

Interaction between the State Executive Authorities: European Experience and Lessons for Ukraine

Nadiya Meltyukhova and Nataliya Doronina

*Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration
of the National Academy of Public Administration
attached to the Office of the President of Ukraine
75 Moskovsky Ave., Kharkiv 61050, Ukraine*

The problems which emerge in Ukraine while forming relations between state governance authorities of different levels are considered. The factors which influence formation of their effective interaction basing on the principle of systemic approach and in the light of Polish, Hungarian and British experience in the organization of public administration system are analyzed. General and specific tendencies of reforming systems of public administration in European countries are determined, basic approaches to reforming administrative systems are analyzed, the evolution of the system of values which make the bases for the managerial process is researched.

Raktažodžiai: vykdomoji valdžia, vykdomosios valdžios institucijos, centrinė valdžia, vietos savivalda, viešasis administravimas, sisteminis požiūris.

Keywords: executive authority, executive bodies, governance, central government, local self-governments, public administration, systemic approach

Introduction

The course of Ukraine's integration into the European Community put forward a great number of pressing issues of different character. Their solution demands deep and balanced analysis and improvement of the existing system of public administration. Among them are those that are connected with the necessity in forming new approaches to providing optimal interaction between the state governance institutions of different levels and their collaboration with local self-governments with the aim of their achieving correspondence with the basic principles, which make the grounds for the strategy of EU-members' development, i.e.: formation of the civil society, decentralization and deconcentra-

tion of power, effectiveness, transparency, openness, accountability and flexibility.

In mass-media among the specialists-practitioners and politicians vivid discussions are conducted on the necessity in structural-functional transformation of public administration bodies, on the need in reconsidering approaches to the processes of managerial decisions taking, changing methods, techniques and technologies of administration, urgency of realizing administrative-territorial reform taking into account European countries' tendencies of development. The same issues are researched in the manuals of domestic and foreign scientists such as V.D. Bakumenko, D. Bossart, I.A. Grytsyak, K. Demmke, V.M. Knyazev, N. Manning, N.R. Nyzhnyk, G.S. Odintsova, N. Parison, A.O. Chemerys etc.

In this context an interesting sphere for the research are the problems, which emerge while forming relations between the state executive authorities of different levels and the set of factors, which influence formation of their effective interaction based on the principles of systemic approach and in the light of European experience of public administration system's organization.

Nadia Meltyukhova – Nacionalinės viešojo administravimo akademijos prie Ukrainos prezidentūros Charkovo regioninio instituto (KRI NAPA) Administravimo ir vadybos katedros vedėja, docentė, ekonomikos mokslų daktarė.

Natalija Doronina – KRI NAPA Administravimo ir vadybos katedros doktorantė, viešojo administravimo magistrė.

Straipsnis įteiktas redakcijai 2006 m. balandžio mėn.; re-
renzuotas; parengtas spaudai 2006 m. birželio mėn.

1. Core themes for state governance reform

European Union does not impose concrete forms of public administration on its member countries, thus EU makes “demands of effectiveness”, which state that system of public administration must work effectively and administrative reform should be performed primarily with the aim of achieving state’s internal objectives, i.e. implementing effective administration of the public sector and providing social control over powerful authorities.

The necessity in reconsidering the stable system of public administration is not just a will of certain leaders or demand of some foreign bodies. Administrative reform is an objective need preconditioned by the social life development. It envisages clear determination of the executive authorities’ structure, their competences, positions’ structure and orders of filling these positions, forms and methods of work, hierarchy of subordination and rules of responsibility. Variety and wide range of transformational processes, completely different structure of changes in the world countries having qualitatively different initial basis in comparison with Ukrainian practice and reforms’ objectives precondition impossibility for drawing parallels between Ukrainian and foreign experience. However, information on the structure, scheme of state executive authorities’ formation, certain facets of reforms in Great Britain, Hungary and Poland being valuable as the examples of creating modern system of public administration, may be of a certain interest for Ukraine in the context of the practice of administrative reform. While reforming public administration in Ukraine and forming the system of interaction between state governance authorities of different levels it is expediently to use basic principles elaborated by the world practice, however, it is impossible to speak about their direct implementation disregarding the principles stipulated in the Ukrainian Constitution, realities of the present days of the Ukrainian society, country’s socio-economic conditions, peculiarities of political situation, etc. Consideration of all the positive trends achieved by the foreign countries into this sphere should be done through their critical analysis from the point of view of correlation with the Ukraine’s culture and traditions.

There are some spheres, closely related to the reforms of state governance [1-6]:

- the character of relations between the state governance authorities of different levels

and with other state institutions, both horizontal and vertical relations (constitutional-political sphere);

- organizational structures, mechanisms of coordination and control, including the central, regional and local levels of administration (organizational sphere);
- systems, functions and methods of administration, administrative procedures and processes (structural-functional sphere);
- personnel politics and public service (personnel sphere);
- state finances’ administration and fulfilment of budget (financial-economic sphere).

The analysis of foreign authors’ publications permits to make a conclusion that a gradual movement towards a more flexible, effective, market-oriented, aimed at the client (citizen) system of administering society is performed in such countries as Great Britain, Hungary, Poland and the main task for them is organization of power for achieving the objectives set (see Table 1).

This comparative analysis of the trends of reforms is evidence of the fact that many problems existing in the system of public administration of modern Ukraine are not only of domestic character. The necessity in decentralization of power, implementation in the activity of state powerful authorities of the achievements of management from the business sphere, development of the organizational culture of powerful institutions with the aim of enhancing transparency and personal responsibility are the primary tasks for many countries. These facts give the opportunity to confirm that the problems which precondition actuality of these trends of development are typical for the system of public administration in general, though with a certain variety in their level and urgency in certain countries. It should be also mentioned about the assessment of public servants’ activity and their salary, which are also stressed among the main trends of development in most of the countries and are pressing for Ukraine.

The information from Table 1 gives grounds for isolating the problems common for the countries, which refused command-administrative style of governing and chose the democratic way for their society’s development. It says about providing development for the market economical system and primarily for the private sector, fair servicing to the democratic political system and power of law that is also important for

Ukraine. Identification of such problems (general or common for the group of countries) gives a chance to ground the expediency of generalizing the experience of their solving in different countries with the aim of applying their basic principles, averting annoyances, which may occur on

this way. The content analysis of Table 1 confirms the existence of problems typical for each definite country. Their solution influences the solution of general problems and this fact should also be taken in the process of experience generalization and application.

Table 1: Trends of reforming the system of public administration in European countries

<i>General:</i>	<i>Special:</i>		
	<i>In Great Britain</i>	<i>In Hungary</i>	<i>In Poland</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decentralization of power; • transition into public administration of the ideas and achievements of management from the sphere of business; • implementation of the qualitatively new organizational culture (high extent of the personal responsibility and transparency). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more grounded politics formation; • more flexible and complex services; • highly qualified population servicing; • implementation of e-government; • evaluation and worthy rewarding of public servants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fair service to the democratic political system and power of law; • provision of the market economical system's development; • strengthening of the Government's position; • provision of the private sector's development; • improvement of the municipal administration system; • personnel politics and public service; • provision of the potential growth for the expense of rationalizing legal system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transformation of the territorial structure; • local self-government development; • decentralization; • transformation of the system of relations between state powerful authorities; • transformation of the system of budgetary financing.

The above mentioned facts prove that different strategies make the basis for reforms and approaches to constructing the system of public administration in different countries and these strategies depend upon the time and the conditions. Nevertheless, there are common tasks for initialization and implementation of these reforms aimed at enhancing effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of administrative structures, decentralization, transmission of responsibilities to the lower layers of administration, improvement of the results of powerful authorities' activity etc. The process of decentralization and delegation of rights on making decisions to the local powerful authorities is the general tendency for reconsideration of the existing administrative system in all the above mentioned countries, whose essence of administrative reforms was presented in this article. It may be the result of the fact that the main precondition for the effective actions of local government authorities is the relevant level of managerial and financial inde-

pendence, but with responsibility and effective external control. The most difficult and the most important thing in the process of transmitting a wide spectrum of powers "on sites" is preservation of public administration's integrity as a system and its direction towards achieving the general aim set for each state. A great problem and risk of decentralization lies in underestimation of the importance of practical application of the principle of systemic approach while forming the new model of relations and mechanisms of interaction both between the state powerful authorities of different levels and between state powerful authorities and local self-governments. The defined moments in the process of decentralization should be the subject for a thorough monitoring by central powerful authorities with the aim of elaborating the strategy of unanimity in actions and in aims' achievement.

The above mentioned approaches of the three European countries towards developing public administration give a chance to have a look at the sys-

tem of public administration in Ukraine from different perspective and to define certain problems in creating interaction between state governance authorities which emerge in the Ukraine of today.

2. Status and tendencies of development of the Ukrainian system of state governance and local self-government

State power in Ukraine is divided into three branches: legislative, executive and judicial. The highest body in the system of executive powerful authorities is the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. The executive power in oblasts and rayons is performed by local state administrations, which are responsible to the President of Ukraine and the Cabinet of Ministers while ful-

filling their duties. They are accountant and under control to the executive powerful authorities of a higher level and to the councils of deputies in the sphere of responsibilities which were delegated to them by the relevant rayon and oblast councils. Local self-government is performed by the territorial communities directly or through the local self-governmental authorities: rural, settlement, city councils and their executive bodies. Oblast and rayon councils represent common interests of the territorial communities of villages, settlements and cities. The only body of the legislative power in Ukraine is the Parliament (Supreme Rada of Ukraine). The highest body of the judicial power is the Highest Court of Ukraine (see Figure 1).




Figure 1: System of the state governance and local self-government of Ukraine

Most part of the problems of different origin and nature occur in the executive branch. The absence of systemic transformations in central executive powerful bodies (CEPB) causes considerable drawbacks which negatively influence their efficiency [1, p.19, p.46 and p.74-76]. Sometimes it can be chaos in creating authorities, duplication of their functions, inability to de-

velop policy, intersection of the spheres of activity, vagueness in the role of ministries and their political functions, uncertainty in relations between ministries and other central executive bodies. There is also a slipshod division of functions between different types of CEPB, their insufficient subordination to the aims of the governmental policy, which leads to emergence of com-

petitive centres of sector politics formation and unconformity in actions aimed at their implementation. As a result it considerably prevents from formation and effective realization of a general governmental policy through the system of CEPB.

The administrative system is also negatively influenced by the problem of vague structure in the executive power vertical line. Local state administrations (LSA) and their heads are double responsible both in front of the President and the Cabinet of Ministers. The structural subdivisions of LSA and local structures (subdivisions) of CEPB also function on the basis of double subordination both to the heads of LSA and to the relevant CEPB. As a result in reality there are two vertical lines of subordination for local executive powerful authorities – “presidential line” and “governmental line”. The first one is more influential since the President has the key power on LSA, though the executive vertical line taking into account its status should have been locked in the government. Another problem at the local level is the absence of the clear distribution of functions between the subdivisions of LSA and local authorities of CEPB. This situation prevents from the concerted solution of both national and departmental tasks. According to the law LSAs should perform the general functions on the realization of the state policy, communal property management at the relevant territories etc., though they are the authorities of the general competence. They also fulfil special functions in different spheres of social life, i.e. science, education, health protection, culture etc. However, the same special functions are stipulated for the local authorities (subdivisions) of CEAB.

For solving the above mentioned problem in case of co-existence of two types of the executive powerful bodies at the local level, it is necessary to make a clear subdivision of functions between them as it is done, for example, in Check Republic, where state administrations being the bodies of general competence perform only general functions of realizing state policy, communal property management, state control etc., while local bodies of ministries fulfil only delegated special functions in different spheres of social life. In Poland, Hungary and Slovak Republic the model with one type of local executive powerful bodies (state administrations) exists. However, in these countries the extent of freedom of their heads from solving current problems is different: in Slovak Republic these

heads are political actors, in Poland they act more like administrators. The optimal structure of the system of local executive powerful bodies is closely connected with the above stated problems. In Ukraine there are two types of local powerful executive bodies (local state administrations and local authorities of central powerful executive bodies) at two out of three layers of the administrative – territorial division. Such a complex structure of the system causes difficulties with forming a clear vertical line of the executive power and with dividing functions between the levels and types of local executive powerful bodies. Considerable efforts should be spent on the creation of concerted interaction between these bodies. However, it seems to be useful to apply Polish and Hungarian experience where they realize the model with one type of local powerful executive bodies (i.e. state administrations being the bodies of general competence), which perform general and special delegated functions of CEPB at the relevant territories.

The attempts of eliminating such gaps in the organization of public administration system's activity have been done in Ukraine since 1998. The main slogan of the reform initiated at that period was the idea of a gradual “creation of such a system of public administration which will support the formation of Ukraine as a highly developed, legal, civilized, European country with a high standard of life, social stability, culture and democracy, and will permit the country to become an influential factor in the world and in Europe”, as well as “formation of the system of public administration which will become close to people's needs and demands, while the main priority in its activity will be service to people and national interests” [7, p.7]. However, eight year experience of reforms shows that in practice most part of the transformations possessed a spontaneous or sometimes even chaotic character. Responsibilities on managing the administrative reform at different periods of time were given to the various official structures, i.e. Cabinet of Ministers, Coordinative Council on Public Service under the President of Ukraine, Commission on Administrative-Territorial Structure, national Council on Coordinating Activity of National and Regional Bodies and Local Self-government, State Commission on Implementing Administrative Reform in Ukraine. Such approach to coordinating implemented changes in the system caused the situation when reform stopped being a unanimous process. It lost the

features of integrity in objectives, tasks, methods, mechanisms of implementation. The strategy and tactics of administrative transformations, efficient, logically balanced program on implementing this strategy and detailed plan of actions which would have defined a coordinative centre, the sequence of actions, requirements, resources, schemes of implementation, monitoring, control which would have taken into account integrity and interconnection of all the factors of systemic reforming process have never been elaborated.

Within the process of interaction between the state powerful authorities basing on the principle of systemic approach special importance should be given to the possibility of creating backward connections between them. Unfortunately, direct vertical connections are more typical at the present stage of managerial traditions' development. They are characterized mainly by directive managerial influences and deprive the interactive process of the elements of cooperation, interaction, initiative from below etc., which in their turn have positive influence on enhancing responsibility for taking and realizing managerial decisions, creative approach to work, motivation level to qualitative fulfilment of the charged duties.

Russian scientist G.V.Atamanchuk proposes to define two types of backward connections in the system of public administration: objective backward connections and subjective backward connections [4, p.147-148].

Objective backward connections demonstrate the level, the depth and the adequacy of the objects' reaction to the administrative influence of the components of the subject of public administration and their role in functioning and development. Each component which is administered demands true knowledge on implementing its activeness in the administered objects' functioning. The most important thing is if the administered objects perceive the ideas and aims fixed in the managerial decisions. The absence of such connections restrains the quality of the public administration subject's activity (its subsystems, certain components), it also does not permit to understand correctly the interests and the objectives of the administered objects.

Subjective backward connections characterize the expediency and rationality of their internal organization and the public administration subject's activity in general, its subsystems, elements, certain components. The complexity, hierarchy, variety of components and elements of the state precondition the urgency and managerial importance of subjective backward connec-

tions. They make it possible to see, to understand and to evaluate how each lower level reacts to the actions and decisions of a higher one, if it considers them in its everyday activity. Control, analysis, organization's and state authorities' activity evaluation, officials' fulfilment of duties, reports, information and responsibilities make the part of the subjective backward connections.

It is possible to claim that subjective backward connections are connected with objective ones. They are built into the latter. Objective backward connection reflects the strength and reliability of interaction with the administered objects, demonstrates the contents and the extent of their mutual informational exchange. Subjective backward connections are able to reflect the validity of the organization and activity of each administered component only when they make a complex with the objective ones.

Responsibilities of regional and local state authorities, interaction between them are quite vague. The procedure of evaluating decisions is not perfect, the system of administration is overcharged with duplicated responsibilities, and there is no responsibility for the quality of services' rendering [2, p. 19-20]. The issues of responsibility place to the centre of attention a personality of a public servant and demand from him understanding that his activity is first of all connected with services' rendering for the realization of the citizens' rights and interests. Such approach to public administration demands from public servants reconsideration of their role and of general ideology, transformation of the existing stereotypes of behaviour in creating relations between the state powerful authorities of different levels. It is impossible to speak about the improvement of administrative services' rendering without public servants' reappraisal of approaches to their activity.

The present globalization processes cover all the spheres of people's activity and considerably change the view of the state's role and place in modern society. World practice permits to define characteristic phenomena which are typical for the effective state apparatus and to define basic trends in its evolution. In general some of the researchers present this process as transition from the traditional values to the new ones and demonstrate them as five basic regulations [2, p. 73]. The tendencies of European countries' public administration system development make it possible to supplement this list with five more statements. The formulated values can make basis for the creation of the "new philosophy" of

relations between the state powerful authorities of different levels (see Table 2).

Table 2: Evolution of the system of values which make the basis of the managerial process

<i>No</i>	<i>Traditional values</i>	<i>New values</i>
1.	Complexity of structures	Simplicity of structures and processes
2.	Centralization and dependency	Flexibility and autonomy
3.	Administration with the help of rules and instructions	Administration through the organizational culture
4.	Emphases to the financial and material resources	Emphases to the human resources
5.	Orientation to the internal processes	Examination of the external factors and orientation to the customers of services
6.	Fulfilment of responsibilities, aimed at the imitation of the continuous process of work	Fulfilment of duties, aimed at the result
7.	Control over the final product of the activity	Monitoring of quality of the process of performing functions with the aim of timely prevention of faults and drawbacks
8.	Support of the interests of the state, administrative body, a customer of services'	Well-balanced support of the interests of a customer of services, administrative body, the state
9.	Spontaneous formation of working groups for the fulfilment of a certain managerial task	Well-grounded approach to forming working groups taking into account professional and qualification characteristics of public servants, their psychological characteristics, previous job experience
10.	Formation of the administrative objective proceeding from the interests and opportunities of the subject of administration	Formation of the administrative strategy and objective proceeding from the needs and interests of the object of administration, its systemic characteristics

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be made taking into account all the above mentioned facts:

1. While using the European countries' experience, it is necessary to avoid a "blind" copying of their models, but historical, territorial, political, geographic, mental preconditions, typical for Ukraine should be taken into consideration;

2. The transformations performed should concern the structure and principles of state power realization, while the managerial paradigm demands transformations into the model of state administration which is more adequate to modern conditions;

3. Systemic principle, but not a factual approach should make the basis for any of the state concepts and programs, the aim of which is to define the strategy of social development as it gives the opportunity for analyzing the process from different perspectives;

4. It is necessary to guarantee the formation of the effective system of the executive power both at the central and local levels, i.e. to ap-

prove such mechanisms, which would guarantee the managerial decisions' effectiveness, division and balancing of powers and responsibilities of different levels of power in the sphere of rendering state and civic services;

5. Taking into account the vagueness, contradictions in the legal base, vagueness in forming objectives and tasks, which do not favour the fulfilment of own and delegated powers by the state executive powerful bodies, it is necessary to provide organic and balanced delegation of managerial powers from top to bottom and to modify not only the format of relations between the state regional and central powerful authorities but also the base of their origin;

6. In the process of administration it is necessary to strive for providing a balanced functioning of the systems that will permits to create such elements of administration, which are able to compensate the external conditions' influence to the system and will support the stableness of its elements;

7. There is a necessity in perfecting the mechanisms of delegating powers and spheres of

responsibility as their imperfectness lead to the gaps in the systems' integrity which is preserved only "hierarchically" (vertical line of subordination is supported), but not "contently" (powers, functions, resources, methods, techniques and technology of administration etc.);

8. State executive power is an independent system and a subsystem of the state, that's why while forming their interaction it is necessary to coordinate the internal needs of each with the general aims and interests;

9. Further researches into this sphere will be directed to the examination of the systemic characteristics of the systems "the state", "the region", "state executive power", "state administrative authorities" etc. with the aim of determining the factors, which permit to preserve the integrity and flexibility of each and in their interaction, through the analyses of the main elements of the system of administration (information, cadres, structural and functional provision, techniques, technologies, methods, process of managerial decisions making).

References:

1. Бакуменка В.Д., Князева В.М.. (За заг. ред.) *Європейські орієнтири адміністративного реформування в Україні*. К.: Вид-во НАДУ, 2005.
2. Чемерис А.О. (За заг. ред.) *Адміністративні послуги місцевих органів державної виконавчої влади*. Львів: Вид-во ЛРІ НАДУ, 2004.
3. Глазунова Н.И. *Система государственного управления*. Москва: Юнити, 2003.
4. Атаманчук Г.В. *Теория государственного управления*. Москва, 2004.
5. Мэннинг Н., Парисон Н. *Реформа государственного управления: международный опыт*. – Москва: Весь мир, 2003.
6. *Адміністративна реформа: світовий досвід. Зібрання документів і матеріалів*. - Том II, ч.2, кн.1. К.: УАДУ, 2001.
7. *Концепція адміністративної реформи в Україні*. К.: Державна комісія з проведення в Україні адміністративної реформи, 1998.

Nadia Meltiukova ir Natalija Doronina

Valstybės vykdomosios valdžios institucijų sąveika: Europos patirtis ir pamokos Ukrainai

Reziumė

Kitų Europos šalių patirties aspektu straipsnyje analizuojamos Ukrainos įvairių valstybės valdymo ir savi-valdos institucijų sąveikos problemos. Sisteminiu požiūriu aptariant šias problemas ir teikiant rekomendacijas joms spręsti, remiamasi Jungtinės Karalystės, Lenkijos ir Vengrijos patirtimi. Straipsnyje akcentuojami bendrieji ir specifiniai šių šalių viešojo administravimo reformų bruožai bei vertybių evoliucija, ir teigiama, kad, įvertinant Ukrainos situaciją, negalima aklaik kopijuoti kitų šalių valdymo patirties, o reikia ieškoti būdų taikyti tą patirtį, sistemiškai analizuojant įvairaus lygio valdžios institucijų geresnio bendradarbiavimo sąlygas.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.ppa.0.16.27090