

Public Service Excellence in the 21st Century

Alikhan Baimenov • Panos Liverakos
Editors

Public Service Excellence in the 21st Century

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Alikhan Baimenov
Chairman of the Steering Committee
Astana Civil Service Hub
Astana, Kazakhstan

Panos Liverakos
Technical Advisor
Astana Civil Service Hub
Astana, Kazakhstan

ISBN 978-981-13-3214-2 ISBN 978-981-13-3215-9 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3215-9>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018965224

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © Andrew Brookes / Getty Images
Cover design by Fatima Jamadar

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

FOREWORD

The momentous political, economic and social changes that have taken place in the past 30–40 years, globalisation, increased interdependence among states, as well as rapid scientific and technological progress have all led to the creation of complex and new relationships and networks and new opportunities and challenges that national governance systems are forced to recognise and, in many cases, accept and effectively lead. In this setting, the state has become a less sacred concept and more of a structure intended to provide public services. Furthermore, citizens have become better informed about what is happening in other countries, thus enabling them to assess the performance of their governments when compared against government performance in other countries.

In this context, citizens, well aware of the technological innovations that have primarily evolved in the private sector recognise the irreversible disruptive effect that such changes afflict to the current state of affairs. They also perceive the potential of emerging technological applications in the public sector, both in the processes of governance and for the provision of citizen-friendly public service delivery. Inevitably, such perceptions cause the rise of citizens' expectations, which effectively change the very character of the government-citizen relationship. In this new setting, government organisations begin to operate in a new “quasi-competitive” environment, although, by their very nature, they still perform monopolistic functions.

Public administration reform and transformation of civil service systems are the core subjects of this study. Still, in light of the immense change that we have witnessed, during the past decades, our focus is mostly on trends

and the causes of those trends. We try to explore the manner in which these have played out in major parts of the world and what the twenty-first century may hold in store, accordingly for government administrations and the civil service, the way we know it today. To be sure, a rapidly ageing population, increased urbanisation and environmental degradation, swift technological advancement and globalisation of the marketplace pose immense challenges that need to be tackled successfully, and which will certainly affect the way governments and the civil service operate in the future.

Public organisations need to adapt accordingly, in order to continue being responsive to people's needs and expectations and thus remain relevant. For instance, governments should take notice of changes caused by cognitive technologies, better known as artificial intelligence, as the repercussions for governments of such technologies are far reaching. These technologies could allow decision-makers to advance their understanding of the cost, impact and consequences of their policy choices. They could also be used in public service delivery settings ranging from transport to healthcare and education, in times of tighter budgets, and in ways that meet the expectations of their increasingly connected citizens. Furthermore, as new technologies are so pervasive, governments need to adapt their regulations and their approach to security issues. They also need to rethink their role as employers, since such technologies may be used to support internal operations for government bodies and in human resource management.

The economy, demography and technology or rather the interface of massive trends in these is the theme of Chap. 2. Its title is suggestive of its thrust and concerns: "Fear and Loathing of Technological Progress? Leveraging Science and Innovation for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". The insightful contribution of Pedro Conceição, Director, Strategic Policy of the UNDP Policy and Programme Support Unit, explores the abiding need for institutions and policies to adopt to a constantly changing environment against the potent challenges of an ageing population, together with concerns to "leave no one behind". In the words of Peter Drucker, we live in an "Age of Discontinuity" (1969),¹ in which the course of change does not invariably follow a linear pattern. No one in the post-war decades, not even in the 1980s of the twentieth century could foretell the sudden implosion of the USSR or the spectacular rise of Planet Earth's two giants, China and India, on both the geopolitical and economic landscapes (Kim and Argyriades 2015).²

In this regard, however, the study of history shows that even ages past impart important lessons. Observers of the tendency towards “bureaucracy-bashing”, so current in our days, may be surprised to find that this is a phenomenon with roots in distant lands, 4000 years ago. So, says Max Everest-Phillips, Director of the UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence, in Singapore. “Plus, ça change, plus c’est la même chose” is a well-known French aphorism. Continuity and change are the threads that run through the argument of Chap. 3: “Lessons from Lagash: Public Service at the Start of History and Now” is its leitmotiv.

Chapter 4, titled “The Emergence of a New Model? Trajectories of Civil Service Development in the Former Soviet Union Countries”, explores civil service development in the post-Soviet countries over the past 30 years, since they gained their independence. The chapter takes the view that, following widespread experimentation with Western-type reforms in public administration and civil service, these countries have now realised that in order to further reform, in a truly meaningful way, they should really look at each other and learn from one another, in order to proceed. Alikhan Baimenov, as Chairman of the Steering Committee of the Astana Civil Service Hub (ACSH) and Saltanat Janenova, Assistant Professor at the School of Public Policy, Nazarbayev University, both in Astana, are very well positioned to address this challenging topic, made complex as a result of the very great diversity of the countries that it covers.

Comparative analyses of public sector management and civil service reform represent the common thread, which runs through Chaps. 5, 6, and 7. The countries examined there are chiefly in East Asia. The cases of Japan, Korea and the People’s Republic of China are carefully reviewed by eminent scholars and experts, with a focus on technology and global trends. Akira Nakamura is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Public Administration, Meiji University, Japan, and Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), USA. He has co-authored Chap. 5 with Kiyoshi Suzuki, Associate Professor of Public Administration at the School of Law, University of Senshu, Japan. From Korea, Byeong-Soo Yoon, Professor of the Korean National Human Resource Development Institute, explores a seminal topic: the role of civil servants in the constantly changing directions of public personnel policy in light of future needs. China is represented by Professor Li Junpeng and Associate Professor Zhang Xian, both with the Chinese Academy of Governance (CAG). Their chapter explores China’s public service and

capacity-building efforts in order to satisfy the demands and expectations of its citizens in the twenty-first century.

Three final chapters 8, 9, and 10, address emerging issues with an eye on current trends in public administration and the challenges they entail. Contributed, respectively, by Dr Christine Leitner with Dr Christian Stiefmueller and, once already mentioned, Everest-Phillips, Chaps. 8 and 9 cut across the subject matter of regional analyses inviting the readers' attention to current dominant trends and challenges confronting administrative systems and civil service management. One has been touched upon: technology, innovation and their often-disruptive effects on society and on governments. It is the focus of Chap. 8 by Leitner and Stiefmueller, respectively, Senior Advisor for Economics and Public Administration and Managing Director at the Centre for Economics and Public Administration (CEPA), both in the UK. In Chap. 9, Everest-Phillips explores what he has called the politics of "Big Data". It places current anxieties, as well as expectations about their growing potential, in an historical context. Given the importance of data in shaping government policy and public service management, the need for oversight over the collection, processing and dissemination of data cannot be overstated. But risk of power abuse must also be underscored because how public authorities address those major perils as well as the transparency in all of data management condition public trust. Sadly, levels of trust worldwide are currently low, affecting the degree of public participation and general acceptance of government and governance (Newland 2015a, b). In the concluding chapter, Chap. 10, Alikhan Baimenov and Panos Liverakos reflect on the crucial role of cooperation and partnerships in international development, as well as in the sharing of information and knowledge for capacity building, through peer-to-peer networks in these fast-changing times.

The Preface and Chap. 1 represent the contribution of three international experts and scholars of repute, who have also played a pivotal role in the growth of the ACSH and in the tasks of preparation, oversight and overall guidance, which gave shape to this volume. They are none other, in fact, than Pan Suk Kim, past President of the IIAS and of the Asian Institute of Public Administration, who is currently the Minister of Public Personnel Management in the Korean government, as well as Professor of Public Administration at Yonsei University; Chester A. Newland, Past President of American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) and Editor-in-Chief of the *Public Administration Review*, currently Senior Professor Emeritus of the University of Southern California; and Demetrios

Argyriades, former UN Consultant and currently Professor of Public Administration at John Jay College, CUNY, in New York.

To them and to all contributors and authors of this volume, the ASCH addresses its most heartfelt sincere appreciation for their valuable and steadfast support. It also extends its earnest thanks to the UNDP Resident Representative in Kazakhstan, Norimasa Shimomura, for his continuous backing in accomplishing this endeavour.

Astana, Kazakhstan

Alikhan Baimenov
Panos Liverakos

NOTES

1. Drucker, Peter F. 1969. *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to our Changing Society*. London: Heinemann.
2. Kim and Argyriades (2015).

PREFACE

When Confucius visited Lao Tzu, he talked of goodness and duty, ‘Chaff from the winnower’s fan,’ said Lao Tzu, ‘can so blind the eyes that we do not know if we are looking north, south, east or west; at heavens or the earth ... All ... those perpetual pin-pricks unnerve and irritate the heaven; nothing indeed, could be more destructive of inner tranquillity’. (Chuang Tzu)

“The State is back!” was Geert Bouckaert’s parting salvo at the International Conference of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), in July 2011. We are in 2018 and—less as a statement of fact than as fervent expression of hope—the message has been heard in both political circles and academic conventions in the intervening years, at fairly frequent intervals. I echoed this pronouncement in a Preface to the volume of the IIAS which appeared in 2013 (Argyriades and Timsit 2013: 9–16). “And not a day too soon”, one might be tempted to add in light of the dysfunctional, as well as painful outcomes occasioned by decades of “hollowing out the State”.

THE STATE AND SDG16

Although eight years have lapsed, this statement, underscoring the pivotal role of the State, has lost none of its relevance, given, on the one hand, the trials and tribulations that vast swaths of the world have undergone in barely three decades and, on the other hand, the steep and mounting challenges of trying to meet the targets of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030. Of these Development Goals,

SDG16 (i.e. promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development; provide access to justice for all; and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels) may be considered the weightiest; it certainly underpins and conditions all the others. Not surprisingly, these challenges represented the core of the agenda of the annual conference of the Eastern Regional Organisation for Public Administration (EROPA), which was held in Seoul, from 11 to 15 September 2017. One of the special sessions of the conference, on Day 3, which I was asked to lead and moderate, focused attention on the world's most intricate challenge: the perils that *fragility* and *fragmentation*, often leading to *failure* of States, presents to the global community. The perils—most pronounced in those parts of the world which suffer from endemic, endless, relentless wars—have also reared their heads wherever the institutions of governance and government are manifestly feeble, unable to confront a rampant disarray, to overcome inertia, restore a measure of trust and rally public opinion around the shared objectives of SDG16.

Restoring *public trust* and rallying public opinion have served, throughout the ages, as metrics of success for leaders, institutions and organisations. They represent the tasks that no ruler or person in a position of power, however secure, may safely ignore or neglect. Their critical importance has been the theme of study in recent times (Inglehart 2018; Fukuyama 1995). Though, since the days of Plato, the Prophets and Confucius, the practice of civility, reason, virtue and moderation have been sure guides of conduct in this regard, they seem to have retreated in recent years, as crises—economic, political and social—have plagued parts of the world. Lip service to these values notwithstanding, many countries have experienced a decline in their effectiveness as factors of cohesion, with largely adverse effects on governance and government. The causes of this trend are multiple and complex, as recent analyses show (Newland 2015a, b). Although it may subside with better models of governance, reversal of this trend may well be slow in coming, so long as centrifugal, mostly disruptive, forces supportive of this trend remain at work.

Lessons of three millennia, as well as three decades, since the mid-1980s, afford proof of the merits of enduring values and virtues, which sum up the profile of democratic governance and institutions in well-performing States (De Vries and Kim 2014). Since then, the world has been inured to praises of efficiency and effectiveness. Though nothing in this book will question their importance, what the authors hope to accomplish is to reintroduce, bringing into sharp relief, those attributes of

governance that make for public trust. They go beyond efficiency, expediency and effectiveness. They also represent the core of what society has come to expect of governments—that citizens or residents demand of public servants. Although they are nothing new, they bear re-emphasising in a regional *compendium* dedicated, as it is, to sound governance and civil service reform. In effect, these attributes and values are none other than *coherence, continuity, consistency* and *integrity*. They are critical because they help sustain a sense of trust, purpose and predictability, knowing what one may expect from one day to the next. Widespread in civil society, they foster a shared sense of confidence which makes democracy work and an economy prosper. Public trust rests on respect for the rule of law and due process but also on transparency and accountability, expected, in particular, of all those people vested with a degree of authority and exercising power in areas of policymaking, which vitally affect the lives and prospects of citizens.

IN BUILDING PUBLIC TRUST: THINK OF THE COMMON GOOD

While signs of erosion of trust are visible worldwide from the 1990s onwards on many fronts, the roots of this phenomenon go deep, being difficult to trace to any particular area with any degree of precision. Still, crucial in this regard is a noticeable decline of the concept of *general interest* or *common good*, which represents the legacy of the Age of Lights. The names of J. J. Rousseau and Thomas Jefferson, among others, spring to mind in this connection. Though to be sure, this concept was easier to defend and to embed in the emerging nation states of the late eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than in our present-day diverse, post-modern societies, it has furnished the foundations of many an institution, which serve our countries well.

None of these institutions deserve attention better than the public service profession and the Administrative State. It can hardly escape our notice that the single transformation of a small band of courtiers into a Great Profession was based on an idea of the State which, in turn, was underpinned by the concept of general interest. This highlighted the idea that the State existed solely or primarily to advance the freedoms and well-being of its citizens and residents. Noteworthy, in this connection, was the “Four Freedoms” speech of President F. D. Roosevelt, which has become the theme of a park in New York City (Krugman 2013: A23).

It is also abundantly clear that the vast expansion of functions of the Administrative State or, to be more precise, its progressive redirection from warfare, law and order to health, education and welfare gave the civil service profession its contemporary profile and critical importance. Public administration, as a field of study and training and civil service reform, would never have attained the salience and significance which they received from the 1930s onwards, but for the mighty currents which owed their inspiration to ideas, belief systems and social movements borne of the Age of Lights. It is these very concepts which, in the 1980s and 1990s, were targeted for criticism and may have been frittered away. The signs of this attrition are visible on many levels, national and international. Of the former, none speaks louder than the phenomenal growth and rapid proliferation of pressure groups. Thus, in the United States, the number of registered lobbyists rose from 175 in 1975 to 13,700 in 2009, between them spending a total of USD 3.5 billion (Fukuyama 2014: 5–26). How their cumulative impact and actions in pursuit of particularistic agendas affect the public sector was the subject of an article by Francis Fukuyama, remarkably a Republican and noted co-signatory of the neoconservative platform “Project for the New American Century” (PNAC). Regarding the overall impact of this spectacular trend on public administration, Fukuyama had this to say:

public administration specialists have documented a steady deterioration in the quality of ... government for more than a generation. In many ways, the ... bureaucracy has moved away from the Weberian ideal of an energetic and efficient organisation staffed by people chosen for their ability and knowledge.
(Fukuyama 2014: 8)

Noting that, currently, the system *is less merit-based*, Fukuyama, refers to Paul Light who suggested that, increasingly, federal employees were more motivated by income than mission (ibid). Though mostly made in reference to the US Federal Government, Fukuyama’s and Light’s verdict may well be said to apply to many other countries, although in varying degrees. Thus, in decades of crises, compounded by wars and unrest, the signs of “decay and dysfunction” have been widespread throughout the world. Often, they have been compounded by the effects of climate change, which are also unevenly felt in East, West, North and South. Indeed, the very prevalence of these disturbing symptoms invites us to reflect, *firstly*, on Planet Earth, our common home and, *secondly*, on the

dominance of models whose sway, in three and a half decades, has been a major part of the problems that have afflicted the world (Mounk and Foa 2018).

THE HEGEMONY OF MODELS

At the dawn of the twenty-first century, no segment of humanity, however isolated, could claim to have no knowledge of the policy departures which were “sold” to the world, and duly encapsulated in the *Washington Consensus* (IIAS 2002: 31–64). The World Bank first proclaimed them as a model of “good governance” in a seminal report, which ventured to advocate a wholly new way to the future. It noted, in particular, a veritable shift as “governments seek to adjust from a pattern of control and intervention to one in which the role of government in the economy is to provide an enabling environment for the private sector” (World Bank 1994: 56). According to the Bank, the new model necessitated a “smaller state”, predicated on “divestiture of state enterprises”. Also, according to the Bank, the process of “shrinking the State” had advanced at a disappointing pace in large parts of the world, where the “need for the state to dismantle large parastatal sectors” and their effective transfer to private sector entities had proved exceedingly slow (*ibid.*).

Presented to the world as chiefly the fruit of experience, pronouncements of the Bank carried the weight of lessons from a global institution well known for its close ties to the centres of finance and political power. One was led to believe that these lessons represented the result of many years of findings and scientific research. In reality, however, their nature and intent took on another complexion. In truth, they gave expression to political objectives and economic agendas substantially at variance with what had been the thrust of national priorities and “development decades” of the UN during the 1950s, 1960s and even early 1970s. New emphasis accorded to privatisation, downsizing and devolution suggested as much. It was brought to the fore in the World Bank Report and underpinned the advice purveyed to member states, including several governments of countries “in transition”, after more than 50 years in the throes of planned economies (Fraser-Moleketi and Argyriades 2010: 48–54).

Enter New Public Management (NPM), a move which Ferrell Heady, recipient of the coveted Dwight Waldo Award, aptly described as “the most recent urge to develop a science of administration with principles of

universal validity” (Heady 2001: 391). It is hardly an overstatement to say of NPM that it is a *misnomer*. “New” it was certainly not but rather a restatement of Scientific Management, albeit in economic—not engineering—terms. “Public” it claimed to be but redefined the term in ways that diluted its meaning, precluding or reducing the scope of any difference that would require a distance or a divergence of public from private sector practice. Its choice of terminology was typical of this approach. Its preference for “Management” over “Administration” spoke volumes in this regard. Both terms have Latin roots but, while the latter—commonly—subsumes both law and order and the provision of services, the former emphasises *command* and *control*, further accentuating top-down determination of scarce resource allocation and of the course to follow.

Soon replicated widely by government organisations and schools or universities, this switch in nomenclature from “administration” to “management” turned out to be far reaching, more than an exercise in semantics. It clearly represented a major *paradigm shift*, compared to what had served as guiding light for half a century earlier (Fraser-Moleketi and Argyriades 2010: 48–50; Hughes 1998: 242). Thus, it was forcefully expressed in aphorisms which showed little patience towards previously accepted theory or practice. The *theory was* stripped of such well-worn *accoutrements* as law, political science, psychology and ethics, as well as knowledge of history (Rosenbloom 2015: 1–17). “Management is Management!”, it proclaimed. This was coupled with the adage, “let the managers manage”, which voiced reluctance to countenance restrictions and constraints on management’s prerogatives or exercise of power. “Results over Process” was another popular dictum on how management should be conducted. “Doing More with Less” and, even more emphatically, “Lean and Mean” were yet two further maxims, suggesting that such practices as liberal investment in employees’ development, welfare and motivation or participative management might prove both time-consuming and costly to taxpayers but, worse still, a concession to public service unions, which they were bound to exploit for their purposes.

NEED TO REVALUE GOVERNMENT AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE PROFESSION

After trials and tribulations, which have caused a lot of damage both to the public purse and to the peace and welfare of society, as a whole, we may be approximating a better understanding of what the public sector and our

own role as managers or leaders might entail (Porcher 2018: 321–323; Pollitt 2016). Of course, we all know well that nothing is forever. Patterns change and, notoriously, paradigms shift. But for the here and now, in an era of globalisation, with the SDGs in mind, it helps to reach consensus on certain basic truths pointing to shared requirements:

- *Firstly*, we need to agree that government is vital. It is a force for good, not a necessary evil. It is a problem-solver, not the source of all our problems, as some theorists contended, at the end of the twentieth century (Friedman 1993).

But for governments to play their part both *adequately* and *correctly*, certain conditions are necessary and ought to be secured. Topmost among these requisites is a *sound institutional framework* and organisational structures duly equipped and tasked to act on behalf of the State, to speak with a voice of authority on issues of importance to the citizenry and the world and to discharge those functions that are required of governments, under the rule of law.

- *Secondly*, experience shows that public sector governance, administration and management may share a lot of ground with their opposite numbers in private enterprise. However, they are distinct in certain essential regards and, for that very reason, ought to be kept apart by some degrees of separation. Basic considerations of efficiency and effectiveness bring the two sectors close. However, other values and, more than anything else, the concepts of the *common weal*, public good and general interest, as well as rule of law and human rights may sometimes pull them apart. This can hardly be a critique of private sector practice. It simply states the obvious: that, in the private sector, the ends are *particularistic*. In the public sphere, by contrast, the goals are *universal*; the global and the long term must be accorded priority. That this has not been so, to the desired extent, and that too many leaders have often overlooked this fundamental principle might rightly be considered as a major cause of dysfunction and disarray in several parts of the world.

What has been visibly present is the massive misappropriation of the general and the long term by lobbies and pressure groups in pursuit of their short-term particularistic agendas. Thus, even in the face of over-

whelming evidence pointing to climate change, groups linked to fossil fuels persisted in their drive to obscure scientific findings and block international efforts to arrest this dangerous trend.

- *Thirdly*, the appropriation of the general and long term by private sector interests for particularistic pursuits is additionally perilous when it occurs within the public sphere and in the hub of governance. An expression which gained ground and has made the rounds of late is that of the “deep State”. It refers to mighty segments within the public sphere (e.g. the armed forces, security or intelligence), conspiring to control the principal levers of power or otherwise to exert an outsized measure of influence on policymaking and governance, partly to group advantage; transforming themselves, in effect, from servants into masters. Related to this concept is that of the “military-industrial complex”, originally invoked by President D. Eisenhower. Only a little later, President J. Carter also touched upon this theme in his *Farewell Address to the Nation*. He remarked on strains and stresses that a process of fragmentation and differentiation in society at large imposed on the Constitution. This trend is more pronounced in technologically advanced, more affluent nation states but hardly limited there.

In every sphere of life, on almost every level, there are today more factions, more definable groups and subcultures and more fields of specialisation than a century ago. The resulting fragmentation and differentiation of interests, ideologies and needs have carried in their trail a wide diffusion of power in spite of contrary trends, as governments and nations try to find a common ground in an effort to configure and define the common interest. Failure to find an answer and come to a resolution is undoubtedly a factor, if not a major cause, of the prevalent dysfunction leading to the fragility, fragmentation and failure of States; and

- *Fourthly*, in this regard, while factors of fragility and causes of failure are many, too diverse to recount, *history* offers examples of exactly the opposite tendency—of vast segments of humanity brought closer together to join in and be part of a common governance culture. Best known are the cases of China, India, Persia and the Roman Empire, but there are certainly others (Farazmand 2001: 9–101). Common to all these cases were administrative systems and gover-

nance structures which provided connectivity, coherence and cohesion to a motley of diverse groups that might have otherwise drifted apart. All of the examples cited highlight the role of government and public administration in cultivating harmony, consensus, conciliation and compromise—holding the pieces together by means of legal constructs, which offer continuity and consistency all around. Though power and domination are necessary factors of long-term success and survival, we owe, to Max Weber, the notion that force alone cannot do it; cannot produce acquiescence; and needed legitimisation that hold a country together, in peace (Bendix 1977: 285–457).

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: A FORCE FOR COHESION AND UNITY

There is reason to believe that this essential role of public administration and institutions of governance was very largely lost in the assault on State and “big government” alike, which was pursued relentlessly at the close of the twentieth and the dawn of the twenty-first centuries. A single-minded pursuit of efficiency and effectiveness was doggedly promoted by means of deregulation, privatisation and “de-bureaucratisation”. They carried in their trail a process of “de-institutionalisation” in some important swaths of the public sphere. Deconstruction and dilution of the concept of general interest have often been the outcomes of this process (Kim and Argiriades 2015: 44–57; 426–453).

Fracture and fragmentation, with propensity to failure, continue to present major abiding challenges to the world of the twenty-first century. Looking to the SDGs for answers to these challenges, strong institutions of governance and public administration come into sharp relief. The need becomes apparent on the national, subnational, the regional, subregional and inter-regional levels. On all levels, there is need for effective institutions and personnel whose competence, integrity, commitment, proactivity, professionalism and dedication serve to both inspire trust and invite cooperation. The need for coordination within and between governments has never been so emphatic; the perils from unilateralism and “go it alone” proclivities so acute as they are today. On all levels and in all areas of activity, as well as in most regions, the wide diffusion of power is creating steep new challenges, which it behoves our field and profession to address

(Brooks 2018: A23). Both State and public service have never been so needed and their part in combating fragility and restoring both inclusion and congruence so critical.

The State and civil service are the hub of the new publication of the Astana Civil Service Hub (ACSH). We welcome its arrival, which could not be timelier. The world and our profession stand at a watershed. After three and a half decades of “deconstructing” governance (Dwivedi et al. 2007: 121), assailing government structures as inimical to freedom and contrary to efficiency, a growing number of people in our field and our profession are having second thoughts. We begin to rediscover the value of *institutions* as guarantors of cogency, consistency, coherence and continuity in the affairs of State and in the lives of people. The same may well be said of the international level, where the UN must be restored to the role for which it was established after World War II.

To be sure, in 70 years, the world has been transformed, with a new constellation of States and organisations—national and international—emerging on the scene and demanding to be heard. Promoting “inclusive societies” with SDG16 is a formidable task. However, we can do it. Building on new technologies, our field and our profession can find the way, *if we set our priorities right*. This may be our steepest challenge. Setting priorities right must begin by reversing a process that has increased disparities, resulting in stark asymmetries beyond acceptable levels—levels, in other words, that may be considered compatible with fundamental requisites for democratic governance. With the SDG16 provisions on our minds, we ought to accord priority to *outreach*, building strategies and structures that include those four-fifths of humanity, who are currently on the margins. We need all-encompassing structures inspiring public trust because they heed the call and strive to advance the welfare of the vast majority of people—not just the powerful few. A formidable task, both nationally and internationally, lies within our reach, if only some prerequisites can be secured, and changes introduced to our *modus operandi*, ultimately to the strategies and methods that we employ in seeking to accomplish our goals.

Moving in the direction of SDG16 calls for a culture of dialogue and cooperation, not one of acrimony, intolerance and confrontation, for policies and processes founded on participation, giving a voice to all. They are policies and processes that are predicated in openness, responsiveness, transparency and accountability (Baker 2018: A7; Brooks 2018: A23; Wilkerson 2018: A21). But are these not the ways of public administration, when properly understood? We need to rediscover the values and the

goals of our profession in democratic governance, *servicing the public good*. What the SDG16 and the errors and lessons of three and a half decades bring into sharp relief is that neither the erstwhile structures of top-down command and control nor the trickle-down approaches favoured by NPM will meet the emerging needs.

In answer to the question what legal, organisational and managerial constructs would satisfy these needs, we ought to be reminded of the intervening changes, which the proliferation of actors on the scene and parallel decline of erstwhile power elites have jointly brought about. Precisely on account of this *metamorphosis*, one may venture to suggest that “let-the-managers-manage”, “my-way-or-the-highway”, unilateral proclivities, which may still find some resonance in certain quarters, cannot be the way of the future. In lieu of the self-referenced, introspective and self-serving groups or entities which seek to seize the State, appropriating power, authority and resources to their own particularistic ends, we need to cultivate new democratically inclusive institutions, respectful of morality, the laws and constitution, willing to show self-discipline and foster the general interest.

A MUCH-NEEDED *PARADIGM SHIFT* FOR OUR FIELD AND OUR PROFESSION

This takes on a special importance in civil service management. Notoriously in some countries, provisions in the law and policy decisions have often come to naught as civil service management has been held hostage by powerful trade unions, which often go on strike in defence of “acquired rights” or in order to secure some other material advantage. How such practices have harmed both the country and our profession has been amply demonstrated in recent years (Argyriades 2013). Sadly, in this regard, they sometimes tend to follow the predatory patterns of private sector interests and pressure groups for which the sky is the limit (Fraser-Moleketi and Argyriades 2009: 17–20).

Some degrees of separation and differentiation between the civil service—its core components specially—and private enterprise might help defend the State, as well as civil society, from predatory practices, which really have no place in public space. Regrettably, the pattern, in several parts of the world has, since the 1970s, been mostly in the direction of discounting any differences. What is good for the goose was deemed good for the gander. Curiously, we have reached the point where such abusive

practices may be more commonly found in the broad public sector, where unions are more powerful than in the private sector, where they have been declining.

Because we *need* these unions, we also ought to rescue them from self-destructive habits. While membership of unions and collective bargaining rights are perfectly legitimate and may be embedded in law, the right to strike at will is not an acceptable option; as it disregards the available alternatives of conflict mediation and arbitration, which offer better pathways and ought to be preferred. It also offends the principle of *continuity of government* and violates the right of citizen-taxpayers to enjoy, without interruption, the services that governments have been required to offer. Recipients of these services (e.g. of schools, universities, hospitals or public transportation) would be at a disadvantage, if it became acceptable that they should be content with a less dependable treatment.

Compounding the disparities that have grown exponentially in recent years (Inglehart 2018: 25), such dereliction of duty by public employees and public sphere corruption disproportionately *target the poor*. They thus offend the fundamentals of democratic governance and should be disallowed. Civil service laws and decrees should be carefully reviewed with ethical considerations, constitutional propriety and democratic principle primarily on our minds. Indeed, this exercise could be conducted jointly by practitioners and scholars from like-minded neighbouring countries on the pattern followed, during the 1990s, in the elaboration of a model code of ethics for African civil servants. It ought to be emphasised that service to the public *is not* like other jobs. Constitutional propriety and ethical considerations create specific needs and imperatives, which go beyond the calls for efficiency and effectiveness, that generally apply to any work environment.

We ought to rediscover the critical components and fundamental principles of *civil service professionalism* before we may come closer to a critically needed new definition of *merit*. One thing is amply clear: that merit is much broader and, in the civil service, a lot more demanding than what the current notion of *competency* suggests. This notion was developed to, arguably, facilitate piecemeal recruitment practices, with the top programme managers demanding to have the final word over the choice of inputs to projects on their watch. In retrospect, however, the costs of taking this road have been infinitely greater than any resulting benefits. Frittered away in this process were: (1) the unity and cohesion of the civil service profession; (2) the scope, role and authority of the Office of Personnel Management (OHRM), which has taken second place, playing

merely second fiddle to that of programme management; (3) the catalytic role and institutional impact of public personnel policies, notably of competitive examinations and civil service recruitment, allied to staff mobility, promotion and development which, historically speaking have, since the seventh century of our era in China, become important drivers of public sector and civil service reforms (Gerth and Mills 1957: 416–444); and (4) last but not least, the much-debated principle of public service careers, that is of *service tenure*, which made careers attractive adding to their prestige but also bound the incumbents to society and the State with strong and lasting bonds of duty and deep commitment.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

There can be no denying the many limitations of permanence and tenure, which have been criticised as progenitors of bureaucratic sloth, complacency and the abuse of power. All of these may be true and point to present inadequacies in public personnel management, which ought to be redressed. There is no getting away from the fact that lack of political will, in all too many instances, has watered down reforms needed for system-wide improvements. Yielding to short-term goals and the temptations of favouritism and clientelism, the pathway of outsourcing and privatisation of public sector tasks have been preferred. Furthermore, in the name of efficiency, the practice of “downsizing” and “doing more with less” trumped the demanding tasks calling for long-term investment and for concerted efforts on behalf of the human resources which, in large parts of the world, represent the best of society and the backbone of the State.

It has been said before but bears repeating that “not one size fits all”. Countries are able to choose among contrasting models available to all (Pollitt 2016). What is required, however, and what this publication of ACSH is well positioned to offer, is the incentive to begin and to pursue a broad comparative study of civil service systems. Related to this study should be a campaign to significantly raise both the *profile* and *performance* of public administration and *re-instil professionalism* in the service of the State. Indeed, the State is back, but we have yet to shape it in ways that meet the needs and best hopes of its citizens, its residents and, ultimately, all seven billion people on Planet Earth.

Yonsei University
Yonsei, Korea

Pan Suk Kim¹

NOTE

1. Pan Suk Kim is on leave from Yonsei University for public service. He is the Minister of Personnel Management in the South Korean central government. He is the former President of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) for the years 2010–2013.

REFERENCES

- Argyriades, D. 2013. “Greek Exit from the Crisis – a Pressing and Much-needed Public Service Reform”, *Social Sciences*, ISSN 2076-0760, www.mdpi.com/journal/socsci, 23 April 2013.
- Argyriades, D.; and G. Timsit. 2013. *Moving Beyond the Crisis: Reclaiming and Reaffirming our Common Administrative Space*. Brussels: Bruylant/IIAS.
- Baker, P. 2018. “Disarmament, Nuclear Deterrents and the Fall of Libya”, *The New York Times*, Monday, April 30, 2018, p. A7.
- Bendix, R. 1977. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brooks, D. 2018. “The New Power Structure” *The New York Times*, Friday, April 6, 2018, p. A23.
- De Vries, M.; and P.S. Kim (Eds.). 2014. *Value and Virtue in Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, 2nd Edition. Basingstoke, Hants: Palgrave/IIAS.
- Dwivedi, O.P; Renu Khator; and Jorge Nef 0.2007. *Managing Development in a Global Context*, Basingstoke, Hants: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Farazmand, A. (Ed.). 2001. “Comparative and Development Public Administration: Past, Present and Future”, *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, 2nd Edition. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Fraser-Moleketi, G.J.; and D. Argyriades. 2009. “Democratic Governance with Government: Scope Objective and Significance”, *Asian Review of Public Administration*, 21 (Nos. 1 and 2), pp. 17–35.
- Fraser-Moleketi, G.J.; and D. Argyriades. 2010. “Development Revisited”, *Journal of Regional Studies and Development*, pp. 37–68.
- Friedman, M. 1993. *Why Government is the Problem*. Palo Alto, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- Fukuyama, F. 2014. “America in Decay: The Sources of Political Dysfunction”, *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), pp. 5–26.
- Fukuyama, F. 1995. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gerth, H.H.; and C. Wright Mills. 1957. “The Chinese Literati”, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Press, pp. 416–444.

- Heady, F. 2001. "Principles for 2001 and Beyond", *Public Administration Review*, 61(4).
- Hughes, O.E. 1998. *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*, 2nd Edition. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- IIAS. 2002. "Governance and Public Administration in the 21st Century: New Trends and New Techniques" *General Report*. Brussels: IIAS, pp. 31–64.
- Inglehart, R. 2018. "The Age of Insecurity: Can Democracy Save Itself?", *Foreign Affairs*, 97(3), pp. 20–28.
- Kim, P.S.; and D. Argyriades (Eds.). 2015. *Democratic Governance, Public Administration and Poverty Alleviation: Thematic Discourse and Geographical Cases*. Brussels: Bruylant.
- Kim, P.S. 2013. "Preface", D. Argyriades, and G. Timsit (Eds.). 2013. *Moving Beyond the Crisis: reclaiming and reaffirming our common administrative space*. Brussels: Bruylant/IIAS, pp. 9–16.
- Krugman, P. 2013. "Free to be Hungry", *The New York Times*, Monday, September 23, 2013, p. A23.
- Mouk, Y.; and Roberto S. Foa. 2018. "The End of the Democratic Century: Autocracies' Global Ascendance", *Foreign Affairs*, 97(3), pp. 29–38.
- Newland, C.A. 2015a. "From Trust to Doubt", M.E. Guy and M.M. Rubin (Eds.). 2015. *Public Administration Evolving: from Foundations to the Future*. New York: Routledge, pp. 39–63.
- Newland, C.A. 2015b. "Balancing Tested Poverty Alleviation Means Amidst Epochal Governance Challenges", P.S. Kim, and D. Argyriades (Eds.). 2015. *Democratic Governance, Public Administration and Poverty Alleviation: Thematic Discourse and Geographical Cases*. Brussels: Bruylant, pp. 111–144.
- Pollitt, C. 2016. *Advanced Introduction to Public Management and Administration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Porcher, S. 2018. "Christopher Pollitt: An Advanced Introduction to Public Management and Administration" *Public Administration Review*, 78(2), pp. 321–323.
- Rosenbloom, D. 2015. "The Public Context", M.E. Guy, and M.M. Rubin (Eds.). 2015. *Public Administration Evolving: From Foundations to the Future*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1–17.
- Wilkerson, L. 2018. "A Familiar Road to War", *The New York Times*, Tuesday, February 6, 2018, p. A21.
- World Bank. 1994. "Governance: The World Bank's Experience". Washington, DC: World Bank.

CONTENTS

- 1 Reclaiming Public Space: Drawing Lessons from the Past as We Confront the Future** 1
Chester Newland and Demetrios Argyriades
- 2 Fear and Loathing of Technological Progress? Leveraging Science and Innovation for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development** 31
Pedro Conceição
- 3 Lessons from Lagash: Public Service at the Start of History and Now** 53
Max Everest-Phillips
- 4 The Emergence of a New Model? Trajectories of Civil Service Development in the Former Soviet Union Countries** 105
Alikhan Baimenov and Saltanat Janenova
- 5 Japan’s Attempts to Digitalise Government: An Introduction of “My Number” System in Reforming Public Management** 145
Akira Nakamura and Kiyoshi Suzuki

6	The Role of Civil Service and the Human Resource Management Policies Required for the Government of the Future	169
	Byeong-soo Yoon	
7	China's Public Service and Civil Service Capacity Building	203
	Li Junpeng and Zhang Xian	
8	Disruptive Technologies and the Public Sector: The Changing Dynamics of Governance	237
	Christine Leitner and Christian M. Stiefmueller	
9	Big Data-Driven Public Service in the Twenty-First Century: The Politics of Big Data	275
	Max Everest-Phillips	
10	Cooperation and Partnerships for International Development in the Era of the SDGs	319
	Alikhan Baimenov and Panos Liverakos	
	Index	341

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Demetrios Argyriades is a graduate of the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Sorbonne University. He started his career in Britain and Greece and, in 1967, joined the ranks of the international public service, working first for the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and then the United Nations Secretariat. In the past 25 years, he has served as a consultant to the EU (PHARE and TACIS), the Bank of Greece, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other international organisations on human resources development, public service reform, ethics and democratic governance. From 1975, he taught for several years at the New York University and the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in Turin, as well as other colleges and universities in the USA and abroad. He is teaching public administration systems, methods and techniques at John Jay College, CUNY and, is a visiting professor at schools and universities in Mexico and Greece. He has published very widely, in four languages, and has served as Rapporteur of the four successive Working Groups of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) on Global Governance, as well as Rapporteur-Général of the XXVth International Congress of the IIAS, in 2001. Of his most recent activities, one took him to Seoul, as Special Speaker, to deliver a paper on “Sustainable Development and the Fragility of States” at the EROPA Conference and General Assembly, in September 2017; the other entailed contributions to “Global and Regional Trends in Civil Service Development”, a 2016 publication of the Astana Hub of Civil Service. He

is Doctor *honoris causa* of the University of Athens and recipient of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) F.W. Riggs Award.

Alikhan Baimenov is Chairman of the Steering Committee of the Astana Civil Service Hub (ACSH), and is a distinguished public figure, who has held leading public posts in the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. In his political career, he has served as the Head of the Executive Office of the President, Head of the Office of the Prime Minister, Chairman of the Agency for Civil Service Affairs, Minister of Labour and Social Protection and Member of the Parliament of Kazakhstan. Baimenov has overseen two waves of civil service reform of the Republic of Kazakhstan, as well as the concept of social protection for Kazakhstan's citizens. He graduated from the Karaganda Technical Institute (1981) and completed his postgraduate studies at the Moscow Motor-Road Institute (1985–1988). He holds a PhD in Technical Sciences. He is the author of the monographs *Public Service. International Experience. Kazakhstan's Model* (2000) and *Civil Service in the Republic of Kazakhstan* (2000) and of a series of publications on such issues as social protection, public management and public service management, as well as political and party building. He was also the guiding force behind the *Global and Regional Trends of Civil Service Development*, a book published in 2017 under the auspices of the ASCH. Baimenov is a recipient of a number of national and international awards, including a Special Award of the UN Office of South-South Cooperation for promoting regional and interregional cooperation in the civil service field. He is also a member of the National Academy of Natural Sciences.

Pedro Conceição is Director, Strategic Policy, at the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support since October 2014.. Before that, he was Chief Economist and Head of the Strategic Advisory Unit at the Regional Bureau for Africa (from 1 December 2009). Prior to this, he was Director of the Office of Development Studies (ODS) from March 2007 to November 2009 and Deputy Director of ODS from October 2001 to February 2007. His work focuses on financing for development and on global public goods. He has co-edited the books *The New Public Finance: Responding to Global Challenges* (2006) and *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalisation* (2003). He has published on inequality, the economics of innovation and technological change, and development in, amongst other journals, the *African Development Review*, *Review of Development Economics*, *Eastern Economic Journal*, *Ecological*

Economics, Environmental Economics and Policy Studies, and Technological Forecasting and Social Change. He has co-edited several books including *Innovation, Competence Building, and Social Cohesion in Europe: Towards a Learning Society* (2002) and *Knowledge for Inclusive Development* (2001). Prior to coming to UNDP, he was an assistant professor at the Instituto Superior Técnico, Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal, teaching and researching on science, technology and innovation policy. He has degrees in Physics from Instituto Superior Técnico and in Economics from the Technical University of Lisbon, and he holds a PhD in Public Policy from the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, where he studied with a Fulbright Scholarship.

Max Everest-Phillips is the Director of the UNDP's Global Centre for Public Service Excellence in Singapore. He worked previously as Director of Governance at the Commonwealth Secretariat in London. He started his career in the British Diplomatic Service, serving in Finland, Japan and Washington, and was Senior Governance Adviser at the UK's Department for International Development. He holds a BA (Hons, first class) from Oxford University, an MA from the University of Pennsylvania and an MSc from Johns Hopkins University. He has been a research fellow at the Overseas Development Institute in London.

Saltanat Janenova graduated from Durham University (UK) with a master's degree in Sociology in 2000 and the University of Edinburgh (UK) with a PhD in Social Policy in 2010. Her doctoral thesis was on "Public Service Integration in Kazakhstan: The One-Stop Shops case". Janenova worked in the Kazakhstan Civil Service and for various international organisations, including the European Union, the OECD and UNDP as a local expert on public management. She was the Network Facilitator at the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre for Public Administration Reform in CEE and CIS states in 2009–2010. In 2013, she joined the Graduate School of Public Policy, Nazarbayev University, as an assistant professor and is teaching MPP/MPA/PhD programmes in public policy. She has co-authored and published papers on civil service reform and public service modernisation in the *International Review of Administrative Sciences (IRAS)*, *Central Asian Survey*, *International Journal of Public Administration* and the *Cornell International Law Journal*.

Li Junpeng is a professor at the Chinese Academy of Governance (CAG) and Director of the Public Administration Office in the Department of Public Administration and Policy. He is also a doctoral supervisor and postdoctoral co-supervisor, following his appointment in the National Teachers Pool for Cadre Education and Training by a panel of experts and the approval of the CPC Organisation Department leaders. He obtained his PhD from the School of Government, Peking University. He ranked 22nd on the List of China's Most Influential Scholars in Social Sciences (Political Top 50, released in December 2016). He has published more than 300 theses and articles in the *People's Daily* on Chinese public administration, academic research, and so on. In addition, he has been the co-author and editor of more than 20 academic books. He has also written more than ten monographs ranging from public administration, public service-oriented government, public management, to public service provision as well as on establishing and improving the socialist public administration system, deepening administrative reform, and on government responsibility and accountability systems. Moreover, in 2015, he published the *Global Comparative Study on Public Service Systems*. In 2017, he published the *Construction of a Modern Government*, as part of the "Chinese Path" series, gifted to the 19th Communist Party of China (CPC) National Congress. Junpeng has also led and participated in more than 30 research projects at the national, ministerial and provincial government levels. Many of his articles have been reprinted in full by *Xinhua Digest*. Furthermore, many of his consulting reports have received commendation from the leaders of the State Council. He is a recipient of the First Prize of the third Competition for Excellent Theses on Administration Management in China and of the Second Prize of the fourth Competition for Excellent Academic Monographs on Administration Management in China. He has also been the recipient of five Excellent Scientific Research Consultation Results Awards and two Excellent Teaching Awards by the CAG.

Pan Suk Kim is the Minister of Personnel Management (MPM) in the Republic of Korea (from July 2017). He is an elected lifetime international fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) in Washington, DC. He was the Dean of the College of Government and Business at Yonsei University, and he is on leave for public service from Yonsei University. He received his doctoral degree from the American University in Washington, DC, and an MPA degree from Florida

International University. He was the President of the Asian Association for Public Administration (AAPA) and the IIAS. He was the Vice Chairperson of the UN Committee of Experts on Public Administration (UNCEPA) during the period 2010–2013. He received several awards including the International Public Administration Award (2009) and the Paul P. Van Riper Award for Excellence and Service (2012) from the ASPA. In 2017, he received the Warner W. Stockberger Achievement Award from the International Public Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA-HR) and the Philippine Society for Public Administration (PSPA) Achievement Award from the Philippine Society for Public Administration. In 2018, he received the ACSH Award. He is a member of the editorial board of several international journals including the *Public Administration Review* (PAR), the *Public Management Review* (PMR), the *Public Administration and Development* (PAD) and others.

Christine Leitner is a senior advisor and co-founder of the Centre for Economics and Public Administration (CEPA) in London where she focuses on public sector innovation programmes. Since 2013, she has been a senior policy advisor at the Austrian Ministry of Science Research and Economy. Before that, she headed the Centre for European Public Administration at Danube University, Austria. From 2002 to 2010, she was the Director of the European eGovernment Awards, a “lighthouse” project initiated and funded by the European Commission. Previously, she was a senior lecturer at the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA) in Maastricht. Leitner is a supervisory board member of the Estonian e-Governance Academy, an associate of the Austrian Institute for European Law and Policy and the chair of a working group on gender and IT at the Austrian Computer Society. She has also worked with the European Commission and the OECD on numerous occasions. She has served as a delegate to the EU Council, the European Public Administration Network (EPAN) and the UN. She was a member of the European Commission’s Expert Group on Public Sector Innovation and a member of the selection committees for national programmes for innovation in government in Dubai, Oman, Austria, Germany, Slovakia and, most recently, in Abu Dhabi. Leitner has lectured at academic institutions, including the Kennedy School of Government, the University of Maastricht, ESADE Business School, the European University Institute in Florence, the University of Applied

Sciences in Bern and Ludwigsburg, as well as the School of Public Administration in Vienna and Valencia. She is the editor and author of several publications on e-Government and has been a keynote speaker at numerous international conferences.

Panos Liverakos is a governance and public administration professional, engaged with the ASCH as a senior knowledge management consultant. He served for many years as Chief Technical Advisor/Team Leader with UNDESA and UNDP. His work covered a wide range of topics including institutional development, change management, governance assessments, public administration and civil service reform and development. It also involved partnership building and networking with governments and public institutions in the Western Balkans, Central and Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States and South East Asia. Prior to this, he worked as a freelance consultant on various assignments ranging from innovation practices, to change management and performance management systems design and implementation, as well as an analyst and researcher for the Long Island Regional Planning Board engaged in large-scale needs-assessments and forecasting projects. He holds graduate degrees from the State University of New York at Stony Brook in Political Science and Political Economy and a first degree from Bournemouth University in Business Administration and Institutional Management. He is the editor and author of several publications on public administration and civil service reform.

Akira Nakamura received his BA in Political Science from University of California at Berkeley (1966) and his PhD from the University of Southern California (1973). He served as both Vice President and Dean of the Graduate School of Meiji University (2002–2008). He retired from Meiji University and was concurrently conferred the honour of Professor Emeritus (2011). He has been involved for many years with the IIAS in Brussels. He served as the IIAS Vice President between 2010 and 2013. He was also a board member of the *Governance* journal and the international editor for the journal *Public Administration Review* (2008–2011). Furthermore, he was a member of the UNCEPA from 2001 to 2006. In 2007, Nakamura was awarded a medal of honour (JMN) by the Government of Malaysia for his contribution to the training of public officials in the country. Similarly, he was accorded an honour of recognition by President Sadako Ogata of the Japanese International Cooperation

Agency (JICA) in 2008. In December 2015, he became the first Japanese to be nominated as a “Fellow” of the NAPA in USA.

Chester Newland served, for many years, as Distinguished Professor of Public Administration at the University of Southern California (USC). He was earlier on the faculties of the University of North Texas and George Mason University. Newland has been an active Fellow of the congressionally chartered NAPA since 1975. He is past national president of the ASPA. He has also been an honorary member of the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), since 1980 and is a member of the ICMA Credentialing Advisory Board, as well as member of the Board of the Cal-ICMA. He was editor-in-chief of the leading journal in the field, the *Public Administration Review (PAR)*, from 1984 to 1990. He served as the initial director of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library and twice as director of the Federal Executive Institute (FEI). In 2007, he received the topmost national recognition in public administration, the Dwight Waldo Award, for lifetime practice, teaching and scholarship in the public service field. In 2011, moreover, he received the Los Angeles ASPA Earl Warren Award for Public Service. In April 2014, USC presented him with its own Lifetime Distinguished Service Award. He contributed substantively to the work of the Regional Hub of Civil Service in Astana, notably its report on “Global and Regional Trends in Civil Service Development”, 2016. The fundamental themes of Newland’s work in public administration have been the disciplined values and practices of public service in a constitutional democracy, and searches for human dignity and reasonableness, via the rule of law.

Christian M. Stiefmueller provides advice to public sector clients and civil society organisations. He has authored numerous reports, policy statements and commentaries on regulation and governance, with a particular emphasis on the financial sector. His research focus at present is on the legal and societal aspects of disruptive technological innovation. Christian is a regular speaker at international conferences and works as an expert with a number of international organisations, including the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Previously a senior investment banker, Christian has more than 20 years’ first-hand experience in the financial industry and worked for major global banks advising cor-

porate clients and financial investors on mergers, acquisitions and capital markets transactions. He also managed two London-based corporate finance advisory firms serving clients in the technology and telecom sectors. He holds graduate degrees in Law and Applied Languages from the University of Innsbruck and an MB.A degree from the University of California (Berkeley).

Kiyoshi Suzuki is Associate Professor of Public Administration in the School of Law at Senshu University, Japan. He holds a PhD in Political Science from Meiji University, researching policy implementation by Japanese local governments. He has worked at the Japan Centre for Cities as a senior research fellow. He taught at Senshu University in the School of Law, Public Administration and Public Policy and at Meiji University in the School of Political Science and Economics, Urban Governance and Political Science. Previous publications include *Policy Implementation in Japanese Local Governments* (2009) and *Reforming the Budget Process in Japan* (with Katsuhiko Inazawa, 2012).

Zhang Xian is an associate professor at the Department of Public Administration, CAG. She received her PhD, in 2012, from the Department of Public Administration, University of Hong Kong; her master's and bachelor's degrees from the School of Government, Peking University, in 2007 and 2005, respectively. Her major research interests cover comparative administrative reform, collaborative governance and civil service management. Her open courses include inter-agency collaborative governance, civil servicetraining in China, deepening administrative approval systems reform, and so on. She has both initiated and participated in many research projects assigned by the central and local governments ranging from regional collaborative governance and public service innovation to government institutional reform. Xian has authored a book titled *Explaining Public-Private Partnerships in China: Case Study of Primary Land Development Policy in Beijing*. She has also published a multitude of papers in such periodicals as the *Chinese Public Administration Review*, *Study Times*, *Liao Wang* on topics ranging from local innovation, civil service management to administrative reform and administrative accountability.

Byeong-soo Yoon is a professor at the National Human Resources Development Institute of Korea, under the Ministry of Personnel Management. He has also served as Director of the Civil Service

Commission in Korea, Director in the Ministry of Public Administration and Security, as well as the Director of the Specialised Training Division of the National Human Resources Development Institute of Korea. He holds a master's degree from the Graduate School of Public Administration, Yonsei University, Korea, and a master's degree in Public Policy and Administration and a PhD from the University of Exeter, England. His research interests focus on public management and governance, public human resources management, competency-based training and public policy. Yoon has been awarded a Ministerial and a Presidential Commendation, and he has also received the Red Stripe Order of Service Merit.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AAAA	Addis Ababa Action Agenda
ACSH	Astana Civil Service Hub
AI	Artificial Intelligence
ASAN	Azerbaijan Service and Assessment Network
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASPA	American Society for Public Administration
BC	Before Christ
C&C	Centralisation and Control
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CEPA	Centre for Economics and Public Administration
CFC	Chloro-Fluoro-Carbon
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CPC	Chinese Communist Party
CPI	Corruption Perception Index
CPPCC	Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
CUNY	City University of New York
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DC	District of Columbia
D&C	Devolution and Centralisation
D&D	Decentralisation and Devolution
DDoS	Distributed Denial of Service
DESA	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
DLT	Distributed Ledger Technology
EC	European Commission

ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EID	Electronic Identity
EIP	Effective Institutions Platform
EGA	Estonian Governance Academy
ETSI	European Technology Standards Institute
EU	European Union
FDR	Franklin Delano Roosevelt
FSU	Former Soviet Union
GAO	Government Accountability Office
GBP	Great Britain Pound
GCI	Global Cybersecurity Index
GCPSE	Global Centre for Public Service Excellence
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GDP PPP	Gross Domestic Product Purchasing Power Parity
GDS	Government Digital Service
HRM	Human Resource Management
HRM&D	Human Resource Management and Development
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IDC	International Data Corporation
IEAG	Independent Expert Advisory Group
IIAS	International Institute of Administrative Science
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IOG	Institute of Government
IoT	Internet of Things
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
J-LIS	Japanese Agency for Local Authority Information Systems
JPY	Japanese Yen
KWh	Kilowatt per Hour
LBJ	Lyndon Baines Johnson
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party
LSE	London School of Economics
M2M	Machine to Machine
MCA	Management and Coordination Agency
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MIC	Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
ML	Machine Learning
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NCSI	National Cyber Security Index

NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NIA	National Information Society Agency
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NLP	Natural Language Processing
NPM	New Public Management
NSA	National Security Agency
NTC	Nanyang Technopreneurship Centre
NYU	New York University
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OHRM	Office of Human Resource Management
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OSS	One-Stop Shop
P2P	Peer-to-Peer Learning
PAR	Public Administration Reform
PFM	Public Finance Management
PNAC	Project for the New American Century
R&D	Research and Development
RFID	Radio Frequency Identification
RIA	Estonian Information Systems Authority
RISO	State Information System Subdivision
RMB	Renminbi/Chinese Yuan
SAI	Supreme Audit Institutions
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEC	State Examination Centre
SIGMA	Support of Improvement in Governance and Administration Project
SN-OS	Smart Nation Operating System
SSN4PSI	South-South Network for Public Sector Innovation
START 1	Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I
SQL	Structural Query Language
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UN/OSSC	United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation
UN/OWG	United Nations Open Working Group
US	United States
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

WEF	World Economic Forum
WGI	World Governance Index
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WW I	World War I
WW II	World War II

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2.1	Jedediah Strutt, North Mill at Belper, in 1819, showing vertical shaft leading from waterwheel to horizontal drive shafts running the length of each floor. (Rees's Cyclopædia, 1802–1819. Drawn by John Farey and engraved by Wilson Lowry)	36
Fig. 2.2	Decline in the relative price of investment goods (Karabarbounis and Neiman 2014)	39
Fig. 2.3	The hollowing out of the labour market in developed economics (OECD 2017)	40
Fig. 2.4	Breakdown in the relationship between labour productivity and average earnings (Furman 2014)	41
Fig. 2.5	Average mark-up for US firms (De Loecker and Eeckhout 2017)	42
Fig. 2.6	Change in inequality by region, 1985–2015. (Percent of total number of countries in region; <i>ADV</i> advanced economies, <i>AP</i> Asia and Pacific, <i>EUR</i> Europe, <i>LAC</i> Latin America and the Caribbean, <i>SSA</i> sub-Saharan Africa. IMF 2017b)	43
Fig. 2.7	Progress of computational power measured by the decrease in the real cost of a computation per second (Nordhaus 2015)	45
Fig. 3.1	The speed of change. (Source: Fogel 1999)	80
Fig. 4.1	Government effectiveness in the region (2016). (Source: World Bank 2018)	123
Fig. 4.2	Government effectiveness in the region (2006–2016). (Source: World Bank 2018)	123
Fig. 4.3	Control of corruption in the region (2006–2016). (Source: World Bank 2018)	124
Fig. 4.4	Corruption perception index in the region (2006–2017). (Source: Transparency International 2018)	125

LIST OF TABLES

Table 7.1	Total health expenditure and items of expenditure in China	225
Table 7.2	Development of social security coverage in China (in millions)	227