



Interministerial Coordination Report

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

Sustainable Governance Indicators 2020

©vege - stock.adobe.com

Indicator

GO Expertise

Question

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

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

- 10-9 = The GO / PMO provides regular, independent evaluations of draft bills for the cabinet / prime minister. These assessments are guided exclusively by the government's priorities.
- 8-6 = The GO / PMO evaluates most draft bills according to the government's priorities.
- 5-3 = The GO / PMO can rely on some sectoral policy expertise but does not evaluate draft bills.
- 2-1 = The GO / PMO does not have any sectoral policy expertise. Its role is limited to collecting, registering and circulating documents submitted for cabinet meetings.

Australia

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

:

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

Canada

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

Chile

Score 9 The president's advisory ministry (Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Segpres) and the Government or Cabinet Office (Ministerio Secretaría General de Gobierno, Segegob) have the necessary instruments and capacities at their disposal to monitor and evaluate the policy content of line-ministry proposals. Nevertheless,

channels of evaluation and advice are not fully institutionalized, and may change with each new head of state.

Finland

Score 9

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

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

Latvia

Score 9

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

Citation:

1. National Development Plan 2020, Available at (in Latvian): <https://www.pkc.gov.lv/lv/valsts-attistibas-planosana/nacionalais-attistibas-plans>, Last assessed: 25.10.2019

2. Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, Available at: http://www.pkc.gov.lv/sites/default/files/images-legacy/LV2030/LIAS_2030_en.pdf, Last assessed: 25.10.2019

United Kingdom

Score 9

The primary coordinating role is undertaken by the Cabinet Office, which has expertise in all areas of government since Cabinet Office officials commonly worked in other departments before. According to its website, the Cabinet Office has over 2,000 staff, is responsible for the National Security Council and is central to "making government work better." The Cabinet Office's Economic and Domestic Secretariat

is responsible for coordinating policy advice to the prime minister and the cabinet, and the attached Parliamentary Business and Legislation (PBL) Secretariat provides advice on legislation and supervises progress made by bill drafting teams. The head of the Economic and Domestic Secretariat is also responsible for the Implementation Unit and the operation of the Implementation Task Forces, which oversee the implementation of government policies, and coordinates between ministers and public officials. Implementation Unit staff are policy experts from the civil service with good ministerial networks and excellent substantive expertise. The role of the Treasury in putting pressure on departmental spending also contributes to interministerial coordination.

Mexico

Score 8

The presidential office offers positions of high prestige in Mexico. It is involved with the legislative process to a decisive degree. Due to the absence of a high-level career civil service, both the cabinet and the presidential office are staffed with presidential appointments, which generally have the capacity to assess proposals from line ministries. Nevertheless, the independence of figures within the executive is thus questionable since everyone of influence in the presidential office is a political appointee.

Holding a majority in Congress and benefiting from a high degree of public legitimacy the initiatives of the president and MORENA are highly likely to be implemented.

New Zealand

Score 8

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

To support the prime minister and her government's priorities, DPMC added the Child Well-being and Poverty Reduction Group as a business unit in February 2018. DPMC's wider Policy Advisory Group continues to play a crucial role in aligning the public service's effort in supporting the government's priorities and providing free and frank advice to the prime minister on all items of government business.

Citation:

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Annual Report 2019 (<https://dpmc.govt.nz/publications/annual-report-2019>)

Norway

Score 8

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

South Korea

Score 8

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

Citation:

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

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

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

Spain

Score 8

Spain's Government Office (Ministry of the Presidency) and Prime Minister's Office (Gabinete) are tasked with evaluating line-ministry proposals from the political and technical points of view. The two departments together form the very powerful political core of the executive. In general, these different units have ample staff with

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

Citation:

Structure of the Ministry of the Presidency

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

Sweden

Score 8

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

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

The practice of governing and coordination is much more complex. Each department has a fair amount of autonomy in their respective sector. Coordination among departments takes places at different organizational levels depending on whether the issue is a technical and administrative issue, or whether it is a more political matter. With the latter, political actors make the final decisions. When bills involving more than one department are drafted, coordination is achieved through meetings where drafts of the bill are discussed. There are instances where drafts have gone through a very large number of revisions as part of the coordination process. In pro-growth policies in the mid-2000s, for instance, the bill that eventually was submitted to the parliament (Riksdag) was the 56th version of the bill.

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

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

Citation:

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

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

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

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

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

Belgium

Score 7

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

Denmark

Score 7

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

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

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

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

Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen has created the Political Secretariat, which is headed by a former adviser to the Social Democratic Party. This has been criticized by the opposition, who argue that there is no tradition in Denmark for political appointees filling important posts in ministries, but has been defended by the prime minister, who argues that it ensures the government's policy line is respected. The official description of the Political Secretariat on the PMO's website states that it has "a special focus on the government's priority projects and policy development, and is working to strengthen the strategic direction of the government and increase internal coordination between ministers and special advisers."

Citation:

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

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

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

The Prime Minister's Office Organisation, http://www.stm.dk/_a_2749.html (Accessed 17 October 2019).

France

Score 7

There are three main loci of policy coordination once a policy proposal has been forwarded to the prime minister. The first is the Prime Minister's Office (PMO), the second is the President's Office, and the third, in cases of legislation or regulation, the Council of State. This hierarchical organization gives the prime minister the option of modifying ministers' draft bills. For important issues, this steering function is shared with the President's Office, and entails strong cooperation and collaboration between the two secretaries-general at the Élysée and Matignon. Both the president and the prime minister appoint civil servants from all ministries as sectoral policy advisers. All ministerial domains are covered in this regard. Several hundred people are involved in government steering, monitoring, oversight and advising functions.

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

Greece

Score 7

The center of government has traditionally struggled to coordinate and evaluate government legislation. As with previous governments, in the period under review, under the Syriza-ANEL government, draft legislation has rarely been subjected to substantive and systematic evaluation. In fact, ministers have often been able to add last-minute amendments to draft legislation in order to favor selected interest groups, organizations or municipalities in their own electoral district or former colleagues of the minister.

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

After the government turnover of July 2019, there was a visible change in the role played by the center of government. The New Democracy party, which won the national elections of July 2019, rose to power with a concrete plan of reorganizing decision-making and passing legislation in a less haphazard manner than was the case with preceding governments. Government priorities were clearly laid out in the summer of 2019, and interministerial coordination processes were streamlined. According to descriptions of the new governance model, the PMO will continue to play a vital and overarching role in monitoring targets and effectiveness within all ministries. Nevertheless, it is still too early to judge the significance of these reforms. In the autumn of 2019, government ministers occasionally submitted last-minute amendments to laws as they moved through parliament. This has a common

occurrence under past governments, and it remains to be seen whether the new incumbent government will be able to overcome the practice.

Hungary

Score 7

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

Ireland

Score 7

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

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

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

Citation:

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

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

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

Japan

Score 7

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

Citation:

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

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

Lithuania

Score 7

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

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

Citation:

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

United States

Score 7

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

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

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

Austria

Score 6

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

The Federal Chancellery does have a department called the Legal and Constitutional Service (Verfassungsdienst), which is responsible for checking the constitutionality of policy proposals coming from the various ministries. Another instrument of oversight is the evaluation of policy effects (Wirkungsorientierte Folgenabschätzung, WFA) that as of 2013 must be integrated into every policy proposal. Under this policy, every draft law has to include an evaluation of its effects in financial, social and other terms, thus enabling other members of government to evaluate its consequences. The cabinet is de facto a collective leadership, complicated by the conflicting interests of coalition partners.

The ÖVP-FPÖ coalition government (2017 – 2019) was not able to change the structural conditions of the system. Any strengthening of the position of the chancellor will not be in the interest of the vice-chancellor. Any new coalition (like the previous coalition) will be based on a balance between two equally strong partners.

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

Germany

Score 6

The Chancellery, and particularly its head, sets the agenda for cabinet meetings. However, real political power lies elsewhere. The cabinet's agenda is negotiated in advance between the top politicians of coalition partners, and the cabinet mostly gives official approval to matters already decided by the heads of the political parties. Thus, the Chancellery will only in exceptional cases refuse items envisaged for the cabinet meetings on the basis of its own policy considerations. Generally, the heads of political parties, rather than the Chancellery, act as gatekeepers. In the current government, the degree of interministerial coordination is comparatively low.

Iceland

Score 6

The Prime Minister's Office has the fewest staff members of any of the country's ministries and a limited capacity for independently assessing draft bills. The left-wing cabinet 2009 – 2013 merged a number of ministries, reducing the total number of ministries from 12 to eight. A primary justification was that some ministries lacked broad-based expertise and the merger would make this expertise more widely accessible, which has in some cases been achieved. The Gunnlaugsson center-right

cabinet 2013 – 2016 partially reversed this reform in 2013 by appointing separate ministers to head the Ministry of Welfare’s subdivisions of Social Affairs and Housing and Health Affairs. Furthermore, a separate minister of environment and resources was appointed at the end of 2014. These changes increased the number of ministers from eight to 10. After the 2016 elections a cabinet comprising three parties was established – the Benediktsson cabinet coalition. This led to an increase in ministerial posts from 10 to 11 – a symbol of politicians’ disdain for the proposed constitutional change, which was approved by 67% of voters in 2012 and would cap the number of ministers at 10. The Ministry of Interior was split in two, separating justice from communications and local government affairs. This has remained the same under the Jakobsdóttir cabinet, which has held office since late 2017.

Israel

Score 6

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

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

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

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

Citation:

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

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

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

“The committee to investigate the prime minister’s headquarter,” Official report (April 2012) (Hebrew).

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

Luxembourg

Score 6

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

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

Citation:

“Conseil de gouvernement.” Le portal de l’actualité gouvernementale. https://gouvernement.lu/fr/actualites/conseils_de_gouvernement.html. Accessed 20 Oct. 2019.

“Gouvernement.” Le portal de l’actualité gouvernementale. <https://gouvernement.lu/fr/gouvernement.html>. Accessed 20 Oct. 2019.

Netherlands

Score 6

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

The prime minister’s own Ministry of General Affairs office has some 14 advising councilors (raadadviseurs, with junior assistants) at its disposal. The advising councilors are top-level civil servants, not political appointees. In addition, the prime minister has a special relationship with the Scientific Council of Government Policy. Sometimes, deputy directors of the planning agencies play the role of secretaries for interdepartmental “front gates.” To conclude, the Prime Minister’s Office and the prime minister himself have a rather limited capacity to evaluate the policy content

of line-ministry proposals unless they openly clash with the government platform (regeer-akkoord). Of course, personal skills and experience make a difference, and Prime Minister Rutte has a reputation for excellent informal leadership and conflict management. But structural capacity remains weakly developed.

Citation:

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

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

Additional reference:

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

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

M. van Weezel and T. Broer, *Max en Rhijs over de premier: het geheim van politiek trapezewerker en 'nat zeepje' Mark Rutte* (Vrij Nederland, vn.nl, accessed 8 November 2019)

Nieuw.nl, 1 October 2019. *Rutte moet regie nemen in stikstofkwestie* (nieuws.nl, accessed 8 November 2019)

BNR Nieuwradio, 6 June 2019. *Oppositie over klimaatakkoord: iets teveel regie van Rutte* (bar.nl, accessed 8 November 2019)

Poland

Score 6

While the Chancellery is well-staffed and evaluates most draft bills, its policy expertise has declined under the PiS government, as the main criterion for staff employment is political obedience, not expertise or professionalism.

Portugal

Score 6

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

It remains to be seen how the new government formed following the 2019 legislative elections will operate. While it is nominally identical – a minority Socialist executive headed by António Costa – it does not have the formal parliamentary support of

other parties. Moreover, the new government structure hints at a possible reduction in the internal influence of the minister of finance, which may also have an impact in this regard. However, it is too early to tell, as the new government took office on 26 October 2019, right at the end of the review period for this report.

Czechia

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

Estonia

Score 5 The GO and prime minister's support structures primarily provide consulting services, monitor governmental processes and provide technical (judicial) expertise. There is no capacity to undertake substantial evaluations of line-ministry proposals, as the Strategy Unit within the GO employs only 13 people. From 2020, the core responsibility for the country's strategic planning framework will be transferred from the Ministry of Finance to the GO. The change grants the prime minister more power to manage strategic planning.

The current government of Jüri Ratas, which entered office in April 2019, has defined five wide-ranging priorities for 2019 – 2023. However, the GO has been unable to provide sufficient expertise, or organizational, financial or staff support.

Italy

Score 5 The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) as a rule evaluates all draft bills before they are submitted to the Council of Ministers for approval. This scrutiny however mainly deals with legal aspects (which largely concern compatibility with European laws) as the PMO itself does not have the size and the systematic sectoral expertise that would allow it to scrutinize policy in detail. This means that intervention by the PMO is in general more reactive than proactive. As a result, corrections to the legislative proposals of the government are often necessary prior to parliamentary approval. Important draft bills are in general scrutinized by the office with regard to the effects a bill may have on the cohesion of the majority coalition. A detailed scrutiny of the financial implications of each bill is conducted by the Treasury, which has a kind of preventive veto power.

Prime Minister Conte's political weakness has meant that the Government Office has had even less control over the legislative process than previous cabinets.

Malta

Score 5

Government ministries in Malta traditionally enjoy almost complete autonomy in several areas of policy. The government office was primarily tasked with overseeing budgetary matters. Consequently, the fall-out for governments from policy failures has been significant. The present government initially faced the same problems, but in recent years has worked to bring policy under greater central control. Today the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) enjoys greater control mainly through the cabinet, and through the central control of permanent secretaries in ministries. As early as March 2013, the government appointed a minister as part of the PMO to oversee implementation of the government's manifesto and more recently introduced a specific strategy to implement the government's program. This strategy operates on a three-year planning cycle in conjunction with the budgetary cycle implementation program. Ministries have full responsibility for the policy, and draw up action plans that are monitored on a monthly basis by the PMO; areas of concern are flagged and brought to the attention of the public service and cabinet. More resources are being put into building the capacity of the public service through a centrally controlled Institute for Public Service (IPS), which coordinates training at all levels. The PMO has recently demonstrated an improved ability to respond to policy implementation failures. For example, during the period under review, the PMO heightened its overview of ministries to make up for a number of policy failures that occurred during the previous legislature, although certain ministries still make occasional efforts to evade oversight.

Citation:

Sansone, K Justice to be transferred to OPM – Labor MP is Commissioner Against Bureaucracy Times of Malta 18/06/13
<http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20151029/local/over-32m-in-government-consultancies-in-one-year.590017>

Romania

Score 5

The organization of the Government Office has undergone frequent changes. Until January 2017, it featured two bodies that were engaged in interministerial coordination, the General Secretariat of the Government (GSG) and the Prime Minister's Chancellery (PMC). Whereas the GSG focused on the formal coordination, the PMC, consisting of about 15 state counselors with different backgrounds, provided the policy expertise. In January 2017, Prime Minister Grindeanu dismantled the PMC and transferred its responsibilities to the GSG. Once appointed, its successor, Prime Minister Tudose, re-established the PMC and the old dual structure. Under Prime Minister Dăncilă, the PMC included seven pro bono "scientific" members with some sectoral experts. Under Prime Minister Orban, the PMC has had only six members in total.

Slovakia

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

Citation:

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

Switzerland

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

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

Turkey

Score 5 Following the April 2017 referendum and the June 2018 early elections, the governmental system was changed to a presidential model and the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) was abolished. The organization of the new presidential system was regulated by presidential decree No. 703 in July 2018. In addition to a vice-president, the head of administrative affairs was established. Its main task is to coordinate between public institutions and organizations and examine the congruity of laws adopted by the parliament and draft legislation prepared by government institutions with the constitution, current legislation, presidential decrees and government program. The head of administrative affairs includes four directorates: laws and legislation, personnel and principles, security affairs, and support and finance. The General Directorate of Laws and Legislation deals with presidential decrees, international agreements, suitability of legislation, draft regulations etc. There is no

available official data about the number and functions of presidential personnel. However, according to budget data, as of the end of June, 1,108 regular employees, 479 permanent civil servants and 787 contracted personnel were employed in the presidential offices.

Presidential Decree No. 1 established nine policy councils (including the Local Governing Council, Social Policies Council, and the Health and Food Policies Council) to improve the president's capacity for public policymaking. The councils will report to the president by taking the views of ministries, civil society and sector representatives and experts, and follow the policies and developments implemented. It will also give opinions to public institutions and organizations in their fields.

This decree also established offices of digital transformation, finance, human resources and investment with advisory capacity to the president, and endowed each with a budget while granting them administrative and financial autonomy.

Citation:

2019 Yılı Merkezi Yönetim Bütçe Kanunu İcmali (I) Sayılı Cetvel – Genel Bütçeli İdareler, <http://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/3-a1-2019-2021-D%C3%96NEM%C4%B0-GENEL-B%C3%96T%C3%87E-EKONOM%C4%B0K.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2019)

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

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

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

"Bin 100 odalı saraya bin 108 işçi aldılar," *Sözcü* daily newspaper, 30 October 2018, <https://www.sozcu.com.tr/2018/ekonomi/bin-100-odali-saraya-bin-108-isci-aldilar-2709040/>

Bulgaria

Score 4

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

Slovenia

Score 4

Slovenia has a strong tradition of departmentalism and collegial cabinets. The Government Office focuses on the legal and technical coherence of draft bills but lacks the capacity and sectoral expertise to evaluate their policy content, especially

since the recruitment of expert staff is limited and often subject to political pressures and political compromise. Marjan Šarec, the new prime minister, has brought in few new experts. Among others, he made Damir Črnčec, an influential security expert, his national security advisor, and appointed as his adviser on social issues Anja Kopač Mrak, the former minister of labour, family, social affairs and equal opportunities.

Croatia

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

Cyprus

- Score 2** Under the constitution, line ministers are fully responsible for their ministries. They draft bills and forward them to the Secretariat of the Council of Ministers. The Secretariat ensures that the attorney general's office has checked bills for legal soundness and that they conform to established formats. The Secretariat also offers administrative support to the cabinet's work, forwards decisions to relevant offices and monitors implementation. While according to the constitution, "the general direction and control of the government and the direction of general policy" lies with the Council of Ministers, the Council does not possess administrative depth and the necessary mechanisms to evaluate proposals and collectively chart policy.

Specific GO control that lies with the minister of finance and the cabinet, under the law on fiscal responsibility, is limited to mostly budgetary issues.

Indicator

Line Ministries

Question

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

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

- 10-9 = There are inter-related capacities for coordination between GO/PMO and line ministries.
- 8-6 = The GO/PMO is regularly briefed on new developments affecting the preparation of policy proposals.
- 5-3 = Consultation is rather formal and focuses on technical and drafting issues.
- 2-1 = Consultation occurs only after proposals are fully drafted as laws.

Belgium

Score 10

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

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

Citation:

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

United States

Score 10

In the U.S. system, this item relates to how the executive departments and agencies involve the president and the White House staff in their work. Under long-established practice, however, the president and the White House staff are in fact dominant within the executive branch and can therefore prioritize issues they see as important to the president's agenda. In the Trump administration, agency policy development has been heavily shaped by Trump's desire to cut regulations and to reverse actions taken by the Obama administration. There has been little policy

development shaped by long-term agency missions or priorities, nor has White House involvement reflected organized deliberative processes.

Australia

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

Canada

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

Chile

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

Citation:

About the structure of the Cabinet Office (Centro de Gobierno):

https://www.cepchile.cl/cep/site/docs/20160304/20160304100347/presentacion_CAninat.pdf

<https://politicaspUBLICAS.uc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/presentacion-claudio-seebach-ministerio-secretaria-general-de-la-presidencia.pdf>

Denmark

- Score 9 The norms of “minister rule” and the portfolio principle (where ministers are in charge of certain areas) give the line ministries a fair amount of autonomy. The line ministries also have the most technical expertise. Nonetheless, to achieve coherent government policy, interdepartmental coordination is required. Since most governments are coalition governments this is particularly important. Coordination is

not hierarchical, but rather based on negotiations. The prime minister has a special position given his/her constitutional prerogatives as the person who appoints and dismisses ministers. Major issues and strategic considerations are dealt with in the government coordination committee (regeringens koordineringsudvalg) involving the prime minister and other key ministers. The standing committees are also important coordination devices. In addition, there are ad hoc coordination meetings between the leaders of the parties constituting the governing coalition. The former three-party government formed in November 2016 was a minority government. The prime minister had to maintain contact with the leaders of the other government parties, the Conservatives and Liberal Alliance, as well as the parliamentary support party, the Danish People's Party.

The current Social Democratic government, which has held power since June 2019, is a minority single-party government. It depends on three parties – the Social Liberals, the Socialist People's Party and the Unity List – for parliamentary support. However, it can also seek broader agreements during the legislative process.

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

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

Citation:

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

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

Finland

Score 9

The guiding rule in Finland is that each ministry is, within its mandate, responsible for the preparation of issues that fall within the scope of government and also for the proper functioning of the administration. Given this framework, rather than line ministries involving the Prime Minister's Office in policy preparation, the expectation is that the Prime Minister's Office involves ministries in its own policy preparations. In practice, of course, the patterns of interaction are not fixed. For one thing, policy programs and other intersectoral subject matters in the cabinet program are a concern for the Prime Minister's Office as well as for the ministries, and efforts must be coordinated. The government's analysis, assessment and research activities that support policymaking across the ministries are coordinated by the Prime

Minister's Office (PMO). In addition, because decision-making is collective and consensual in nature, ministry attempts to place items on the cabinet's agenda without involving the Prime Minister's Office will fail. Finland has a recent tradition of fairly broad-based coalition governments, although the Sipilä government was an exception, as its majority in parliament had shrunk to 52.5% by the end of its term. The Rinne government enjoyed the support of 58% of parliamentarians when it came into office. The tradition of broad-based coalition necessarily amalgamates ideological antagonisms, and thereby mitigates against fragmentation along ministerial and sectoral lines.

Citation:

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

France

Score 9

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

Ireland

Score 9

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

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

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

New Zealand

Score 9

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

Citation:

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

South Korea

Score 9

Executive power is concentrated in the president’s hands. Thus, line ministries have to involve the Blue House in all major policy proposals. The president has the authority to, and often does rearrange, merge and abolish ministries according to his or her agenda. For example, President Moon created a Ministry of SMEs and Startups; renamed the Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning as the Ministry of Science and ICT; and merged the National Security Agency and the Ministry of Public Administration and Security into a single Ministry of the Interior and Safety. He also (re-)established the National Fire Agency and the Korea Coast Guard abolished by his predecessor. However, while Moon has promised to decentralize power, there have as yet been few signs of any weakening of the role of the Blue House. The Blue House gets involved with and coordinates certain policies by exerting its political dominance rather than through administrative capability. This is particularly true for policy areas falling outside the president’s main priorities, for which the Blue House does not possess sufficient knowledge or human-resources capacity to act effectively.

United Kingdom

Score 9

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

Line ministries' policymaking is subject to intense scrutiny by the Cabinet Office, while the cost implications of line ministries' policy proposals are controlled by the Treasury.

The creation of implementation taskforces, working alongside cabinet committees, is intended to strengthen the central oversight of policy proposals.

Nevertheless, coordination mechanisms were not able to resolve the political tensions around Brexit. Thus, while the machinery of government remains broadly capable of involving the Prime Minister's Office, the manner in which Brexit has dominated policymaking over the last year militated against "business as usual."

Hungary

Score 8

Under the Orbán governments, line ministries have mostly acted as executive agencies that follow orders from above and whose activities have been subject to detailed oversight by the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). The PMO has made sure that policies are as close in line as possible with the prime minister's policy preferences and the ideological rhetoric. However, the strong coordination capacity of the PMO has also meant that it has sometimes become a bottleneck in the process of policymaking. Moreover, the co-existence of the PMO and the Cabinet Office has created unnecessary complexity. Following the April 2018 parliamentary elections, the structure of the incumbent Orbán government has undergone a major transformation. The Ministry of Innovation and Technology (ITM) has been created and received many functions, while the largest super-ministry, the Ministry of Human Resources (EMMI), has been significantly weakened. In socioeconomic decision-making Hungary's central bank, MNB and its governor, György Matolcsy, have become increasingly influential, decreasing the role of Mihály Varga, the Minister of Finance.

Citation:

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

Iceland

Score 8

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

Citation:

Reglur um starfshætti ríkisstjórnar. Nr. 292/2016 18. mars 2016.

Skýrsla starfshóps forsætisráðuneytisins (2010): Viðbrögð stjórnslunnar við skýrslu rannsóknarnefndar Alþingis. Reykjavík, Forsætisráðuneytið.

Latvia

Score 8

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

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

Luxembourg

Score 8

The Prime Minister's Office is not legally allowed to be involved in the preparation of bills or proposals by line ministries. Sensitive political proposals are often included in the coalition program. There are no institutionalized mechanisms of coordination between line ministries and there is no unit dealing with policy

assessment and evaluation. Informally, however, no sensitive proposal is presented to the Council of Ministers without being approved beforehand by the prime minister. An informal body of ministerial civil servants meets ahead of the Council of Ministers, to prepare the agenda and make adjustments if needed. Even though the prime minister has not held the influential finance portfolio since 2009, his central role in the governance process has not been weakened.

Citation:

“Arrêté grand-ducal du 28 janvier 2015 portant constitution des Ministères.” Journal officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, 30 January 2015. www.data.legilux.public.lu/eli/etat/leg/agd/2015/01/28/n1/jo. Accessed 23 Oct. 2019.

Netherlands

Score 8

Generally, line-ministry legislative or white-paper initiatives are rooted in the government policy accord, EU policy coordination and subsequent Council of Ministers decisions to allocate drafting to one or two particular ministries. In the case of complex problems, draft legislation may involve considerable jockeying for position among the various line ministries. The prime minister is always involved in the kick-off of major new policy initiatives and sometimes in the wording of the assignment/terms of reference itself. After that, however, it may take between six months and four years before the issue reaches the decision-making stage in ministerial and Council of Ministers committees, and again comes under the formal review of the prime minister. Meanwhile, the prime minister is obliged to rely on informal coordination with his fellow ministers. It is difficult to draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of informal coordination, information-sharing procedures and other such practices. High-level civil servants close to the prime minister have complained about the increasing use of spin doctors and political assistants in such processes. But the prime minister has a good reputation with regard to formal leadership and conflict management.

Citation:

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

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

Norway

Score 8

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

Spain

Score 8 Both the Government Office (GO) and the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) are regularly briefed on new developments affecting the preparation of policy proposals by line ministries. Although these offices are formally autonomous, the legal and political hierarchy within the government facilitates and even encourages this pattern of consultation with the prime minister's entourage. Consultation with the GO tends to focus on drafting or technical issues, while the PMO is more interested in political and strategic considerations. The process is firmly institutionalized and takes place weekly, since representatives of all ministries gather at the cabinet meeting preparatory committee, which is held every Wednesday and chaired by the GO head and the deputy prime minister. Advisers from the PMO also participate in this committee and in the important specialized ministerial committee on economic affairs (see "Cabinet Committees") that also assists the Council of Ministers. However, even if the primary joint role of the GO and the PMO is horizontal coordination, their staff resources are limited, and cannot be briefed on the whole range of government activity. Therefore, they normally focus on each ministerial department's most important sectoral developments. Since April 2019, under the powers of Spain's caretaker government, line ministries have had limited room for maneuver with regard to the ordinary office of public affairs.

Citation:

Paniagua (2018), *La Moncloa*, in: Lanzaro (coord.) *Centros de Gobierno*, Tecnos, Madrid.
Ley 39/2015

Greece

Score 7 Since the onset of the crisis in 2010, the PMO has gradually acquired more power and resources to supervise line ministries, the policies of which were streamlined to fit the fiscal consolidation effort of Greece. However, the PMO was not the only authority with which line ministries consulted. In fact, as the implementation of the Third Economic Adjustment Program for Greece unfolded, line ministers often turned to the Ministry of Finance for technical and drafting guidance in cases where legislation in development within individual ministries ran into financial constraints imposed by Greece's creditors. However, after the government turnover of July 2019, ties between line ministries and the PMO were further strengthened, as the latter was reorganized and staffed with highly skilled policy experts.

Citation:

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

Israel

Score 7

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

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

Citation:

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

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

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

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

Japan

Score 7

In Japan, the role of line ministries vis-à-vis the government office is complicated by the influence of a third set of actors: entities within the governing parties. During the decades of the LDP's postwar rule, the party's own policymaking organ, the Policy Affairs Research Council, developed considerable influence, ultimately gaining the power to vet and approve policy proposals in all areas of government policy.

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

While ministries have sometimes sought to regain their former clout over their portfolios, seven years under one prime minister (Abe since late 2012) have centralized policymaking practices to a quite substantial degree. The cabinet reshuffle of September 2019 seems to have strengthened this trend further, with Abe setting up “axes” of close political allies in core ministries to promote his agenda.

Citation:

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

Jesper Koll, Abe’s lesson in stability and pragmatism, *The Japan Times*, 13 September 2019, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2019/09/13/commentary/japan-commentary/abes-lesson-stability-pragmatism/>

Lithuania

Score 7

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

Mexico

Score 7

Given Mexico’s presidential system, cabinet ministers are respectful of and even deferential to the presidential office. Moreover, cabinet ministers dismissed by the president after disagreements rarely find a way back into high-level politics, which tends to promote loyalty to the president and presidential staff. Accordingly, senior figures in the presidential office are very powerful, because they determine access to the president and can influence ministerial careers. At present, President López Obrador dominates Mexican politics, perhaps more than his predecessor.

Portugal

Score 7

The Prime Minister's Office (PMO) is regularly briefed on new developments affecting the preparation of policy proposals.

The minister of finance, Mário Centeno, was by far the most influential minister in the Council of Ministers under the 21st constitutional government that was in office until October 2019. His internal prestige is bolstered by the international recognition he receives as president of the Eurogroup. In many cases, it was Minister Centeno that pushed back on policies. It remains to be seen whether this pattern will be maintained under the 22nd constitutional government that took office on 26 October 2019. As noted in the previously, the new government structure hints at a possible reduction in the internal weight of the minister of finance. However, it is far too early to tell.

Sweden

Score 7

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

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

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

Citation:

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

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

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

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

Switzerland

Score 7

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

There is a tension, however, between the consensus principle in the Federal Council that demands a common solution supported by all seven ministers, and the departmental principle that enables ministers to pursue their party line within their departments which, in turn, allows them to satisfy party members as they secure support for consensus-derived government solutions. Increasing polarization in parliament strengthens the departmental principle and renders consensus-driven solutions within the Federal Council more difficult to achieve. Nonetheless, the Federal Council so far managed to balance the two principles (Sager and Vatter 2019).

Citation:

Sager, F. & Vatter A. (2019). „Regierungshandeln im Spannungsfeld von Partei- und Exekutivpolitik am Beispiel des Bundesrats“, in *Blackbox Exekutive*. Eds. A. Ritz, T. Haldemann & F. Sager. 195-211. Zürich. NZZ Libro.

Bulgaria

Score 6

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

Czechia

Score 6

The legislative plan of the government divides tasks among the ministries and other central bodies of the state administration and sets deadlines for the submission of bills to the cabinet. The line ministry has to involve and take comments from, a range

of institutions, including the Government Office and the Government Legislative Council. This consultation process primarily focuses on technical issues and the harmonization of legal norms.

Estonia

Score 6 Two different forms exist to communicate line ministries' proposals to the GO. Firstly, all policy initiatives are discussed in the coalition council. Secondly, the cabinet informally examines all substantial issues at its weekly meetings. No binding decisions are made in the meetings, the main function being to exchange information and to prepare for formal government sessions. Under current government (in office since April 2019) advance communication between line ministries and the Prime Minister's Office has weakened, and line ministries sometimes act independently.

Germany

Score 6 The preparation of bills is mainly the prerogative of the line ministries (Ressortprinzip). Over the course of regular policy processes, the Chancellery is generally well informed, but is not strongly involved in ministerial initiatives. Most disputes between ministries and the Chancellery are discussed and resolved in the often-weekly meetings between the state secretaries and the Chancellery's staff. Because of the rapidly decreasing electoral support of the three governing parties, the CDU, CSU and SPD, the line ministries and their respective policies have become increasingly independent, following the preferences of the political party that heads each ministry. Each party today works to push through its own policy conception even if this may contradict that of the other coalition parties. Negotiating a commonly developed government policy is a highly contested and extraordinarily difficult process. From the perspective of the middle of the current government period, it is evident that all ministries are used to further the party politics of the individual coalition partners with an eye to the declining voter support in opinion polls.

Italy

Score 6 The Prime Minister's Office is in principle regularly kept informed of the development of policy proposals generated by line ministries. With regard to the policy proposals of particular political relevance for the government, the consultation process starts from the early stages of drafting and is more significant, involving not only formal but also substantive issues. In the fields less directly connected with the main mission of the government, exchanges are more formal and occur only when proposals have been fully drafted. Under the first Conte government, government

control over line ministries was weaker than in previous governments, given the political weakness of the prime minister and the ideologically bifurcated nature of the coalition. Ministers responded more readily to their party leader than to the head of government. This pattern seems likely to continue under the second Conte government.

Poland

Score 6 Under the PiS government, the Chancellery has kept its enhanced formal involvement in the preparation of policy proposals by the line ministries. However, its actual gatekeeping role has declined. Most bills are submitted by individual members of parliament rather than by ministries, although the bills will have been prepared by the government in advance. This procedure allows for a swifter legislative process with fewer consultation requirements, so that law-making can more effectively be controlled by the PiS leadership.

Turkey

Score 6 Currently there are 16 line ministries and nine policy councils, which develop long-term strategic vision and report on the progress of governmental activities. The Ministry of Development, which has been the primary consultative body for preparing policies according to the government's program, was abolished. In addition, four offices were established: finance, investment, digital transformation and human resources.

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

Decree no. 698 has arguably transferred all lawmaking power to the president. In August 2019, the duties of the Ministry of Treasury and Finance were expanded “to enable the Treasury to participate in domestic and foreign companies by the decision of the president of the republic.” The decree has also precipitated a draft proposal to authorize the president to appoint the head of Boğaziçi University and members of the executive board tasked with the construction of the Istanbul canal, which is currently under the domain of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and four district municipalities.

Citation:

TC Cumhurbaşkanlığı Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı, 2018 Yılı Genel Faaliyet Raporu, www.sbb.gov.tr > 2018-yili-genel-faaliyet-raporu (accessed 1 November 2019)

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

KHK 703, <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180709M3.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2018)

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

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

2018.

“Bakanlar Kurulu Yetkileri KHK’yle Cumhurbaşkanına Geçti,” 4 July 2018, <http://bianet.org/bianet/siyaset/198847-bakanlar-kurulu-yetkileri-khk-yle-cumhurbaskanina-gecti> (accessed 1 November 2018)

“Boğaz’daki imar yetkisi Cumhurbaşkanlığı’na mı devrediliyor?” 30 October 2019, <https://www.dw.com/tr/bo%C4%9Fazdaki-imar-yetkisi-cumhurba%C5%9Fkanl%C4%B1%C4%9F%C4%B1na-m%C4%B1-devrediliyor/a-51053304> (accessed 1 November 2019)

Austria

Score 5

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

The 2017 – 2019 government tried to develop a policy of “message control.” The policy aimed to reduce the visibility of individual ministers (although not necessarily their power, as was evidenced by the actions of the FPÖ minister of the interior), and increase the guiding power of the chancellor and deputy chancellor – at least as long as both were in control of their respective parties.

The “Ibiza scandal” – which followed the release of a secretly filmed meeting in which the former FPÖ leader, who was also deputy chancellor, attempted to sell government positions and a media outlet to a (fake) Russian oligarch – also demonstrated the limits of the attempted “message control.”

The conflict concerning the Federal Agency for the Protection of the Constitution and Fighting Terrorism (BVT) demonstrated a significant lack of coordination between the different branches of the Ministry of the Interior, and between the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice.

Malta

Score 5

Since 2013, a sustained effort at coordination has been made in the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO) and in line ministries. During the period under review, the government established an office within the PMO to coordinate the policies contained in the ruling party’s electoral manifesto. In a new review strategy, ministries monitor the outputs of policies previously discussed with the cabinet; the OPM then monitors policies until they are implemented and supports the ministries in their implementation. Coordination meetings are also organized by the OPM bringing together the various ministries. Decisions taken by ministries have more than once been rescinded by the PMO, a practice less common in the past. The PMO may also seek to review its policies with the help of the Management Efficiency Unit and

occasionally employs consultants. Cabinet meetings have allowed experts to give direct advice to ministers, a departure from the past. From time to time, cabinet meetings are held in different regions for the purpose of consultations. As a consequence of a number of past policy failures, most policy proposals have since 2017 required cabinet approval, with implementation subsequently monitored. Specialist ad hoc committees and interministerial cabinet committees are set up to facilitate coordination between the PMO and ministries.

Citation:

http://www.maltatoday.com.mt/news/national/33324/prime-minister-holding-cabinet-meeting-in-mellieha-20140121#.V_uQfvI96M8

http://www.maltatoday.com.mt/news/national/48377/cabinet_meeting_in_gozo_cost_taxpayers_7000#.V_uQpfI96M8

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

<https://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2019-10-07/local-news/74-of-the-2019-budget-has-been-implemented-government-exercise-shows-6736214453>

Romania

Score 5

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

Croatia

Score 4

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

The involvement of the Prime Minister's Office in the preparation of policy proposals has been complicated by the large number of ministries. During the era of Prime Minister Ivo Sanader, Croatia had only 14 ministries. By contrast, the second Plenković government consists of 20 ministries, the third highest number in the European Union.

Citation:

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

Slovakia

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

Cyprus

Score 3 The services within the presidential palace have essentially been ad hoc and determined by the president in office. The tasks of the Secretariat of the Council of Ministers are mostly limited to providing administrative support and format checks of proposals. The Attorney General's Office undertakes legality checks of draft legislation. In drafting laws, ministries may refer to policies formulated by the government or to general frameworks decided by the cabinet. Draft laws are discussed only during the presentation and deliberation process in the Council of Ministers and not within a broader policy discussion.

Under the law on fiscal responsibility, the finance minister controls policy proposals to ensure compliance with general budgetary plans and policies. No central coordinating body exists that could oversee policy proposals in a comprehensive manner.

Citation:
Directorate of Strategy, Coordination, & Communication, Cyprus Ministry of Finance,
<http://mof.gov.cy/en/directorates-units/directorate-of-strategy-coordination-communication>

Slovenia

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

Indicator

Cabinet Committees

Question

How effectively do ministerial or cabinet committees coordinate cabinet proposals?

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

- 10-9 = The vast majority of cabinet proposals are reviewed and coordinated first by committees.
- 8-6 = Most cabinet proposals are reviewed and coordinated by committees, in particular proposals of political or strategic importance.
- 5-3 = There is little review or coordination of cabinet proposals by committees.
- 2-1 = There is no review or coordination of cabinet proposals by committees. Or: There is no ministerial or cabinet committee.

Belgium

Score 10

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

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

Finland

Score 10

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

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

Citation:

<https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/government/ministerial-committees>

Denmark

Score 9

Policy preparation tends to take place in cabinet committees (regeringsudvalg) involving a smaller number of ministers. The number of such committees has varied over time. Currently, the following standing cabinet committees exist: the government coordination committee (chaired by the prime minister), the economy committee (chaired by the finance minister), the security committee (chaired by the prime minister), the appointments committee (chaired by the prime minister), the government's EU implementation committee (chaired by the minister of employment) and the committee for green transition (chaired by the minister of energy, utilities and climate). The latter committee was formed by the new Social Democratic government of Mette Frederiksen.

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

Citation:

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

Oversigt over faste regeringsudvalg, http://www.stm.dk/_a_1848.html (accessed 17 October 2019).

New Zealand

Score 9

There are clear guidelines for policy formulation in the New Zealand core executive. All policy proposals are reviewed in cabinet committees. Full cabinet meetings therefore can focus on strategic policy debates and policy conflicts between coalition partners or between the government and its legislative support parties in the House of Representatives. In quantitative terms, from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019, the full cabinet met 41 times while cabinet committees met 182 times. A revised cabinet committee structure was implemented in October 2017 following the formation of the government after the general election. The overall number of committees remained ten, but seven out of ten committees were discontinued or superseded. Key committees are now the Cabinet Legislation Committee, the Committee on Economic Development and the Cabinet Environment, Energy and Climate Committee.

Citation:

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Annual Report 2019 (<https://dpmc.govt.nz/publications/annual-report-2019>)

Spain

Score 9

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

Citation:

Real Decreto 694/2018

Real Decreto 595/2018

United Kingdom

Score 9

The composition and terms of reference of cabinet committees are decided by the prime minister. The minister for the Cabinet Office generally also has an influential role, chairing 10 and sitting on all but two cabinet committees under the May government. The creation of implementation taskforces alongside conventional committees led to a net increase in committee numbers. After the change of prime minister in the summer of 2016, two noteworthy innovations were the establishment of the European Union Exit and Trade Committee, and the Economy and Industrial Strategy Cabinet Committee, both of which were chaired by the prime minister. Additionally, a committee on social reform was created. However, leaks from cabinet ministers suggested that key decisions on Brexit were not adequately shared outside the prime minister's inner circle.

When Johnson succeeded May as prime minister, he radically altered the mix of committees, reducing them to just six, three of which were largely focused on concluding Brexit, the over-riding priority of his government. This exemplifies the UK government's tendency to create new committees rapidly in response to shifts in political priorities, demonstrating the flexibility of the system. Once withdrawal from

the European Union has taken place a wide-ranging revision of these committees to reflect the next set of political priorities is certain to occur.

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

Citation:

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

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

Australia

Score 8

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

Citation:

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

Canada

Score 8

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

France

Score 8

Coordination is strong across the French government, and is in the hands of the PMO and the President's Office, which liaise constantly and make decisions on every issue. Coordination takes place at several levels. First at the level of specialized civil servants who work as political appointees in the PMO (members of the cabinet, that

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

The council of ministers takes place once a week. There are also a large number of interministerial committees chaired by the prime minister or the president. Most of these committees meet upon request. While plenty of them hold meetings every week, these are usually attended by the ministers dealing with the topics discussed, and include only the ministers and secretaries of state involved. In some cases, these meetings might be chaired by the secretary-general of either the President's Office or the Prime Minister's Office, two prestigious and powerful high civil servants who respectively serve as the voices of the president and prime minister.

In 2017, the new government introduced the practice of government seminars with the aim of improving cohesion and harmonization. The team spirit seems to have improved considerably in comparison with the past, given that many ministers are not professional politicians.

Latvia

Score 8

Cabinet committees are an integral part of the official decision-making process. If ministerial agreement on draft policy proposals cannot be reached at the state-secretary level, issues are automatically taken up by a cabinet committee for resolution. The cabinet committee's mandate is to iron out differences prior to elevating the proposal to the cabinet level. In 2017, cabinet committees considered 151 issues, of which 148 were sent on to cabinet.

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

Citation:
State Chancellery (2018), Report, Available at (in Latvian):
https://www.mk.gov.lv/sites/default/files/page/attachments/valsts_kancelejas_gada_parskats_2018_0.pdf, Last assessed: 06.11.2019.

Luxembourg

Score 8

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

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

Citation:

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

Netherlands

Score 8

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

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

However, since the Rutte I and II cabinets have consisted of two or more political parties of contrary ideological stripes (the conservative-liberal VVD and the PvdA or Labor Party, in the case of Rutte II), political pragmatism and opportunism has tended to transform "review and coordination" to simple logrolling, or in Dutch

political jargon: “positive exchange,” meaning that each party agrees tacitly or explicitly not to veto the other’s bills. This tendency has negative consequences for the quality of policymaking, as minority views effectively win parliamentary majorities if they are feasible from a budgetary perspective without first undergoing rigorous policy and legal analyses. In the second half of the Rutte II cabinet, the government had to garner political support for its policy initiatives through elaborate negotiations with political parties in the Senate/First Chamber who were not formally part of the governing coalition. Introducing a wider range of perspectives and decision criteria may have increased the quality of policymaking and the democratic nature of the process, given that not only ministerial committees but also political parties were involved.

Ireland

Score 7

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

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

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

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

In 2016, there were 10 cabinet committees. The most recent addition focuses on Brexit, while other cabinet committees focus on the economy, trade and jobs; housing; healthcare; social policy and public sector reform; justice reform; European affairs; regional and rural affairs; infrastructure, environment and climate change; and the arts, Irish culture and the Gaeltacht.

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

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

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

Citation:

For information about Cabinet Committee see:

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

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

Lithuania

Score 7

Although Lithuania's government can create advisory bodies such as government committees or commissions, the number and role of such committees has gradually declined since the beginning of the 2000s, when coalition governments became the rule. Top-priority policy issues are frequently discussed in governmental deliberations organized before the official government meetings. The Strategic Committee is composed of several cabinet ministers, the chancellor and a top prime-ministerial deputy who manages the government's performance priorities, policy and strategy. Another government committee, the Crisis Management Committee, advises the government on crisis management. A Governmental European Union Commission continues to act as a government-level forum for discussing Lithuania's EU positions; made up of relevant vice-ministers and chaired by the minister of foreign affairs. Separately, a new commission established at the end of 2018 has been tasked with developing a strategy for sustainably increasing the wages of public sector employees through 2025. However, these coordination processes are often detached from the day's political agenda, and are not given much attention by ministers who are often driven by their party agendas; for example, this means that some policymakers show little interest in the EU agenda and its connection to Lithuania's national policies.

Portugal

- Score 7** Most ordinary meetings of the Portuguese cabinet – the Council of Ministers – are used for policy decisions rather than strategic policy debates. Political issues and strategic policy considerations are by-and-large prepared by an inner core of ministers, augmented by other ministers and staff when required. This inner core is an informal group, with a composition that can vary depending on the policy area.
- In addition, Council of Ministers meetings are preceded by a formal weekly meeting of junior ministers (Reunião dos Secretários de Estado), which is intended to prepare the Council of Ministers meeting. These meetings of the junior ministers play a crucial role in filtering out and settling more technical issues prior to cabinet meetings. These meetings are chaired by the minister for the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (Presidência do Conselho dos Ministros), who has a seat in the Council of Ministers.

Slovenia

- Score 7** Cabinet committees play an important role in the preparation of cabinet proposals in Slovenia and settle issues prior to the cabinet meeting. The Šarec government has kept the three standing cabinet committees existing under its predecessor: the Committee of State Matters and Public Issues, the Committee of National Economy and the Commission of Administrative and Personnel Matters. Unlike the Cerar government, however, it has not established any temporary committees.

South Korea

- Score 7** Formally, the cabinet is the executive branch's highest body for policy deliberation and resolution. In reality, the role of the cabinet is limited because all important issues are discussed bilaterally between the Blue House and the relevant ministry. However, bureaucratic skirmishing takes place on many issues. The Blue House's capacity to contain rivalries between the various ministries tends to be relatively high early in a given president's official term. However, coordination power becomes weaker in a lame-duck administration. Committees are either permanent, such as the National Security Council, or created in response to a particular issue. As many government agencies have recently been moved out of Seoul into Sejong city, the need to hold cabinet meetings without having to convene in one place at the same time has been growing, and the law has therefore been amended to allow cabinet meetings in a visual teleconference format.

Chile

- Score 6 Ministerial or cabinet committees are not necessarily central when it comes to decision-making on policy matters. Depending on the topic, ministerial committees are more or less involved in preparing cabinet proposals, especially those of relatively significant strategic or financial importance. These proposals are normally coordinated effectively.

Croatia

- Score 6 The rules of procedure of the Croatian government provide for different kinds of cabinet committees and assign a major role in policy coordination to them. The prime minister and the vice prime ministers form the core cabinet (Uži kabinet vlade). In addition, there are various permanent and non-permanent cabinet committees that focus on particular issues. As there is little ex ante coordination among ministries, controversies are often pushed upwards, with cabinet committees playing an important role in resolving conflicts. However, the quality of coordination suffers from the fact that cabinet committees are absorbed by these disputes and other matters of detail.

Iceland

- Score 6 Cabinet committees rarely prepare cabinet meetings, although the Budget Committee and some ad hoc committees are exceptions. However, the majority of items on cabinet meeting agendas are prepared by ministers often with two or more ministers coordinating the cabinet meeting. In the immediate aftermath of the 2008 economic collapse, cooperation between ministers increased, particularly between the prime minister, the minister of finance, and the minister of commerce. However, this change was temporary and intended only to facilitate the cabinet's immediate reactions to the 2008 economic collapse. In February 2013, new regulations were introduced permitting the prime minister to create single-issue ministerial committees to facilitate coordination between ministers where an issue overlaps their authority areas.

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

The number of ministerial committees to coordinate overlapping policy issues was reduced from seven to three in 2016, but has since been increased to five. These committees included the Ministerial Committee on Public Finances (Ráðherranefnd um ríkisfjármál), with four ministers, and the Ministerial Committee on National

Economy (Ráðherranefnd um efnahagsmál), with four ministers. The newly established Ministerial Committee on Coordination of Issues that concern more than one ministry (Ráðherranefnd um samræmingu mála er varða fleiri en eitt ráðuneyti) encompasses the former ministerial committees on equality, solutions for household debt, arctic affairs and public health affairs. In 2018, the number of committees was increased to four following the re-establishment of the special Ministerial Committee on Equality (Ráðherranefnd um jafnréttismál) and, in 2019, to five when the Ministerial Committee on Food Policy (Ráðherranefnd um matvælastefnu) was introduced.

Citation:

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

Cabinet committees (Ráðherranefndir), <https://www.stjornarradid.is/rikisstjorn/radherranefndir/> Accessed 17th October 2019.

Israel

Score 6

The government is authorized to appoint cabinet committees (called ministerial committees) to handle different policy issues. Moreover, it is obligated to appoint security- and state-focused cabinet that includes the prime minister, the minister of defense, the minister of justice, the foreign minister, the minister of state security and the minister of finance. Currently, 35 ministerial committees work to address a wide range of topics.

Most ministerial committees receive limited attention in the media. The ministerial committee for legislation handles the preparation and the first approval of legislative proposals. The committee's decisions regarding proposals determine how the coalition members will vote on the proposals in the Knesset. The committee has the right to control and delay legislation, and decide when a bill should proceed to a parliamentary vote. In 2016, about 40% of draft bills were delayed, some up to six to seven times. It should be mentioned that the committee does not publish its protocols, the order of votes is not listed and only the committee's final decisions are published without any explanation or elaboration. In 2019, under the current transitional government, the committee did not publish any decisions or legislative proposals.

Ministerial committees in Israel have become more relevant. Their decisions accounted for 54% of all governmental decisions during the 33rd government of Israel (2013 – 2015). Though the 34th government has not yet updated its information on this topic, committee decisions appear to have remained relevant through 2015 to 2018. However, there has not been any serious development in this field in 2019.

Citation:

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

Data proves: Ayelet Shaked is the real prime minister of the State of Israel, June 2018,

<https://www.haaretz.co.il/blogs/tomeravital/BLOG-1.6200567>

Friedberg, Chen, "The Knesset's Committees – Foretold Failure?," The Ben-Gurion Law Proposal – Amendments of 'Basic Law: The Government,' 2015

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

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

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

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

"The guidelines for government work," PMO's website (Hebrew) Working Plan Book 2017-18, PMO Office, March 2017: <http://www.plans.gov.il/pdf2017/> (Hebrew)

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

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

Italy

Score 6

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

Japan

Score 6

Government committees exist in a number of important fields in which coordination among ministries with de facto overlapping jurisdictions plays an important role. The most important is the Council for Economic and Fiscal Policy (CEFP), headed by the prime minister. However, this has never been a "ministerial committee" in a strict sense. First, it has only an advisory function. Second, individuals from the private

sector – two academics and two business representatives in the current configuration – are included. This can increase the impact of such councils, but it also means they are somewhat detached from political processes.

Prime Minister Abe again strengthened the formal role of the CEFPP and set up the Headquarters for Japan's Economic Revitalization as a “quasi-sub-committee” of the CEFPP encompassing all state ministers. The CEFPP or the Headquarters are expected to hold initial discussions on the assignment of policies to committees, while the cabinet has to approve decisions. However, given Abe's strong grip on the policy process, council discussions have lost some of their relevance.

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

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

Citation:

'Bold' economic and fiscal policy in Japan becoming a mere facade, Editorial, The Mainichi, 22 June 2019, <https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20190622/p2a/00m/0na/009000c>

Malta

Score 6

Malta's EU's presidency helped to strengthen and refine Malta's cabinet and ministerial committees. Since the 2017 election, greater stress has been placed on such committees, which report to the cabinet. Most of these committees remain focused on issues that cut across ministerial portfolios, but some ad hoc committees are more focused on single ministerial policies. The new prime minister, who took office in 2020, has advocated for the use of special committees, and immediately set up a special cabinet committee for constitutional reform.

Citation:

Harwood Mark, Malta in the European Union 2014 Ashgate, Surrey
<https://www.pressreader.com/>

Mexico

Score 6

Mexico is unusual, because the constitution does not recognize the cabinet as a collective body. Instead, Mexico has four sub cabinets, respectively dealing with economic, social, political and security matters. As a result, Mexico in practice has a system of cabinet committees each of them normally chaired by the president. The full cabinet never or hardly ever meets. Mexico's cabinet, as a collective, matters less than in most countries. The cabinet is not a supreme executive body as it is in,

say, Britain. For one thing, there are a number of heads of executive agencies, with cabinet rank, who are not directly subject to a minister. There is a trend of governments to increase this process, partially out of the logic of depoliticizing and cementing programmatic decisions and views in social and economic policy fields. Under the current administration, cabinet reshuffles have frequently taken place, often in response to unpopular policy outcomes or political pressure. The central political figure has been and is the president.

Slovakia

Score 6

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

Turkey

Score 6

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

As of 1 August 2018, several coordination committees and boards, presidential policy councils and other public institutions were established in association with the presidency. During the review period, observers have publicly pointed to the need for coordination mechanisms between the ministries, parliament and the AKP.

Citation:

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

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

K. Gözler, Türkiye'nin Yönetim Yapısı (TC İdari Teşkilatı), Bursa: Ekin Basın Yayın Dağıtım, 2018.
Z.Sobacı et al., Turkey's New Government Model and the Presidential Organization, SETA Perspective No. 45, July 2018.

Cyprus

Score 5 Forming ad hoc and ministerial committees is a regular practice. The constitutional limit on the number of ministries (11) results in the overlapping of competences and a great need for coordination. There are at present 18 committees, which focus on sector-specific matters that are within the powers of many ministries. The formulation of policy frameworks is also within their purview. Departments or technical committees mainly from within the ministries support their work; in some cases, they may seek contributions from external experts. The scope of work and degree of efficiency in committee coordination are not easy to assess, given that no activity reports are published.

Citation:

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

Czechia

Score 5 The Czech government routinely establishes advisory and working bodies made up of members of the cabinet, ministry officials and other experts to support its activities. Such entities may be given permanent or temporary status according to the issue under consideration. In addition, there are a number of advisory bodies, commissions and councils that are managed by individual ministries and which deal with issues related to the ministries' portfolios. In 2019, there were 17 permanent committees at the government level, four fewer than in 2018. Among the most important were the National Security Council, the Government Legislative Council, the Committee for the European Union, the Government Council for Human Rights, and the Research and Development Council. The committees discuss and approve policy documents, thereby filtering out issues and saving time in cabinet meetings. However, they do so in an ad hoc fashion, and are not systematically involved in the preparation of cabinet meetings.

Germany

Score 5 As a rule of thumb, the cabinet functions as an institution that formally ratifies policy decisions that have been made elsewhere. In principle, line ministers are responsible for policies within their own jurisdiction. Therefore, they have a strong leeway to pursue their own or their party's interests, though each ministry must to some extent involve other ministries while drafting bills. Formal cabinet committees do not play an important role in policymaking and are rarely involved in the review or coordination of proposals. One particularly interesting innovation in the area of early

coordination occurred during the review period: In March 2019, the government created a Cabinet Committee for Climate Protection (“Klimakabinett”). This consists of the ministries for Economic Affairs (Peter Altmeier), for Environment (Svenja Schulze), for Transport (Andreas Scheuer), for the Interior (Horst Seehofer) and of Agriculture (Julia Glöckner). In addition, Chancellery Head Helge Braun is involved, and the body is led by Chancellor Merkel and Vice Chancellor Olaf Scholz (SPD).

Greece

Score 5 There are cabinet committees tasked with overseeing specific policy sectors. However, these committees meet only when a major policy decision has to be made and are not subject to systematic organization. Substantive policy work is done at the line ministries and by the PMO before issues are presented to the cabinet. Within the headquarters of the PMO, a small, informal circle of advisers and ministers close to the prime minister bear primary responsibility for the formulation and coordination of cabinet proposals. Ministerial committees often performed a rather symbolic function while Greece was struggling to fulfill the requirements of three successive Economic Adjustment Programs in 2010-2018. After the government turnover of July 2019, there are initial good signs of rejuvenation of cabinet committees.

Hungary

Score 5 The Orbán governments have occasionally set up a cabinet committees. Since the 2018 parliamentary elections, such committees have played a subordinate role in interministerial coordination.

Romania

Score 5 In Romania, ministerial committees, which are composed of one minister, deputy ministers and public servants, feature prominently in interministerial coordination. They are used for preparing decisions on issues that involve multiple ministries. However, de facto coordination of the process is typically led by the line ministry initiating the policy proposal. By contrast, committees consisting only of ministers or with several ministers are rare.

United States

Score 5 The question for the U.S. system is whether, on major issues, White House advisory processes prepare issues thoroughly for the president, and on lesser issues with interagency implications, whether interagency committees prepare them thoroughly for decision by the relevant cabinet members. The U.S. system of advisory processes varies considerably, even within a single presidential administration, but is largely under control of the president’s appointees in the White House. The process is to a

great extent ad hoc, with organizational practices varying over time and from one issue area to another, based partly on the personnel involved. Typically, important decisions are “staffed out” through an organized committee process. However, the ad hoc character of organization (compared with a parliamentary cabinet secretariat), along with the typically short-term service of political appointees – resulting in what one scholar has called “a government of strangers” – renders the quality of these advisory processes unreliable.

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

Bulgaria

Score 4

No cabinet or ministerial committees coordinate proposals for cabinet meetings in Bulgaria. There are many cross-cutting advisory councils that include several ministers or high-ranking representatives of different ministries and have some coordinating functions. These might thus be seen as functional equivalents to ministerial or cabinet committees. The role of the councils, which often have a rather broad membership, is quite limited in substantive terms. Inasmuch as there are individual members from various ministries who sit on a number of such committees, their personal involvement may ensure some level of coordination between proposals.

Poland

Score 4

The number and role of cabinet committees under the PiS government have been limited. After the 2015 elections, it set up an Innovativeness Council, consisting of five ministers, in February 2016 and an Economic Committee at the end of September 2016. The latter was in charge of coordinating the implementation of the Strategy of Responsible Development. There was also a cabinet-level Committee for Social Affairs headed by former Prime Minister Beata Szydło. However, conflicts among ministries were ultimately resolved not by cabinet committees, but by PiS leader Kaczyński and his immediate circle, including Prime Minister Morawiecki. The cabinet was reorganized following the 2019 elections, but the new structures are hidden from public scrutiny.

Citation:

There is a new reconfiguration among ministers after the 2019 election. Generally however, there is very little reliable knowledge on how these committees de facto work. It is all hidden from public eyes and scrutiny.

Austria

- Score 2** During the last years of the SPÖ-ÖVP coalition cabinets (until 2017), there had been no regular (or permanent) cabinet committees. In rare cases, ad hoc committees were established to deal with specific matters. As coalitions are typical in Austria, such committees usually consist of members of both coalition parties in order to ensure an outcome acceptable to the full cabinet. Similarly, the ÖVP-FPÖ coalition did not establish any regular cabinet committees either.

Estonia

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

Switzerland

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

Norway

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

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

Sweden

Score 1

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

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

Indicator

Ministerial Bureaucracy

Question

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

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

- 10-9 = Most policy proposals are effectively coordinated by ministry officials/civil servants.
- 8-6 = Many policy proposals are effectively coordinated by ministry officials/civil servants.
- 5-3 = There is some coordination of policy proposals by ministry officials/civil servants.
- 2-1 = There is no or hardly any coordination of policy proposals by ministry officials/civil servants.

Estonia

Score 10

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

Finland

Score 10

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

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

Citation:

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

Switzerland

Score 10

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

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

Denmark

Score 9

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

Citation:

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

Luxembourg

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

Citation:

Thomas, Bernard/Schmit, Laurent: “Die Unentbehrlichen: Wieviel Macht haben hohe Beamte?” Forum.lu, September 2013, pp. 33-37. www.forum.lu/pdf/artikel/7693_332_ThomasSchmit.pdf. Accessed 20 Oct. 2019.

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

Bossaert, Danielle (2019): How size matters. In: forum, 2019, no. 394, pp. 32-34.

New Zealand

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

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

Portugal

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

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

Australia

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

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

Canada

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

France

Score 8 If a ministry wishes to get its proposals accepted or passed, it must liaise and coordinate with other ministries or agencies involved. For instance, the Macron Law on the economy (2015) had to be co-signed by 13 ministers. In case this consultation has not taken place, objections expressed by other ministers or by the Council of State might deliver a fatal blow to a proposal. All ministries are equal, but some are more equal than others: for example, the finance minister is a crucial, omnipresent and indispensable actor. Usually the coordination and consultation process is placed under the responsibility of a "rapporteur," usually a lawyer from the ministry bureaucracy (who is also in charge of arguing and defending the draft bill before the

Council of State, whose intervention is crucial even beyond the purely legal point of view). The dossier is always followed by a member of the minister's staff who communicates with his/her counterparts and tries to smooth the process as much as possible. In the most difficult cases (when ministers back up strongly the positions of their respective civil servants), the prime minister has to step in and settle the matter. In contrast to Germany, for instance, sectoral ministers have a limited margin of maneuver.

Latvia

Score 8

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

Issues can be fast-tracked at the request of a minister. Fast-tracking means that the usual procedures for gathering cross-sectoral and expert input can be circumvented, putting the efficacy of coordination at risk. In 2018, 29% of all issues before the cabinet were fast-tracked, a drop from 2015.

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

Citation:

State Chancellery (2015, 2018), Reports (in Latvian), Available at: <https://www.mk.gov.lv/lv/content/gada-publikie-parskati>, Last assessed: 07.11.2019

United Kingdom

Score 8

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

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

There are concerns that the workload required to deliver Brexit will undermine coordination within government. Though once Brexit is concluded, reversion to the usual procedures can be expected.

Chile

Score 7 Ministry staff and civil servants do not always play a dominant role in the drafting of policy proposals before those proposals reach ministerial committees. Depending on the ministry and the importance of the proposal, officials and civil servants are more or less effectively involved in the preparation and coordination process.

Germany

Score 7 Ex ante coordination between the line ministries' leading civil servants has not been particularly strong under past German coalition governments. In addition, an entrenched political practice ensures that no ministry makes any proposal that might be postponed or blocked by other ministries. The federal Ministry of Finance must be involved when budgetary resources are concerned, while complicated legal or constitutional issues necessitate the involvement of the federal Ministry of Justice. But generally, every ministry is fully responsible for its own proposed bills. All controversial issues are already settled before being discussed by the cabinet. The dominant mechanism for conflict resolution is the coalition committee, which is composed of the heads of the governing parties, sometimes supplemented by higher bureaucrats and/or party politicians. It is the most important and informal decision-making body, with comprehensive competences in the governing process.

Iceland

Score 7 Ministry officials and civil servants play an important role in preparing cabinet meetings. Even so, no cooperation between ministries is presumed in cases where the ministers themselves are not involved. As a consequence of the strong tradition of ministerial power and independence, the involvement of too many ministries and

ministers has been found to be a barrier to policymaking. Currently, coordination between ministries is irregular. The prime minister has the power to create coordination committees, but the number of active committees is currently low.

Italy

Score 7

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

Japan

Score 7

The LDP-led government in power since 2012 has worked effectively with the bureaucracy. In 2014, the government introduced a Cabinet Bureau of Personnel Affairs tasked with helping the prime minister make appointment decisions regarding the 600 elite bureaucrats in ministries and other major agencies. This significantly expanded the Cabinet Office's involvement in the process and its influence over the ministerial bureaucracy, including the influence of Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga, who has been in office since 2012. There are more political appointees in the ministries than before, and since Abe's accession in 2012, the average stay of such appointees has become longer, giving them greater expertise and clout in their ministries. In the September 2019 cabinet reshuffle, Abe again reappointed key allies. There are growing concerns that basing the promotion of senior ministry civil servants on political considerations and personal allegiances may diminish their utility in terms of offering neutral expertise.

Citation:

Loyalty trumps scandal in Abe's selections for new Cabinet, Editorial, The Asahi Shimbun, 12 September 2019, <http://www.asahi.com/ajw/articles/AJ201909120031.html>

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

Lithuania

Score 7 The process of drafting laws and resolutions requires consultation with the ministries and state institutions affected by the issue. The coordination process is led by the ministry responsible for a given issue area. Coordination takes place at various levels of the administrative hierarchy: coordination at the civil-servant level is followed by that of ministerial representatives (junior ministers and ministerial chancellors) representing the ministries at the government level. The latter meetings, which had been initially discontinued under the Skvernelis government, were later reintroduced in the form of inter-institutional meetings after a change of the government chancellor.

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

Norway

Score 7 Senior civil servants and political appointees play an important role in preparing cabinet meetings. This process follows fixed procedures, and matters must be appropriately prepared before being presented to the cabinet. This includes the creation of documentation alerting cabinet ministers to the essentials of a proposal, thus allowing cabinet meetings to focus on strategic issues and avoid being distracted by routine business details. Most issues on the agenda have been prepared well before the meeting.

South Korea

Score 7 Civil servants from different ministries regularly coordinate on policies of common concern. This coordination and cooperation among related civil servants across ministries can be either formal or informal, hierarchical or horizontal. Unfortunately, attitudes in the ministries are shaped by departmentalism that obstructs coordination. Different ministries use their policies to compete for support and approval from the office of the president. There is also a clear hierarchy delineating the ministries. Civil servants in important ministries, such as the Ministry of Strategy and Finance,

consider civil servants from other ministries, such as the Labor Ministry or the Environment Ministry, as being “second tier.” Key issues given a high priority by the president can be effectively coordinated among concerned ministries.

Some attempts to improve coordination among ministries are being made. Various interministerial coordination mechanisms have been implemented on the basis of sector and theme, such as the interministerial coordination system for ODA. Moreover, it is expected that the efficiency of and communication between government agencies will be improved by the introduction of a new records-retrieval system. The National Archives and Records Administration (NIS) has announced that it will establish a search and retrieval service in consultation with the Ministry of Patriots and Veterans Affairs. However, in spite of the Blue House’s political dominance, the Moon government has exhibited numerous cases of coordination failure among relevant ministries. For example, the Blue House; the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport; and the Ministry of Strategy and Finance have frequently failed to communicate and coordinate effectively on real-estate policy, a fact that has helped produce skyrocketing prices and increasing inequality.

Citation:

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

Spain

Score 7

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

While policy proposals are efficiently coordinated at the highest level of the bureaucratic hierarchy, the tradition of interministerial coordination at mid-level administrative bureaucracy means efficiency is weaker here. To be sure, the role of

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

Under the caretaker government that has held office since April 2019, the workload of the preparatory committee has decreased considerably.

Citation:
Ley 50/1997
Real Decreto 595/2018

Sweden

Score 7

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

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

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

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

Austria

Score 6

Austria’s federal bureaucracy is characterized by structural fragmentation. Each federal ministry has its own bureaucracy, accountable to the minister alone and not to the government as such. Each minister and his or her ministry is regarded as having a party affiliation according to the coalition agreement. Policy coordination is possible only when the ministers of specific ministries agree to establish such a specific coordination. As fitting in the government’s ministerial structure of the

government, individual ministers fear loss of control over their respective bureaucracies, and thus lasting and open contacts are possible only between the (politically appointed) personal staff of ministers belonging to the same political party.

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

Nonetheless, by introducing “secretary generals” above the heads of departments in government ministries, the autonomy of civil servants was reduced by the ÖVP-FPÖ coalition. Though it will have to be seen whether this trend toward internal centralization within the ministries will survive the new government.

Ireland

Score 6

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

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

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

Citation:

Niamh Hardiman, Aidan Regan and Mary Shayne ‘The Core Executive: The Department of the Taoiseach and the

Challenge of Policy Coordination, in Eoin O'Malley and Muiris MacCarthaigh (eds, 2012), *Governing Ireland: From Cabinet Government to Delegated Governance*. Dublin: IPA.

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

Malta

Score 6

The effort to enhance collaboration at all levels, reported in the last review period, continues to be strengthened within ministries and across ministries. The government office (GO) has gone to great lengths to enhance ministries' personnel capacities for this purpose. This is done through focused training and targeted recruitment efforts. The GO also collaborates with universities by offering placements and research posts to undergraduates in an attempt to help recruit future top civil servants. These students are placed in sectors where they can build their own managerial capacities, and are offered fast-track employment to senior offices on graduation. In other cases, it is now compulsory for top senior managers to hold post-graduate degrees, and existing personnel are offered bursaries and time off to pursue such qualifications.

In 2017, the first 12 key performance indicators (KPIs) for the public service were put into place. This is a new concept for Malta's public service, and is designed to establish clear objectives that need to be attained within a specific time frame. A "mystery shopper" for government departments was also introduced, with the aim of identifying shortcomings in service delivery and allowing such situations to be remedied.

Citation:

<https://www.pressreader.com/>

https://education.gov.mt/en/education/myScholarship/Documents/OPM%20Circular%2019_2016%20%20%20BA%20Work%20and%20HR.pdf

http://www.grtu.org.mt/index.php/publications-resources/publication-after-2010/publications-in-2013/2849-Tackling_bureaucracy

Netherlands

Score 6

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

increased. Especially in the Ministry of Justice and Safety, the quality of bureaucratic policy and legislation preparation has become a reason for serious concern.

Citation:

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

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

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

Romania

Score 6

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

Slovenia

Score 6

The government rules of procedure establish clear mechanisms to ensure effective cooperation between the ministries. They require the consultation of all ministries that are concerned before the submission of bills to the cabinet. While senior civil servants are thus heavily involved in the coordination of legislation, the effectiveness of this coordination has suffered from the deteriorating quality and increasing politicization of the upper echelons of civil service.

Belgium

Score 5

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

receive the approval of each minister. Proposals may be submitted to the ministers' council only at this stage.

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

Cyprus

Score 5

The broad area that each of the 11 ministries is responsible for has been extended to new fields since EU membership. Ministry officials and civil servants participate in ad hoc bodies or seek coordination with other ministries and formulate policy proposals. Final decisions rest with the ministers themselves, who sometimes apply political criteria. While the constitution accords exclusive powers to ministers within their ministry, bureaucrats have an increasingly significant role in formulating policies and proposals.

More interministerial interaction was promoted through units created in the framework of the reform effort. However, the dissolution of the Unit for Administrative Reform has led to the reallocation of its tasks back to the ministries. The absence of a centralized coordination body has increased the need for consultation and coordination between line ministries.

Citation:

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

Czechia

Score 5

As part of the interministerial coordination process, some coordination among line ministry civil servants takes place. Senior ministry officials are generally a crucial link in collecting and discussing comments on proposed legislation. The definition of their roles and responsibilities was improved through the civil service law, which went into effect at the beginning of 2015 and regulates the legal status of state employees in administrative offices and represents a significant step toward establishing a stable and professional public administration. However, the form in which the civil service law is implemented has not yet led to a complete depoliticization of the public administration, and it remains difficult to attract highly qualified workers into public service.

Hungary

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

Israel

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

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

More so, it seems that in some cases various ministries are responsible for the same topic or field of expertise and that there is no coordination between them. This is somewhat deliberate as some of the reforms reflect the personal interests of the prime minister's agenda. For example, the Ministry of Strategic Affairs and Public Diplomacy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs came into conflict regarding BDS movements and the question of which ministry was responsible given the lack of coordination between the ministries.

Citation:

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

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

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

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

Israel Democracy Institute, The two great successes of the outgoing government – thanks to inter-agency cooperation, 2019 [Hebrew]
<https://www.idi.org.il/articles/25492>

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

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

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

"The division of electronics and technologies," Accountant General website (Hebrew) "The guide for governmental sharing: A model for cooperation between ministries," official state publication, 2013: <http://www.ihaklai.org.il/Portals/0/Documents/articles/הלימודים%20לדיון%20העבודה%20במשרד%20הכלכלה%20והתעשייה.pdf> (Hebrew)

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

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

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

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

Mexico

Score 5

Traditionally, there was little real distinction in Mexico between civil servants and politicians, though the relationship between them has significantly varied over time. The upper administration overly consists of presidential appointments, with only a limited number of career bureaucrats. Two exceptions are the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where bureaucratic expertise has always played a major role. The cabinet today is much more heterogeneous, however, with some figures personally close to the president and others more independent. The politicization of the cabinet, which has increased under the three recent administrations, is constraining its ability to coordinate policy proposals given the centrifugal tendencies. On the other hand, the previously mentioned independent agencies are often characterized by higher levels of bureaucratic professionalism.

Poland

Score 5

Senior ministry officials play a substantial role in interministerial coordination. All meetings of the Council of Ministers, the Polish cabinet, are prepared by the Council of Ministers' Permanent Committee, which is made up of deputy ministers from the

ministries. The Committee for European Affairs, which is in charge of EU coordination, also relies strongly on coordination by top civil servants. In contrast, bureaucratic coordination at lower levels of the hierarchy is still relatively limited, even though the joint administration of EU funds has helped to intensify interministerial exchange. Changes in personnel have secured the dominance of the government over administration.

Slovakia

Score 5 In Slovakia, senior ministry officials have traditionally been heavily involved in the interministerial coordination process at the drafting stage. In contrast, coordination at the lower levels of the ministerial bureaucracy has suffered from a strong departmentalist culture and the top-down approach taken in most ministries. Since the 2016 elections, SNS and Most-Híd have further weakened the role and independence of the civil service by seeking to provide ministerial positions to party members.

Turkey

Score 5 Following the introduction of the presidential system, Decree No. 703 abolished the offices of an undersecretary, deputy undersecretary and central governor.

The new centralized government system consists of four offices, nine councils and 16 ministries formed around the presidency. Under the new system, offices produce projects, councils transform projects into policies and the ministries implement policies. The Department of Administrative Affairs conducts monitoring and the State Supervision Council performs a control function. The new governmental system is an attempt to promote efficiency and coordination in governmental processes, especially in decision-making and implementation. However, the centralization and unification of decision-making in the hands of the president raises doubts about the sustainability of interministerial coordination in particular.

Citation:

TC Cumhurbaşkanlığı Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı, 2018 Yılı Genel Faaliyet Raporu, www.sbb.gov.tr › 2018-yili-genel-faaliyet-raporu (accessed 1 November 2019)

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

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

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

Bulgaria

- Score 4 Some coordination of policy proposals by ministry officials and civil servants takes place, but the relevant issues are usually resolved at the political level. Within the ministries, a departmentalist culture prevails. This is especially true during coalition governments, when coordination between line ministries under ministers from different parties is virtually nonexistent.

Croatia

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

Citation:

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

Greece

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

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

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

This meritocratic selection of civil servants was not accelerated after the government turnover of July 2019. However, the new government passed legislation limiting the number of political appointees at the top of the civil service hierarchy, and depoliticizing high-ranking ministerial positions, such as the post of general secretary. The new legislation had not yet been implemented by the end of 2019.

Citation:

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

United States

Score 4

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

Indicator

Informal Coordination

Question

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

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

- 10-9 = Informal coordination mechanisms generally support formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.
- 8-6 = In most cases, informal coordination mechanisms support formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.
- 5-3 = In some cases, informal coordination mechanisms support formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.
- 2-1 = Informal coordination mechanisms tend to undermine rather than complement formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination.

Finland

Score 10

Intersectoral coordination has generally been perceived as an important issue in Finnish politics, but rather few institutional mechanisms have in fact been introduced. One of these is the Iltakoulu (evening session), an informal meeting between the ministers with the objective of discussing and preparing key matters to be handled in the government's plenary session the following day. In addition, there are other informal government meetings and items can also be referred to informal ministerial working groups. To a considerable extent, then, coordination proceeds effectively through informal mechanisms. Recent large-scale policy programs have enhanced intersectoral policymaking; additionally, Finland's membership in the European Union has of course necessitated increased interministerial coordination. Recent research in Finland has only focused tangentially on informal mechanisms, but various case studies suggest that the system of coordination by advisory councils has performed well.

Citation:

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

<https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/government/informal-government-meetings-and-ministerial-working-groups>

Hungary

Score 10

The strong formal role of Prime Minister Orbán and his Prime Minister's Office is complemented by informal coordination mechanisms. As the power concentration has further increased in the fourth Orbán government, so has the role of informal

decision-making. Formal mechanisms only serve to legalize and implement improvised and hastily made decisions by the prime minister. Orbán regularly brings together officials from his larger circle in order to give instructions. Many decisions originate from these meetings, which subsequently ripple informally through the system before any formal decision is made. These informal coordination mechanisms make rapid decision-making possible. Given the pivotal role of the prime minister, this system encourages anticipative obedience, but also creates a bottleneck in the implementation of decisions and precludes any genuine feedback. Orbán travels with a large retinue of personal staff and rules the country by the “remote control” use of phone calls, which terrifies medium-level politicians. If the prime minister is not available, ready or able to decide, issues remain in the air without any decision being made. A case in point was the widespread chaos in the government and Fidesz following the weak showing of Fidesz in the 2019 municipal elections and the Borkai scandal. Since Orbán had a very busy international program immediately before and after the elections, in some instances, Fidesz leaders received instructions four days after the elections.

Japan

Score 9

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

Under the government in power since 2012, the political leadership has had to navigate skillfully between the coalition partners, line ministries and their bureaucrats, and a more inquisitive public. The chief cabinet secretary is a key actor in this regard. Cabinet meetings are essentially formalities, with sensitive issues informally discussed and decided beforehand. Ministries collect and make public few, if any, records of meetings between politicians and bureaucrats as they are supposed to do under the 2008 Basic Act of Reform of the National Civil Servant System.

The general trend toward greater transparency may even have strengthened the role of informality in order to avoid awkward situations. In a number of instances, it has become apparent that senior agencies have deleted files relating to discussions extremely early. In 2019, the chief cabinet secretary admitted that no records of meetings between the prime minister and senior officials are kept at the prime minister’s office.

Citation:

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

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

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

Hiroyuki Oba, Suga admits Japan PM office kept no records of meetings between Abe, gov't agency execs, *The Mainichi*, 4 June 2019, <https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20190604/p2a/00m/0na/011000c>

Luxembourg

Score 9

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

Citation:

Bossaert, Danielle (2008): Die Modernisierung der öffentlichen Verwaltung und des öffentlichen Dienstes im Großherzogtum Luxemburg in: Wolfgang H. Lorig (ed.): *Moderne Verwaltung in der Bürgergesellschaft*, Nomos Verlag, Baden-Baden, pp. 298 – 312.

New Zealand

Score 9

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

Citation:

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

Switzerland

- Score 9** Given the small size of the federal administration and the country's tradition of informal coordination, there is a continuing presence of strong and effective informal coordination. According to Mavrot and Sager, informal coordination not only takes place among administrative units in the seven departments, but also between the respective administrations at the different federal levels.

Citation:

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

Australia

- Score 8** Information coordination procedures exist at the level of the party, where informal consultations on policies take place on a regular basis to make sure that the party leadership supports the government's direction. This occurs regardless of which party is in office. The federal system and the division of responsibilities between the federal government and the state and territory governments means that informal coordination is always an important component of any policy that may involve the states. These procedures are ad hoc, and take place at two levels, among ministers from different jurisdictions, and at the level of senior public servants.

Belgium

- Score 8** Belgian governments are typically broad coalition governments, and informal coordination mechanisms are indispensable to their operations.

The central unit of coordination – the inner cabinet or “kern” – is comprised of deputy prime ministers (one from each coalition party), and the prime minister. The kern meets regularly to negotiate any strategic decision not foreseen in the governmental agreement which arises due to changing circumstances or specific difficulties within the coalition. Further down the line, party leaders and party whips ensure policy coordination with other ministers, secretaries of states and members of parliament. This kind of coordination relies heavily on strong linkages between each deputy prime minister and his or her respective party leader, and on the ability of both to impose the compromises reached within the kern to their respective ministers/secretaries of state and parliamentary groups. This is most frequently the case, as strong party discipline normally prevails.

The functional logic of the kern was, however, shattered in December 2018. An international campaign against the signing of the UN Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration rendered further coordination impossible. While the

government had initially agreed to sign the compact, the N-VA, the right-wing conservative member of the government, made a u-turn and declared it would vote against Belgium participating in the conference held in Morocco and voting to endorse it. The rest of the government, together with the left-wing opposition parties, instead decided to oppose what they viewed as the N-VA's efforts to commit "blackmail." The N-VA then withdrew from the government, which has since operated as a minority government with very little capacity to initiate proactive policymaking beyond daily management. Nonetheless, the kern system has been maintained with the remaining parties in government.

Legislative elections held in May 2019 delivered a strongly polarized parliament, with both the Flemish extreme right and the Walloon extreme left gaining seats. Popular movements in support of a faster "green transition" also stimulated green parties. This fractionalization of parliament has produced a deadlock and – so far – (November 2019) prevented a new federal government from being formed.

Chile

Score 8 Informal coordination plays an important role in settling issues so that the cabinet can focus on strategic-policy debates. Existing informal mechanisms might be characterized as "formal informality," as informal coordination mechanisms are de facto as institutionalized as formal ones in daily political practice.

Denmark

Score 8 The Danish administrative system is a mix of formal rules and norms and more informal traditions. As a few examples, officials hold informal talks in the halls of government, over lunch and during travel to and from Brussels. The informal mechanisms can make formal meetings more efficient. Of course, important decisions must be confirmed in more formal settings. At the political level, informal mechanisms are probably more important than formal ones among officials. The fact that most governments have been coalition governments (and often minority governments) has increased the importance of information coordination mechanisms.

Citation:

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

France

Score 8 A crucial factor and essentially an invisible coordination mechanism is the "old-boy network" of former students from the "grandes écoles" (École nationale d'administration (ENA), École Polytechnique, Mines, ParisTech, etc.) or

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

Greece

Score 8

Most coordination mechanisms are informal and complement the more meager formal coordination mechanisms, such as the infrequently convened cabinet and ministerial committees. Most informal mechanisms are ad hoc meetings among ministers convened at the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO). Such meetings are followed up by person-to-person contacts between staff members of the PMO and advisers to ministers. In the review period, under pressure to complete the Third Economic Adjustment Program for Greece, informal coordination was frequent and organized by close associates of Prime Minister Tsipras (e.g., ministers without a portfolio) working at the PMO. Following the cabinet reshuffle of August 2018, at least three ministers were successively given such informal-coordination roles. The role of informal coordination was preserved after the government turnover of July 2019, as a deputy prime minister, one additional minister and one junior minister without portfolio were appointed to serve directly under the prime minister, and tasked with steering the government mechanism. Overall, the importance of informal coordination has increased over time.

Ireland

Score 8

All governments in Ireland between 1989 and 2016 have been coalition governments. The 2016 general election produced a Fine Gael-led minority government with nine independent deputies, a government which is dependent on the abstentionism of the main opposition party, Fianna Fáil, in votes relating to confidence and supply.

The impression conveyed by accounts of cabinet meetings is that the agenda is usually too heavy to allow long debates on fundamental issues, which tend to have been settled in various ways prior to the meeting. On the whole these informal

coordination mechanisms appear to work effectively (see also Ministerial Bureaucracy on the importance on ministers' special advisers).

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

Citation:

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

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

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

Poland

Score 8

Informal mechanisms of coordination have played an important role under the PiS government. PiS Chairman Jarosław Kaczyński has served as the gray eminence behind the scene. He makes many important decisions himself, and government ministers' standing strongly depends upon their relationship with him. Prime Minister Morawiecki's informal power has grown as both his public reputation and his personal relationship with Kaczyński have improved.

South Korea

Score 8

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

In addition, informal coordination processes tend to be plagued by nepotism and regional or peer-group loyalties, particularly among high-school and university alumni. There has been both cooperation and competition between the ministries. Informal networks between the president and powerful politicians work very effectively to further specific policies. However, these practices can also lead to

corruption and an inefficient allocation of resources. The Moon government has been criticized for working within relatively small networks of key staffers; moreover, in a number of cases of failed implementation, it has emerged that informal networks and coordination have overridden formal policy.

Citation:

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

Spain

Score 8

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

Citation:

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

Sweden

Score 8

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

Citation:

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

United Kingdom

Score 8 Informal coordination was a hallmark of the Labour governments under Tony Blair (1997 – 2007). However, informal coordination was reduced during the Labour government of Gordon Brown (2007 – 2010) and largely abolished under the coalition government (2010 – 2015), because of the need for avoiding tensions within the coalition.

Having returned to one-party government in May 2015, it was expected that informal forms of coordination would become more common again. Yet, the divisions within the governing Conservative Party, namely among senior ministers and party factions, over the United Kingdom's future relations with the European Union complicated informal coordination, to a point of more or less open sabotage, that finally led to the collapse of the May government. The rift within the Conservative Party even widened under May's successor Boris Johnson.

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

Citation:

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

Canada

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

It is worth noting that Canada's federal system has no formal provisions that deal specifically with federal-provincial coordination. Pressing federal-provincial issues and other matters that require inter-governmental discussions are usually addressed in the First Ministers' Conference, which includes the prime minister, provincial premiers and territorial leaders, along with their officials. These meetings are called by the prime minister and have typically been held annually, but there is no formal schedule. The lack of any requirement for the conference to be held regularly is cause for concern, as it is critical for first ministers and the prime minister to engage in face-to-face discussions or negotiations, given the many policy areas that demand federal-provincial coordination. The latest First Ministers' Conference, held in 2018, revealed deep interprovincial and federal-provincial rifts, ranging from the quarrel between Alberta and British Columbia on the Trans-Mountain pipeline expansion, provincial resistance to the carbon tax and the debate over immigration to the persistence of interprovincial trade barriers.

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

Estonia

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

Iceland

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

The SIC report also identified a tendency to move big decisions and important cooperative discussions into informal meetings between the chairmen of the ruling coalition parties. In March 2016, revised regulations on the procedures for cabinets were introduced but this only addresses formal cabinet meetings and not informal ministerial meetings. Therefore, we can conclude that the SIC report's call for clearer regulation has been addressed in part. However, informal meetings continue without proper reporting.

Citation:

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

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

Latvia

Score 7 A coalition council that represents the political parties forming the governing coalition meets for weekly informal consultations. Despite its regular meetings with formal agendas, the council is not a part of the official decision-making process. Given that cabinet meetings are open to the press and public, coalition-council meetings provide an opportunity for off-the-record discussions and coordination. The

council plays a de facto gatekeeping function for controversial issues, deciding when there is enough consensus to move issues to the cabinet. The coalition council can play both a complementary role, creating an enabling environment for consensus-building, and a destructive role, undermining the legitimacy of the official decision-making process.

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

Lithuania

Score 7

Formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination still dominate the decision-making process, despite the emergence of new informal coordination mechanisms and practices at the central level of government. Political councils are created to solve political disagreements within the ruling coalition. In addition, the leadership of political parties represented in the government is often involved in the coordination of political issues. Informal meetings are sometimes called to coordinate various issues at the administrative or political level. Since the Skvernelis government decided at the end of 2018 to make all government meetings public (official government sessions had already been public before this decision), cabinet ministers have more frequently engaged in informal policy discussions.

Furthermore, the 2012 to 2016 government planned to develop a senior civil service stratum, which could actively engage in policy coordination at the managerial level. However, these politically sensitive provisions were later withdrawn from subsequent drafts of the Civil Service Law. New civil service legislation adopted in 2018 did not establish a higher civil service. In addition, by making ministerial chancellors into political appointees, Lithuanian authorities have further politicized the ministry administrations.

Malta

Score 7

The government tendency toward informal coordination mechanisms has increased since Malta joined the European Union in 2004. Many directives from Brussels cut across departments and ministries, and ministries have to talk to and work more closely together. Preparations for the EU presidency in January 2017 and the actions taken during the presidency itself raised this informal coordination to unprecedented levels. Government longevity has also helped to strengthen this informal consultation process. As senior managers remain in their place, they build networks which they

can employ informally. This also applies at ministerial levels. Informal consultation also takes place within party structures, since these are seen as a link to the grassroots level.

Netherlands

Score 7

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

Under the present conditions, in which civil servants are subject to increasing parliamentary and media scrutiny, and in which gaps in trust and loyalty between the political leadership and the bureaucracy staff are growing, informal coordination and the personal chemistry among civil servants are what keeps things running. Regarding interministerial coordination, informal contacts between the senior staff (raadadviseurs) in the prime minister’s Council of Ministers and senior officers working for ministerial leadership are absolutely crucial. Nonetheless, such bureaucratic coordination is undermined by insufficient or absent informal political coordination.

Citation:

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

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

M. van Weezel and T. Broer, *Max en Thijs over de premier: het geheim van politiek trapezewerker en ‘nat zeepje’ Mark Rutte* (Vrij Nederland, vn.nl, accessed 8 November 2019)

Norway

Score 7

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

Portugal

Score 7 Informal coordination mechanisms are central to government functioning and coordination. The horizontal informal links between ministries help compensate for the absence or rigidity of formal horizontal linkages. Informal coordination became even more important as the Socialist Party government depended on the PCP and BE to pass legislation during the 2015 – 2019 legislature. It appears likely that this pattern will continue under the new government formed in late October 2019.

Slovenia

Score 7 Slovenia's tradition of coalition governments has meant that informal coordination procedures have played a significant role in policy coordination. In the period under review, the leaders of the five coalition parties met frequently, making major decisions at coalition meetings that were often also attended by the ministers and from time to time also by the leaders of parliamentary majority groups and coalition members of parliament. There were also regular meetings between the coalition and their outside supporting partner Levica (The Left). In press conferences and public statements after these meetings, very little information about the decisions made was provided to the public. The dominant role of the party leaders within their parties also meant that a considerable amount of policy coordination took place in party bodies.

United States

Score 7 The U.S. government is highly prone to informal coordination, relying on personal networks, constituency relationships and other means. As with formal processes, the effectiveness of such coordination is adversely affected by underdeveloped working relationships resulting from the short-term service of political appointees. The overall or average performance of informal coordination mechanisms has not been systematically evaluated. The Trump administration's lack of experienced personnel in key agency positions leads to an increased role for informal coordination, often based on various personal networks, such as people connected with Trump's family or businesses. These arrangements, however, are not sufficiently developed to make up for the lack of personnel and organization in the departments and agencies. The executive branch under Trump has seen calamitous failures of coordination – for example, in the failure to provide timely disaster assistance after a devastating 2017 hurricane in the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico, and the failure to provide effectively for the humane custody of more than 2,000 children seized in 2018 from asylum-seeking parents at the Mexican border. These failures of coordination, however,

largely reflect general problems of understaffing and lack of competent leadership in the departments and agencies in the Trump presidency.

Austria

Score 6 Previous coordination mechanisms – like weekly informal meetings within each cabinet faction and the cabinet as a whole, as well as the regular informal meetings between the chancellor and vice-chancellor – were sufficiently effective. They did not guarantee a smooth decision-making process based on consensus, but did allow the cabinet to make a realistic assessment of what collective decisions were possible or impossible. Informal coordination mechanisms were used to negotiate a compromise when a proposal from one party’s minister was unacceptable to the other coalition party.

The most effective form of informal coordination within the new government seems to be regular, but not formalized meetings between the chancellor and vice-chancellor. During 2018, the first year of the ÖVP-FPÖ coalition government – before the coalition imploded in 2019 – this pattern obviously worked given that no conflicts between the two coalition partners or between different ministers became public. Only at the end of the coalition – after the FPÖ tried to save the coalition by sacrificing its chairman (and vice-chancellor), Strache, following the “Ibiza scandal” – did informal coordination between the two partners collapse.

Czechia

Score 6 Informal coordination mechanisms have featured prominently in Czech political culture. Like its predecessor, the Babiš government depends on a coalition agreement, which includes agreements on policies as well as coordination mechanisms. Fundamental issues are addressed at the level of the chairmen of the coalition parties or the coalition council. The coalition council consists of the chairpersons of the coalition parties and a maximum of three other representatives of the respective coalition parties. Coordination mechanisms at the level of parliamentary and senatorial clubs are also important. Moreover, the coalition partners also maintain expert commissions consisting of members and party supporters. Because the Babiš government relies on support from the Communist Party (KSČM), it must also take the latter’s reactions into account even though it is not a formal coalition partner. President Zeman is often personally engaged in negotiating Communists support for governmental policies. In fall 2019, the president also personally appeared in the Chamber of Deputies to elicit support for the 2020 budget.

Germany

Score 6 There are a number of informal mechanisms by which government policy is coordinated. The most important of these is the coalition committee, which comprises the most important actors (the chancellor, the vice chancellor, the chairpersons of the parliamentary groups and the party chairpersons) within the coalition parties. According to the recent coalition agreement from 2017, the coalition committee is expected to meet regularly, or can be convened at the request of any of the coalition partners. The coalition committee deals with the most controversial issues, typically yielding decisions based on the lowest common denominator.

Bulgaria

Score 5 Given the tendency of the Bulgarian political system to produce coalition governments, informal coordination mechanisms have played a vital role in interministerial coordination. The rules of coordination between government coalition parties or parties supporting the government are traditionally not communicated to the public. In 2019, informal coordination within the governing coalition was complicated by the fact that the junior partner, a coalition of three nationalistic parties, had de facto fallen apart, with its three leaders engaging in severe and public attacks on one another. This has forced Prime Minister Borissov to rely on purely ad hoc tactics in every specific decision-making context.

Israel

Score 5 Israel's government system is greatly influenced by informal coordination mechanisms, such as coalition obligations and internal party politics. However, due to its highly fragmented party system, it is hard to determine whether they support or undermine formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination. While coordination between like-minded parties may be made easier by the situation, fragmentation may result in stagnation over disputed policies.

Citation:

“Annual report 61 for the year 2010: Treatment of prolonged interministerial disagreements,” The State Comptroller office website (Hebrew)

Blander, Dana and Ben Nur, Gal, “Governmental coalitions: A steering mechanism in the political system,” in The political system in Israel 2013: <http://www.idi.org.il/מירמאמו-בירפס>-האצוה/מירפסה/רואל-האצוה/מירפסה/רואל-האצוה/מירפסה-תכרעמה/הישרקומדל-הירפסה/מירפסה-רואל-האצוה/מירמאמו-בירפס (Hebrew).

“Coalition management,” the Knesset website: <http://main.knesset.gov.il/About/Lexicon/Pages/coalition-management.aspx> (Hebrew)

Rivlin, Reuven, “The intellectual independency of the Knesset member: the limit of the coalition obligation,” The Israel Democracy Institute (December 2010) (Hebrew).

Italy

- Score 5** Under the first Conte government, meetings between the president of the council and the two main political leaders, deputy prime ministers Di Maio and Salvini, acquired increased importance. But these were often hastily convened upon the eruption of an internal conflict. This coordination mechanism did not work smoothly, as the leaders of the two coalition parties were often busy conducting political campaigns. This often produced poorly prepared decisions that later needed to be corrected. This pattern has continued under the second Conte government.

Mexico

- Score 5** A number of informal mechanisms for coordinating policy exist, and given the lack of “formal” coordination capabilities within the Mexican administration, informal coordination often functions as a substitute. This is normal in a presidential system where only a few cabinet secretaries have independent political bases. Ministers retain their positions, for the most part, at the will of the president. It is important to note, however, that some cabinet secretaries are more equal than others. Since his election, President López Obrador has dominated Mexican politics, with interministerial coordination in the hands of the presidency.

Turkey

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

As of 1 August 2018, several coordination committees and boards, presidential policy councils and other public institutions were established in association with the presidency. During the review period, observers have publicly pointed to the need for coordination mechanisms between the ministries, parliament and the AKP. The president appears to make use of an informal coordination network but exactly how it works is not clear.

Citation:

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

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

Croatia

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

Cyprus

- Score 4 A practice of informal meetings exists but has been infrequently utilized. During the post-2010 economic difficulties, more formal meetings took place than before. In the period under review, we noted an increased number of ad hoc formal meetings, in particular with political parties, for important issues, such as migration, refugees and general reforms.

Slovakia

- Score 4 Informal coordination has played a significant, yet ambivalent role in policy coordination. On the one hand, the Pellegrini government has sought to complement the formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination through a complex system of coalition councils, meetings and agreements. On the other hand, former prime minister Robert Fico has frequently tried to undermine coalition compromises by capitalizing on his power within Smer-SDS. As a result, the governing coalition went through a number of coordination crises in the period under review. In late 2018, Smer-SD and SNS opposed Slovakia joining the U.N. Global Migration Compact, which had been approved by the country in July 2018 when Foreign Minister Miroslav Lajčák served as president of the U.N. General Assembly. In October 2019, the Pellegrini government withdrew a healthcare reform, which had already been approved by the cabinet, but was opposed by Fico. Also in October 2019, Smer-SD and SNS ignored opposition from their coalition partner, and the concerns of Prime Minister Pellegrini and other senior cabinet figures to join forces with the far-right opposition party ĽSNS to pass a bill prolonging the moratorium on the publication of pre-election opinion polls.

Romania

Score 3

In addition to the formal mechanisms of interministerial coordination, there has been an informal coordination of the government's work by PSD chef Liviu Dragnea, the "éminence grise" of the PSD governments. Barred from becoming prime minister himself by a criminal conviction, Dragnea has been keen on preventing prime ministers to act in too independent a manner. In January 2018, he toppled Prime Minister Mihai Tudose, barely seven months after his predecessor Sorin Grindeanu had suffered the same fate. Thus, the informal coordination within the governing party has tended to undermine rather than complement the formal coordination mechanisms within government. Since his imprisonment in May 2019, however, Dragnea's control over the PSD and the Dăncilă government has weakened.

Indicator **Digitalization for Interministerial Coordination**

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

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

- 10-9 = The government uses digital technologies extensively and effectively to support interministerial coordination.
- 8-6 = The government uses digital technologies in most cases and somewhat effectively to support interministerial coordination.
- 5-3 = The government uses digital technologies to a lesser degree and with limited effects to support interministerial coordination.
- 2-1 = The government makes no substantial use of digital technologies to support interministerial coordination.

Estonia

Score 10 The Estonian government has pioneered a large-scale use of information technologies. An Information System for Legal Drafts (Eelnõude infosüsteem, EIS) is used to facilitate interministerial coordination and public consultations online. EIS allows users to search documents currently under consideration, participate in public consultations and submit comments on draft bills. Draft bills are submitted to the government and parliament via EIS.

Policymaking and policy monitoring are further supported by an interoperable data exchange platform X-Road, an integrated system that facilitates the exchange of data between different organizations and information systems. Over 900 enterprises and organizations use X-Road daily. X-Road is also the first data exchange platform in the world that allows data to be exchanged between countries automatically. Since June 2017, an automatic data exchange capability has been established between Estonia and Finland.

Denmark

Score 9 According to the European Commission's Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI), Denmark is the fourth most advanced country in the European Union (2019) when it comes to using digital technologies. The index is based on connectivity,

human capital, use of internet services, integration of digital technology, digital public services, the EU ICT sector and its R&D performance, and research and innovation. Public services are highly digitalized in Denmark, including e-government and e-healthcare services.

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

Although these reports and strategies do not focus on interministerial coordination as such, digital technologies are also increasingly used to facilitate interministerial coordination.

Citation:

European Commission, "The Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI)," <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/desi> (Accessed 1 December 2019).

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

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

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

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

Finland

Score 9

Finland is a global leader for information and communications technology, and the digitalization of public services was a key project in Sipilä's government program. In line with this ambition, the government set out to digitalize internal administrative processes. The government administration department within the Prime Minister's Office, which has a central role in interministerial coordination, has a special Information Management and ICT Division. The government plenary session adopted an electronic tool for session materials in 2015. Ministers follow the progress of decision-making at plenary sessions on tablet computers. Finland is ranked first overall in the European Union's Digital Economy and Society Index (2019), and also holds the top place with regard to digital public services.

Citation:

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

New Zealand

- Score 9** The New Zealand government has identified a coordinating unit for ICT deployment at the center of government, developed a strategy (2015 ICT strategy) for coordination across government levels in order to improve effectiveness, and introduced new bodies in charge of leading the digital transformation. In 2017, the portfolio of minister for government digital services was created. The government chief digital officer (GCDO) is the government functional lead for developing and improving digital infrastructure across government. The GCDO is supported by the Digital Government Partnership, which is a partnership of stakeholders from agencies across government to support the goal of a coherent, all-of-government digital system. It helps the GCDO and government chief data steward (GCDS) to develop and improve the digital and data system across government; ensures government is aligned with the government ICT strategy; and reviews and informs the strategy. The partnership is made up of a leadership group and four working groups that support the strategy as well as a chairs' group, which bring together experts from across the different focus areas to provide support and advice to the leadership group. However, it is not absolutely clear how effective the use of digital technologies really is, especially with regard to interministerial coordination.

Citation:

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

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

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

Norway

- Score 9** Government ministries use similar digital platforms and share a digital platform for publishing information online. Ministries use digital technologies to coordinate activities, but the specific digital platform used depends on the specific security needs. Governance in Norway is highly digitized, which creates efficiencies. However, there is growing awareness of and sensitivity to managing cyber risks and ensuring secure ICT systems.

South Korea

- Score 9** The South Korean government utilizes e-government software (the Policy Task Management System) to monitor the implementation of policies in real time. In the UN E-Government Survey 2018, Korea was ranked at third place internationally for the implementation of e-government.

Citation:

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

Lithuania

Score 8 Lithuanian authorities use digital technologies frequently and quite effectively to support interministerial coordination during policy development and monitoring. Various document management systems track the execution of activities set out in the Government Program's Action Plan and other documents, while the MIS (Monitoring Information System) supports the preparation of strategic (action) plans and budget programs. There are two systems and IT tools for monitoring the implementation of EU-financed and national interventions (the Structural Funds' MIS and MIS). Also, there is a special information system that enables online cooperation among state institutions and external stakeholders in the negotiation of EU legislation, while a new system for the coordination of systemic projects is under development within the framework of managing government priorities.

Although Lithuanian authorities rely strongly on IT systems during interministerial coordination, the application of collaborative knowledge management tools (e.g., shared spaces and collaborative learning) is underdeveloped. New IT solutions are being developed centralizing support services in a newly established National Center of Shared Services that will provide accounting and personnel management services to more than 100 institutions associated with the central government. Digital technologies do support policy coordination, but their potential is not exploited for jointly improving policy content during policy formulation, or to take corrective management actions during policy-monitoring processes. Several new laboratories have been established (PolicyLAB and GovTech) that may promote the development of innovative digital solutions in the public sector.

Spain

Score 8 Spain ranks 11th out of the 28 EU member states in the European Commission 2019 Digital Economy and Society Index. The performance of Spain is especially remarkable in the area of Digital Public Services, where Finland has the highest score, followed by Estonia, the Netherlands and Spain. Law 18/2015 on data reuse and data transparency has promoted a culture of open data within the public administration, and the public sector is quickly progressing with regard to the integration of digital technologies. In recent years, a number of laws updated procedures with the aim of exploring the potential of digital technologies and structures. Moreover, shared interdepartmental platforms (such as the Cl@ve platform) and shared services have been developed. According to the Digital Transformation Plan for the General Administration and Public Agencies (ICT Strategy 2015 – 2020), all ministries are required to draft digital-transformation action plans. These are to include means of simplifying interdepartmental working

procedures, the electronic exchange of information between administrative units, the issue of information classification, and the implementation of standards for the exchange of information. The secretary of state for digital progress at the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism is responsible for the implementation of the Digital Agenda for Spain.

Spain's decentralized structure has created challenges in establishing a coherent and nationwide interministerial e-government coordination plan. However, the ICT Strategy 2015 – 2020 and the Law on Common Administrative Procedures have together created a strategic framework for inter-administrative compatibility and coordination. The General Secretary for Digital Administration is the governing body for digital administration, rationalization of information technologies and communications in the field of public administration. In 2019, the PSOE government developed the Fourth National Action Plan for Digital Administration (2019 – 2021), taking into account contributions from public administrators, citizens and other agents of civil society. In March 2019, the Ministry for Science, Innovation and Universities published a Spanish RDI strategy on artificial intelligence.

Citation:

EC (2019), Europe's Digital Progress Report, Country Profile Spain, <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/scoreboard/spain>

EC (2019), Digital Government Factsheet 2019

file:///C:/Users/mario/Desktop/Digital_Government_Factsheets_Spain_2019_1.pdf

Spanish government (2015), ICT STRATEGY 2015-2020

United Kingdom

Score 8

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

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

The Cabinet Office has introduced the "Better Information for Better Government" program in response to Sir Alex Allan's Review, which examined the government's approach to record-keeping in the digital age. However, effective digitalization in the NHS remains a major challenge and there were difficulties in rolling out the Universal Credit welfare reforms.

An assessment by Daniel Thornton of the Institute for Government provided qualified support to government efforts to achieve more digital coordination. A report by the Public Accounts Committee on the progress of the government's Verify program (intended to ease digital access for citizens by simplifying verification of their identity) was scathing about the failures of implementation and lack of progress.

Citation:

Alex

Allan

review:

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

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

<https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/public-accounts-committee/news-parliament-2017/accessing-public-services-through-verify-report-published-17-19/>

United States

Score 8

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

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

Australia

Score 7

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

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

Citation:

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

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

Belgium

Score 7

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

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

Citation:

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

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

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

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

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

Bulgaria

Score 7

The 2014 – 2020 e-government strategy and the State e-Government Agency, established in 2016, aim to improve interministerial communication through the use of digital technologies. The necessary infrastructure for electronic document flows and communication between ministries exists and is increasingly used. As of the end of 2019, no e-government strategy proposal for the 2021 – 2027 program period had yet been made public.

Chile

Score 7

The president's advisory ministry (Ministerio Secretaría General de la Presidencia, Segpres) and the Division for Digital Government support line ministries and respective services with digitalization, facilitating instruments and providing advice regarding the implementation of digital services. The implementation of the Digital Agenda 2020, released in 2015, has been continued by the current government of Sebastián Piñera. In general, and especially in comparison with other Latin American countries, the level of digitalization regarding public information and services in Chile is quite advanced. Chile is trying to follow OECD recommendations to ensure consistency in the use of technology as an enabler for open government. To achieve this, public institutions have increasingly adopted digital tools and open-government agendas.

Citation:

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

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

OECD: Digital Government in Chile, Strengthening the Institutional and Governance Framework, 2016, DOI:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264258013-en>

Ireland

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

Latvia

Score 7 In 2013, the Cabinet of Ministers approved the Information Society Development Guidelines 2014 – 2020, which is the current National e-Government Strategy. The guidelines were elaborated to ensure continuity of existing policies, and to determine priorities in the area of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for the European Union Structural Funds Programming period 2014 – 2020. One of the key goals identified in the document was the creation of centralized platforms for all governmental actors, ensuring more efficient public administration and emphasizing inter-institutional and cross-sectoral government cooperation.

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

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

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

A 2018 report by VARAM observed that the percentage of digital documents in inter-institutional communication had risen from 14% in 2014 to 39% in 2018, but noted that inter-institutional cooperation could be improved by organizing it centrally within departments rather than delegating this task to other offices.

Citation:

1. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (2018) E-Index:Results, Available at (in Latvian): <https://mana.latvija.lv/e-indeksa-rezultati/>, Last assessed: 05.11.2019.
2. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (2013), Guidelines for Development of Information Society 2014-2020, Available at: http://www.varam.gov.lv/eng/darbibas_veidi/e_gov/?doc=13317, Last assessed: 05.11.2019.
3. Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (2017), Report on the circulation of electronic documents in ministries and their subordinate institutions (in Latvian), Available at: http://www.varam.gov.lv/in_site/tools/download.php?file=files/text/Dokumenti/pol_doc/elietas/MK_171017_InfoZinojums.pdf, Last assessed: 05.11.2019.
4. State Audit Office (2017), Report: Is public administration handling the accumulated information effectively?, Available at: http://www.lrvk.gov.lv/uploads/reviziju-zinojumi/2016/2.4.1-12_2016/zinojums.pdf, Last assessed: 05.11.2019.

Luxembourg

Score 7

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

Citation:

- <https://guichet.public.lu/de/entreprises/urbanisme-environnement/construction-amenagement-site/construction-transformation-demolition/plan-amenagement-general.html>. Accessed 20 Oct 2018.
- <https://guichet.public.lu/de/entreprises/urbanisme-environnement/construction-amenagement-site/construction-transformation-demolition/plan-amenagement-particulier.html>. Accessed 20 Oct 2018.
- “Noch viel Platz in Luxemburg,” Tageblatt, 11 September 2017. <http://www.tageblatt.lu/headlines/noch-viel-platz-in-luxemburg/> Accessed 20 Oct. 2019.

Malta

Score 7

The use of digital technologies in Malta has now become widespread both to support interministerial coordination and for client use. The government is determined to make full use of digital technologies, including blockchain. A total of €40 million have been earmarked for the digitalization of public services over the next five years. Individual government ministries can access policies by other ministries that may touch on their own policy formulation, as well as any policies that come from the cabinet.

Each government ministry has its own information management unit (IMU), headed by a chief information officer (CIO). The IMU's primary role is to ensure that the information technology used is aligned with the ministry's strategic priorities. IMUs are also involved in applying government-wide policies, standards and protocols aimed at ensuring that IT systems are mutually compatible and that staff members understand and adhere to government policies and procedures.

All CIOs are a part of a CIO Forum chaired by the permanent secretary (strategy and implementation) within the Office of the Prime Minister. Various topics and issues are discussed during the monthly meetings; however, the CIO Forum also serves as a venue in which ideas and projects can be shared across ministries. This serves as a platform for CIOs to unite their efforts toward achieving a digitalized public administration.

In 2017, a total of 21 mobile apps for government services were launched; moreover, the servizz.gov.mt website went live, offering access to about 800 services and the associated forms. The public.service.gov.mt website was also launched to disseminate information and news about the country's public services. The 2019 Ombudsman report focused on efforts to upgrade this technology in such a way as to facilitate the monitoring of ministries.

Citation:

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

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

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

<https://timesofmalta.com/articles/view/public-services-to-be-digitized-over-the-next-few-years.714394>

<https://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2019-06-17/local-news/40-million-investment-for-digital-transformation-of-the-public-administration-6736209668>

https://publicservice.gov.mt/en/Documents/MappingTomorrow_StrategicPlan2019.pdf

<https://mita.gov.mt/en/ict-features/Pages/2017/Malta-reconfirmed-as-European-leader-in-the-provision-of-digital-public-services.aspx>

<https://economy.gov.mt/en/ministry/The-Parliamentary-Secretary/Pages/Malta-Digital-Economy-Vision.aspx>

Slovenia

Score 7

In an effort to better coordinate the digitalization of public administration with the broader issue of digital transformation, the Cerar government transferred in 2016 competences for information society and electronic communication from the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport to the Ministry of Public Administration. This reorganization of responsibilities has yielded a more appropriate structure for the implementation of the 2016 "Digital Slovenia 2020" strategy and a more efficient use of the existing ICT infrastructure. One of the goals of the strategy is to further strengthen the use of digital technologies to support interministerial coordination.

Since the Šarec government has taken over, the implementation of the strategy has slowed.

Citation:

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

Switzerland

Score 7

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

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

On cross-national comparison, Switzerland receives medium to low scores on e-government issues. In the European Commission's e-Government Benchmark 2019 report, however, Switzerland fared well in terms of user-centricity and cross-border mobility for businesses. It received middling scores in terms of transparency and cross-border mobility for citizens, and low scores with respect to key enablers.

The federal government developed a Digital Switzerland Strategy in September 2018 emphasizing the opportunities associated with a digitalization of the economy, polity and society of a small country. The Confederation, the cantons and the communes have established e-Government Switzerland as the organization responsible for the expansion of e-government services in Switzerland. Its strategic plan runs under the framework agreement 2016-2019 and focuses on steering, planning and coordinating joint e-government activities at the three levels of government.

Citation:

<https://www.bakom.admin.ch/bakom/en/homepage/digital-switzerland-and-internet/strategie-digitale-schweiz.html>

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

Canada

Score 6

The effective control exercised by cabinet over the ministries mostly obviates the need for elaborate technical means of coordination. That said, the government created Shared Services Canada (SSC) in 2011, which is mandated to provide a unified IT infrastructure for the federal government that is modern, secure and reliable. SSC delivers email, data center, network and workplace technology device services to all government departments and agencies in a consolidated and standardized manner. The common IT program and platform naturally enables improved and secure information, and data sharing across all government agencies. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the consolidation of IT infrastructure through SSC has not gone smoothly, and the department has been criticized for slow service delivery and for putting some federal agencies at risk. Statistics Canada's chief statistician resigned in 2016, arguing that SSC compromised Statistics Canada's ability to fulfill its mandate. In 2017, RCMP Commissioner Bob Paulson criticized SSC for outages that negatively impacted police operations.

The federal government has been unsuccessful in the implementation of two major digital technologies, the Phoenix payroll system and the government-wide Canada.ca email reorganization. A recent PBO report stated that a functional pay system would not be operational until 2023. These failures cast serious doubt on the ability of the federal government to make effective use of digital technologies.

On a positive note, Canada has charged the governmental unit leading digital government efforts with responsibility for coordinating and leading action in the area of open government.

Citation:

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

Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, Costs Associated with Replacing the Federal Pay System, May 16 2019, posted at https://www.pbo-dpb.gc.ca/web/default/files/Documents/Reports/2019/Federal-pay-system-phoenix/Costs_Associated_with_Replacing_the_Federal_Pay_System_EN.pdf

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat 2018/19: Digital Operations Strategic Plan: 2018-2022, <https://www.canada.ca/en/government/system/digital-government/digital-operations-strategic-plan-2018-2022.html#ToC8>

France

Score 6

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

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

Hungary

Score 6

Previous Orbán governments did not pay much attention to the digitalization of government activities in general and of interministerial coordination in particular. However, the fourth Orbán government clearly represents a turning point. As the government has sought to enhance the competitiveness of the Hungarian government through technological modernization, the newly created Ministry of Innovation and Technology (ITM) has set more ambitious goals with respect to digitalization. Moreover, the oligarchs around the government have realized new business opportunities and have purchased firms in this field, especially with regard to EU transfers in the next Multinational Financial Framework. However, the use of digital technologies for interministerial coordination has just begun.

Citation:

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

Israel

Score 6

The Israeli Government ICT Authority was created in 2012 and placed under the Prime Minister's Office in 2015. In 2013, it introduced the Digital Israel program to assist government communication with the public by improving the digitalization of government offices. The initiative aims to strengthen public engagement through a

series of websites and online forms, and improve coordination between public, domestic and international NGO, academic, and government actions.

The authority also plans to digitize all services provided by the government and interministerial services. For example, 880 out of 960 forms, which were previously unavailable online, are now available online for public and interministerial use. This in turn facilitates better cooperation and coordination between government offices, as it minimizes bureaucratic work and provides a widely accessible platform for government offices. Furthermore, 120 services have been moved to digital and online platforms.

Another new initiative from the authority, the Open Government Initiative, aims to enable public and government offices to access the various sources and information archives needed to improve coordination and accessibility.

Excluding the work of the authority, the Knesset Parliamentary Oversight Coordination Unit (KATEF) was established in 2017 to monitor government work and the application of laws passed by the parliament. While it is not a digital body, the unit does publish reports and articles online for public and government use. With this, the Israeli parliament hopes to better monitor and support government activities.

Citation:

“Annual report 61 for the year 2010: Treatment of prolonged interministerial disagreements,” The State Comptroller office website (Hebrew)

Approval of the national digital plan, promotion of the “Digital Israel” national initiative and the reform of government decisions, https://www.gov.il/he/departments/policies/2017_dec2733

Blander, Dana and Ben Nur, Gal, “Governmental coalitions: A steering mechanism in the political system,” in The political system in Israel 2013: <http://www.idi.org.il/מירפס-מירמאמו-מירפס-האצוה/האצוה-מירפס-מירפס-האצוה-מירפס-מירפס-האצוה> (Hebrew).

“Coalition management,” the Knesset website (Hebrew): <http://main.knesset.gov.il/About/Lexicon/Pages/coalition-management.aspx>

Headquarters for the National Digital Israel Initiative, Ministry of Social Equality, 2018 (Hebrew): https://www.gov.il/en/Departments/news/digital_israel_national_plan

KATEF – The Knesset Unit for the Coordination of Parliamentary Oversight, The Knesset (Hebrew): 2018, <https://main.knesset.gov.il/Activity/Oversight/Pages/OversightAbout.aspx>

National Initiative “Digital Israel,” Decision No. 1046 of the Cabinet, PMO Office, 2013 (Hebrew): https://www.gov.il/he/Departments/policies/2013_dec1046

OECD report: The government has taken extensive steps to reduce regulation, Ynet news, 2018 (Hebrew): <https://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-5310465,00.html>

PMO Office, Open Government Years 2018-2019 Work Plan, 2018, <http://www.pmo.gov.il/MediaCenter/SecretaryAnnouncements/Documents/DECO150218.pdf>

PMO Office, Israel Government ICT – Activity for the year 2019, 2019, <https://bit.ly/2XHUV4y>

Rivlin, Reuven, “The intellectual independency of the Knesset member: the limit of the coalition obligation,” The Israel Democracy Institute (December 2010) (Hebrew).

The end of the fax era? A new headquarters in the Prime Minister's Office will promote a digital vision for Israel, The Marker 2013 (Hebrew): <https://www.themarker.com/technation/1.2185272>

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

The Government Coordination Guide, Version 1, 2013, <https://bit.ly/3eZAkyy>

Mexico

Score 6

The Mexican government has adopted a National Digital Strategy and established a Change Management Plan in order to guide agencies in the development of projects. Furthermore, the Executive Council Interministerial Commission for e-Government Development (Comison Intersecretarial para el Desarrollo del Gobierno Electronico, CIDGE) has ensured the technical and operational coordination necessary to implement the strategy.

In July 2018, Mexico launched an online platform to track progress toward achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. President López Obrador has announced plans to create a public internet company, which will enable people in the most remote areas of the country to access the internet. Though this proposal is unlikely to be carried out in the near future.

However, as often in Mexico, implementation of digitalization is falling behind schedule, especially on the subnational level. This reflects the heterogeneity of digitalization within the broader Mexican society.

Citation:

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

OECD Digital Government Studies Digital Government in Mexico Sustainable and Inclusive Transformation: Sustainable and Inclusive Transformation, OECD 2020.

Poland

Score 6

The PiS government has been eager to increase the level of digitalization in the country and to use digital technologies to support interministerial coordination. On entering office, the PiS government established a separate Ministry of Digital Affairs and a Committee of the Council of Ministers for Digitalization. After some haggling, Marek Zagórski, who is also the deputy chairman of the Agreement party (i.e., the party of Deputy Prime Minister Jarosław Gowin), was appointed minister of digital affairs in April 2018. He kept this position following the 2019 elections. The Committee of the Council of Ministers for Digitalization has coordinated the government's use of digital technologies.

Citation:

European Commission (2019): Digital Government Factsheet 2019. https://www.ospi.es/export/sites/ospi/documents/documentos/Administracion-Digital/Digital_Government_Factsheets_Poland_2019.pdf

Portugal

Score 6 There is a unit responsible for providing technological support to the government, the Centro de Gestão da Rede Informática do Governo (Ceger).

This has a central remit to manage the government's IT network (Rede Informática do Governo, RInG). The information on Ceger's website indicates that there were 32 people working in this service in 2018, with a plan to increase this to 35 in 2019.

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

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

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

Sweden

Score 6 The digitalization of the Swedish public sector has come a rather long way. One exceptional example is the budget process (one of the key mechanisms to support coordination among government departments), where documents are digitally shared and simultaneously developed among various departments. The government also uses digital services to coordinate interdepartmental responses to communications from the EU. Overall, however, digitalization is mainly used to support intraorganizational processes such as drafting documents and only to a lesser extent to support interdepartmental coordination.

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

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

Turkey

Score 6

The Office of Digital Transformation, which is affiliated with the Presidency, is entitled to lead public policies and strategies targeting digital transformation and e-government. It is also tasked with communicating the delivery of services, improving inter-agency cooperation and coordination in these areas, all in accordance with the goal set by the president. No information has been provided with respect to a mechanism facilitating interministerial coordination. However, the closed “kamunet” network for a more secure data exchange between public institutions and organizations has been established as part of an effort to reduce cybersecurity risks.

Turkey is a member of the e-Europe+ initiative, while the e-Transformation Turkey Project was introduced by a prime ministerial circular of December 2003. In 2004, e-government applications were introduced into public administration following the adoption of e-signatures. In 2008, a prime ministerial circular stated that the electronic document management standards and Registered Electronic Mail (KEP) projects were being implemented. Turkey developed an Information Society Strategy and Action Plan 2006 – 2010. The subsequent 2015 – 2018 Information Society Strategy and Action Plan focuses on economic growth and employment, and includes 72 actions in eight axes, including horizontal issues.

Citation:

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

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

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

2019/12 Sayılı Bilgi Güvenliği Tedbirleri Cumhurbaşkanlığı Genelgesi, 5 July 2019, <https://cbddo.gov.tr/mevzuat/2019-12-sayili-bilgi-guvenligi-tedbirleri-cumhurbaskanligi-genelgesi/> (accessed 1 November 2019)

Czechia

Score 5

Digitalization of the state administration features as one of the priorities identified in the Babiš government manifesto. Some progress has been made with regard to enabling electronic communication between citizens and the authorities. In 2018, the government approved the Digital Czech Republic program, which aims at advancing the digitalization of the public administration, including the use of digital technologies in communications between ministries. The implementation plans for the program were elaborated in 2019. However, state funding for the project has remained insufficient, which means that the country’s digitalization efforts continue to lag behind those in other EU countries. Digital technologies have not taken a leading role in interministerial coordination.

Germany

- Score 5** In general, Germany has been slow to adopt e-governance mechanisms. There is as yet no special digital strategy for interministerial coordination. However, some Länder governments, such as Baden-Wuerttemberg and Brandenburg, have independently begun to digitalize their processes of interministerial coordination.

Greece

- Score 5** While the PMO in Greece uses modern information and communication technologies to monitor government mechanisms, there is little formal coordination of policies across and within ministries. Thus, it is difficult to envisage the digitalization of interministerial coordination. To the extent that such coordination takes place, it is not horizontal, but vertical – flowing from the PMO to line ministries through the political appointees and personal secretaries of the ministers. Policy coordination exists only with regard to the implementation of a few transversal policies, such as public procurement. The latter is now effected through a national system of public procurement (EAADHSY). This system functions through an appropriately developed digital platform for tenders and applications from suppliers of goods and services interested in serving the public sector. Following the government turnover of July 2019, a new ministry, the Ministry of Digital Governance, was established. This is likely to give new impetus to the use of digital technologies across the government. The ministry announced that its first goal was to achieve interoperability between state records systems, enabling different agencies to “talk” to each other and share information.

Citation:

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

The website of the Ministry of Digital Governance is available at <https://mindigital.gr/>

Austria

- Score 4** During the rather brief period of the ÖVP-FPÖ coalition government, nothing specific is known about the government’s approach to digitalization for interministerial coordination. However, as digitalization is very much discussed in public and in government circles, it is likely that a policy on digitalization for interministerial coordination is in the making. Though this will have been postponed until the formation of a new government, probably at the beginning of 2020. It is to be seen whether such an approach to coordination (which could become reality very soon) will run contra to the “message control” policy of the previous government –

or whether it can be used by the next cabinet to improve control over the government's public agenda.

Croatia

Score 4

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

Cyprus

Score 4

The use of digital technology covers a small spectrum of government work and activities as well as relations and interactions with citizens on public services. Some common IT programs aim at assisting the coordination of a limited number of activities, relating to payments, budget preparation and monitoring the progress of projects.

The Exandas project launched in September 2019 facilitates monitoring development works. An enterprise resource planning system, which is being prepared, is expected to enable the full coordination of government planning. Compared to other EU member states, digital services in public services are limited.

Citation:

1. The contract for Enterprise Resource Planning System for the Public Sector was signed, PIO, 7 November 2018, <https://www.pio.gov.cy/en/press-releases-article.html?id=4631#flat>
2. European Commission, The Digital Economy and Society Index, <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/desi>

Japan

Score 4

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

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

Citation:

Leading administrative reform under premise of digitization, METI Journal in the Japan Times, 11 January 2019, <https://meti-journal.japantimes.co.jp/2019-01-11/>

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

Netherlands

Score 4

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

In 2019, two important leaders in the push for improved ICT use within governmental departments resigned, and there are severe disagreements between the political and administrative levels of the Department of Internal Affairs and the leadership of the ICT Assessment Bureau, which was established in 2015 to coordinate ICT projects and contain cost overruns.

Citation:

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

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

Trouw, 15 May 2019. De ICT-projecten bij de overheid zijn nog steeds een chaos. (trouw.nl, accessed 8 November 2019)

Slovakia

Score 4

Slovakia lags behind many EU member states with regard to digitalization. In October 2017, the government published the Detailed Action Plan on the Digitization of Public Administration. The government aim is to develop an e-

government system for citizens, public administration, businesses and academia. In November 2017, an amendment to the Act on e-Government became effective which has introduced a central delivery system for official documents. As it stands, however, digital technologies play only a limited role in interministerial coordination.

Italy

Score 3 Although the government has created a digital-transformation team tasked with promoting digitalization within the public administration, there seems to be little use of digital technologies to support interministerial coordination.

:

https://teamdigitale.governo.it/assets/pdf/Relazione_TeamTrasformazioneDigitale_ITA_30set.pdf

Romania

Score 3 The 2014 National Strategy on Digital Agenda for Romania explicitly called on the public sector to embrace and optimize the use of digital technology for improving effectiveness in governance. This commitment was further buttressed through the establishment of a Government Chief Information Officer within the chancellery. In July 2018, the government announced plans to spend €45 million on the development of a government cloud framework to be used by all public institutions in the country. However, similar plans were announced in 2014 and 2017 without substantial results. Indeed, a 2018 report on government digitalization ranked Romania 67th out of 193 countries and last among 28 EU countries, and also noted that Romania implemented only one-fourth of all commitments it assumed in 2014. To date, the role actually played by digital technologies in interministerial coordination has been limited.

:

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

Iceland

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

:

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

Address | Contact

Bertelsmann Stiftung

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

Dr. Christof Schiller

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

Dr. Thorsten Hellmann

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

Pia Paulini

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

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