by the parliament in 2016. The Skvernelis government, however, has not renewed the mandate of the Sunset Commission. Instead, the government decided to develop a center for evidence-based policymaking involving the government agency MOSTA (the Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis Center).

However, major policy initiatives are usually driven by intra- or interparty agreements rather than by empirical evidence provided by non-governmental academic experts. In many cases, expert recommendations are not followed when the main political parties are unable to come to a political consensus. In addition, the rarity of ex ante impact assessments involving experts and stakeholder consultation contributes to the lack of timely evidence-based analysis. For example, debates on amendments to the Alcohol Control Law, which was adopted by the parliament in 2017, were affected by the lack of timely evidence-based analysis. Some initiatives publicly deliberated by the government in 2018 (e.g., the introduction of vouchers for buying food from small retailers) were not accompanied by impact assessments. These also raised questions as to whether they represented pre-election campaigning aimed at placating popular dissatisfaction with rising inflation rather than serious efforts by the government to deal with public concerns (see also Evidence-based Instruments).

Mexico

Score 6

In the Mexican political system, barriers between the government and scholars are comparatively low. It is quite common for a cabinet to include recruits from academia, and there are also substantial informal contacts between academics and high-level public officials. By the same token, former government officials often teach at universities. The Mexican government is keen to strengthen relationships with technical experts, including economists and international relations professionals, particularly those who hold higher qualifications from outside Mexico and have worked for international organizations or U.S. think tanks. Furthermore, the government receives policy advice from international organizations, such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. Moreover, applied research has played an increasing role throughout the last two decades in the scientifically grounded evaluation of social programs.

However, the procedures by which academic advice is sought are often not formalized, a fact that leads not only to a frequent lack of transparency on relations between academia and politics, but also to policy advice being often obtained on an ad hoc basis. Regarding the role of intellectuals in society, in general, they are held in high esteem.

Despite pressure from civil society on a number of issues, such as corruption, impunity and insecurity, consultations with civil society actors often fail to achieve concrete results. A lack of political will, rather than a lack of discussion or input from societal actors, has often stalled progress.

While the Peña Nieto administration initially adopted a clear reform-oriented strategy and included policy experts on various levels, this verve has completely faded away. Additionally, the president's commitment to transparency is limited.

Netherlands

Score 6

The government frequently employs commissions of scientific experts on technical topics like water management, harbor and airport expansion, gas drilling on Wadden Sea islands and pollution studies. The function of scientific advisory services in departments has been strengthened through the establishment of “knowledge chambers” and, following U.S. and UK practice, the appointment of chief scientific officers or chief scientists as advisory experts. These experts may – depending on the nature of policy issues – flexibly mobilize the required scientific bodies and scientists instead of relying on fixed advisory councils with fixed memberships.

Although the use of scientific expertise is quite high, its actual influence on policymaking cannot be estimated as scholarly advice is intended to be instrumental

and therefore is not yet welcome in the early phases of policymaking. It is certainly not transparent to the wider public. Since 2011, advice has regressed from relatively “strategic and long-term” to “technical, instrumental and mid-/short-term.”

In 2017 – 2018, a debate erupted about whether the government had overstressed instrumental policy advice. The debate started when a whistleblower working as an academic at the Scientific Research and Documentation Center (WODC), a supposedly independent knowledge center and research institute within the Ministry of Safety and Justice, formally complained about political interference in research into illegal-drug production and consumption; a politically hot topic in which the then-minister sought to suppress research conclusions that deviated from the position he had taken in parliament. A subsequent committee investigation judged that political interference had been substantial and “inappropriate.” The Rathenau Institute evaluated the organizational and behavioral procedures for safeguarding integrity and independence of inside-government knowledge institutes. The Royal Academy of Sciences felt it appropriate to advise universities, increasingly dependent on external financing, on issues of freedom and independence of their research.

Citation:

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

B. de Haan, Ministerie handelde ‘onbehoorlijk’ bij WODC-onderzoeken naar drugs, 31 October 2018 (nieuwsuur)

Diercks, G., P. Faasse, B. van der Meulen en P. Diederer (2018). *Met gepaste afstand – Onafhankelijkheid en integriteit bij onderzoek door rijkskennisinstellingen*. Den Haag: Rathenau Instituut

KNAW, *Vrijheid van wetenschapsbeoefening in Nederland*, 13 March 2018

South Korea

Score 6

Non-governmental academic experts have considerable influence on government decision-making. Within the State Affairs Planning Advisory Committee, 14 out of 30 members are professors. Indeed, three out of four members of both this group’s policy and administration subcommittee and the diplomacy and security subcommittee have an academic background. In addition to a presidential advisory committee, scholars are often nominated for top government positions. President Moon has appointed Chang Ha-sung, a professor of economics at Korea University, to be presidential senior advisor for policy affairs, and Cho Kuk, a professor at Seoul National University’s law school, as a senior presidential secretary for civil affairs. The Fair Trade Commission’s newly appointed chairperson Kim Sang-jo, was a professor of economics at Hansung University.

Academic experts participate in diverse statutory advisory bodies established under the offices of the president and prime minister. Advisory commissions are usually dedicated to specific issues deriving from the president’s policy preferences. For example, the appointments of Chang Ha-sung and Cho Kuk can be interpreted as

reflecting the current administration's determination to reform the country's chaebol (conglomerates) and prosecution system by appointing academic experts in these areas. However, the selection of academic experts is often seen as too narrow and exclusive. The process of appointing experts remains highly politicized, and in the past experts have often been chosen because of their political inclination rather than their academic expertise. The Moon government has ignored criticisms of policy failures offered by experts with different political perspectives than his own, which makes the process of policy consultation less effective.

Citation:

Korea.net. President Moon appoints senior secretaries. May 11, 2017
<http://www.korea.net/NewsFocus/policies/view?articleId=145963>

Bulgaria

Score 5

In Bulgaria, there are various ways to consult stakeholders and experts, including a special online portal at the Council of Ministers and more than 70 advisory councils. The government has also started to seek out expertise by forming public councils linked to specific ministries. Representatives of academia and research institutes are traditionally included in the process on an ad hoc basis.

Citation:

Council of Ministers, public consultations portal: www.strategy.bg

Council of Ministers, advisory councils portal: saveti.government.bg

Ireland

Score 5

In 2009, Professor Patrick Honohan of Trinity College Dublin was appointed governor of the Central Bank of Ireland. This marked a break with the tradition that the retiring permanent secretary of the Department of Finance would succeed to the governorship. Following his retirement toward the end of 2015, the government announced the appointment of another academic, Professor Philip Lane of Trinity College Dublin, as his replacement.

The Fiscal Advisory Council is an independent statutory body, comprising five experts, mainly drawn from academia. It was established in 2011 as part of a wider reform of Ireland's budgetary procedures. The council is required to "independently assess, and comment publicly on, whether the government is meeting its own stated budgetary targets and objectives." The claim made by the council's chairman, Professor John McHale of University College Galway, that the 2016 budget violated the rules of the European Union's Stability and Growth Pact received much publicity. This assertion, however, was quickly withdrawn following a rebuttal by the minister for finance. Nonetheless, the council stuck to its criticism of the 2016 budget as excessively expansionary. Following his retirement, Professor McHale,

was replaced as chairman of the Fiscal Advisory Council by Professor Seamus Coffey of University College Cork. Given Fiscal Advisory Council's (IFAC) highly critical report of the government's budgetary strategy in November 2018, it will be interesting to see the extent to which the government takes into account the criticisms of (1) excessive increases in public-sector expenditure and (2) the need to build up buffer funds out of buoyant tax revenues to meet unforeseen future contingencies.

Academics have regularly held advisory posts in government ministries, including the Prime Minister's Office and the Department of Finance. Advisers meet regularly with their ministers but there is no information on the impact on policymaking of the advice proffered. There is no established pattern of open consultations with panels of non-governmental experts and academics, although some ad hoc arrangements have been made from time to time.

Citation:

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

These include:

<http://www.irisheconomy.ie>

<http://www.publicpolicy.ie>

<http://www.politicalreform.ie>

<http://www.nerinstitute.net>

Malta

Score 5

Consultation processes involving academic experts has always been rather intermittent, but since 2013, such experts have been involved in a greater number of areas including family issues, gay rights, care of the elderly, health issues such as diabetes, IT in schools, and others. With the exception of standing parliamentary committees, which regularly consult with academic experts, the government tends to consult with outside experts in an issue-based and ad hoc manner. Academic input is at the line ministry level. Policy issues have at times been the focus of studies directly commissioned from faculties, institutes and other bodies. Information required by the government may also be contracted out on an individual basis. Driven particularly by the needs of the country's EU presidency, this process has become more inclusive since 2017, with many academics providing support for government policymaking. In 2017, two academics were consulted during the drafting of a white paper on a new inspections process. When drawing up new key policy indicators (KPIs) on public administration academics from across Europe were commissioned to prepare the report. New proposals on maintaining or creating affordable rental housing have also been based on academic research. A number of experts have also been appointed as non-resident ambassadors.

The government has increasingly used policy documents when inviting consultation with NGOs and experts. In other cases, calls for expression of interest have been the method. Until recently, Malta did not have a formalized process of consultation. This

rendered the process rather patchy, with one ministry consulting regularly and others rarely. Today, web-based consultation processes have become more refined, and calls for consultation more frequent. Nonetheless, gaps in the consultation process remain. In some policy areas, consultation remains sketchy or minimal, while in others, policy areas stakeholders are brought in only at a late stage. Occasionally, experts selected for the consultation process are accused of having conflicts of interest.

Citation:

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20160908/local/gozo-ministry-ordered-to-publish-consultancy-deals.624367>

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20160818/local/chamber-of-pharmacists-not-consulted-on-move-to-electronic.622392>

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20161007/local/delimara-power-station-ippc-application-to-get-public-consultation.627239>

<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20160816/local/era-chairman-denies-conflict-of-interest-in-townsquare-application.622170>

PA Chief insists Paceville consultants had no conflict of interest Malta Today 02/11/16

Paceville Master plan: Mott MacDonald should refund payment after alleged conflict of interest Independent 23/11/16

<https://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20181002/local/white-paper-on-valletta-monti-stalls-to-be-published-shortly.690602>

https://www.maltatoday.com.mt/news/national/90252/watch_local_government_white_paper_proposes_more_responsibilities_for_regional_committees#.W9MPkXszaM9

https://www.maltatoday.com.mt/news/national/90157/rent_reform_will_not_fix_prices_targets_stability_through_longer_leases#.W9MQJ3szaM8

Portugal

Score 5

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

Slovakia

Score 5

Slovak governments rely on various permanent or temporary advisory committees. Prime ministers have their own advisory body. Prime Minister Fico's advisers largely came from his circle of associates and include only a few truly independent experts, and this pattern has not changed after the reshuffling of government. There are several public research institutions with close linkages to ministries that are largely dependent on state funding and provide their analysis to the government. However, the impact of any of these bodies on decision-making is not really transparent. Within the ministries, expert advice is provided by so-called "analytical centers," which are separated units composed of experts with different backgrounds, but a common sense of mission.

Citation:

Sedlačko, M., K. Staroňová (2018). Internal ministerial advisory bodies: An attempt to transform governing in the Slovak Republic, in: Central European Journal of Public Policy 12(1), 1-16.

Austria

Score 4

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

Economic and financial policy is the only area in which general scholarly advice is commonly sought and available. Two institutions established respectively by the social partners (the Austrian Institute of Economic Research (Österreichisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung)) and through a mix of public and independent funding (the Institute for Advanced Studies (Institut für Höhere Studien) regularly articulate specific opinions such as economic forecasts. Governments typically take these two institutions' work into account when making policy. Both institutes have an excellent reputation for academic quality and independence, but are nevertheless structurally (financially) dependent on government actors. Except with respect to immigration and pension policy, there is no regular academic advisory board, as exists in Germany or the United States.

One consequence of the new ÖVP-FPÖ coalition is that the FPÖ does not possess strong traditional links to the neo-corporatist institutions of "social partnership." This situation automatically creates an interest within the FPÖ to reduce the importance of social partners (like the chambers of labor, business and agriculture) as well as the ÖGB, the trade union federation. As the social partners have a certain control over the Austrian Institute of Economic Research, the structural interest of the FPÖ is to take the advice of the social partners and the institute (the social partnership's brain trust) less seriously. This must be seen as the beginning of a decline in the significance of traditional external expertise.

Another indicator is the relative decline in public consultations and expert opinions regarding new laws and regulations under the new coalition government. Reports indicate that expert opinions from different ministries have also been actively suppressed by the government to avoid public dissent.

Croatia

Score 4

The 2009 Societal Consultation Codex, which serves as a set of guidelines for the policymaking process, mentions the consultation of academic experts. In practice, however, the involvement of academic experts in the policymaking process remains rare. Moreover, it is largely limited to the early phases of policy formulation and does not extend to the final drafting of legislation, let alone the monitoring of implementation.

France

Score 4 In contrast to some other European countries, the French government does not rely heavily on academic advice, even though the President's Office and the Prime Minister's Office frequently consult economists, and outstanding non-governmental academics may be chosen to sit on national reflection councils covering various policy fields (e.g., integration and education). But the influence of academics is not comparable to what can be found in many other political settings. High-level civil servants tend to consider themselves self-sufficient. Once the government has chosen a policy strategy, it tends to stick to it without significant discussion over the appropriateness or effectiveness of choices made. There is nothing comparable in France to the economic institutes in Germany, for example, the opinions of which serve to guide the government and offer a platform for public debates. A telling example of this indifference to experts is the decision (in reaction to the modest ranking of French universities in international rankings) to merge the universities of a city or region and expect that larger universities would produce better results. This was decision was taken in spite of the opposition of the academic community and counter to the evidence provided by, for instance, the American or British university system. The results have been, as predictable, have been rather disappointing and several bureaucratic monsters have been born.

Poland

Score 4 Under the PiS government, policymaking has become ideologically driven rather than evidence-based. While the government does consult with experts, these consultations are not very transparent. The government's ideological approach has led many experts who once showed some sympathy for PiS to break with the party.

Romania

Score 4 Cooperation between the Romanian government and non-governmental experts has traditionally been only weakly institutionalized. Consultations do take place, but they are irregular and lack transparency as well as mechanisms that would ensure feedback received is actually accounted for in policy itself. The dismantling in January 2018 of the Ministry for Public Consultation and Civic Dialogue, which was established in 2015 with the purpose of systematically ensuring public consultation, marked a step backwards in the formalization of public and expert consultation processes within the country.

Slovenia

Score 4 In Slovenia, the Government Office and the ministries have various advisory bodies that include academic experts. Prime Minister Cerar, an academic himself, strongly relied on academic and practitioners' advice when establishing his party platform, coalition and government program. While the Cerar government regularly sought external advice, it often failed to implement it.

Turkey

Score 4 In former years, the frequency of participation by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and experts in political decision-making processes were increased. In addition to working with pro-government think tanks, the government consults with academic experts in the context of projects sponsored by the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union.

However, the spectrum of communication with outside experts is narrowing, as the government has begun to recruit its own experts to provide alternative but not critical opinions on relevant issues of public policy. Policymaking is increasingly biased. As Turkish politics has become increasingly polarized, the government and the ruling party have seemed to shut themselves off from broader societal influences, basing decision-making increasingly on information provided by loyal personal or clientelist networks. Several academics who had previously worked with the government were recently dismissed from their university positions due to their associations to Gülenist organizations.

Public institutions' annual activity reports provide no indication of how often expert opinions have been requested. Selected groups of scholars participate in the preparation of special expert reports related to the national development plans. The Turkish Academy of Sciences has been critical of the lack of scholarly cooperation with public institutions.

The new presidential system, which was fully implemented after the June 2018 elections, includes nine policy councils to provide advice and consultation. The councils consist of experts, NGO representatives and professionals, who provide advice to the president. Their effectiveness remains to be seen.

Citation:

Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2014 Faaliyet Raporu, <http://www.tuba.gov.tr/upload/tables/2014-tuba-faaliyet-raporu.pdf> (accessed 27 October 2015)

Mevzuat Hazırlama Usul ve Esasları Hakkında Yönetmelik, 19.12.2005, <http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/3.5.20059986.pdf> (accessed 27 October 2015)

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi 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.

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

United States

Score 4

U.S. policymaking incorporates scholarly and expert advice in an informal and highly decentralized manner. Along with university-based experts and analytic agency staffs, there are a few hundred think tanks – non-governmental organizations that specialize in policy research and commentary.

Republicans and conservatives have been less supportive of the institutions in government and academia that undertake research and policy analysis than Democrats and liberals, partly because such research is sometimes perceived to have a left-leaning bias. On some issues, especially climate change, Republican officials have simply rejected well-established scientific findings. Through 2018 the Trump administration has canceled or withdrawn various environmental regulations (on pesticides, endangered species, and other matters) without addressing the scientific evidence.

As with the role of strategic planning and other expert units within government, the Trump administration and Republican-controlled Congress have drastically subordinated or ignored sources of independent academic or research-based advice.

Cyprus

Score 3

The appointment of scholars to governing bodies of quasi-governmental institutions and newly created consultative bodies increased since 2014. New consultative bodies were created to advise the government on economic issues, energy policy and geostrategic studies. The administration has also sponsored research at institutes and universities, though this has been ad hoc and sporadic.

There is a long tradition of establishing advisory bodies, but their tasks and scope of work were limited to informing the public, raising awareness, drafting reports, or offering proposals to the government. The non-binding character of their proposals meant that decision-makers would pay little attention to them. One example is the operation of the Fiscal Council, whose advice the government disregards almost completely. Similarly, the Economic Council and Scientific Council became inoperative so much so that their members learned from the media that new members had replaced them.

Generally, there is no established culture of consultation between the state and external academic experts or, more broadly, thinktanks.

Citation:

1. Cabinet establishes new economic council after letting predecessor die, Cyprus Mail, 13 June 2018, <https://cyprus-mail.com/2018/06/13/cabinet-establishes-new-economic-council-after-letting-predecessor-die/>

Italy

- Score 3** The government does not regularly consult non-governmental academics. A small group of partisan experts selected by the prime minister frequently offer strategic and technical advice. However, independent experts are rarely consulted in a transparent way. Important legislative proposals do not benefit from an institutionalized, open and transparent consultation process. In the finance, culture and labor ministries the role of external experts is more established. Independent academic experts have been involved in the spending review, but only on a short-term basis. The current coalition government (between the Five Star Movement and Northern League) has developed a strong anti-expert rhetoric, which is bound to reduce the space for independent consultation.

Hungary

- Score 2** The Orbán governments have shown no interest in seeking independent and knowledge-based advice and have alienated many leading experts who initially sympathized with them politically. The culture war waged by Fidesz and the growing restrictions placed on academic freedom have further intensified this alienation. Fidesz has also invested considerably in creating a network of partisan experts in fake independent institutions that can influence public opinion and has used such institutions to give a voice to government views in the international debates. There is a relatively new, pseudo-professional Institute, Center for Fundamental Rights (Alapjogokért Központ), which tries to deliver legal arguments against the criticisms voiced by EU institutions and/or Hungarian professional NGOs acting as watchdog organizations. For the politics of historical memory, Veritas Institute plays the same role. Altogether, spinning seems to have replaced advice based on facts.

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