

The Main Trends and Principles of Public Administration Development throughout the World and in Latvia

Edvins Vanags

*University of Latvia
Kr.Barona St.30, Riga, LV-1011, Latvia*

Ilmars Vanags

*Central Statistical Bureau of the Republic of Latvia
Lacplesa St.1, Riga, LV-1301, Latvia*

Inga Vilka

*University of Latvia
Aspazijas blvd.5, Riga, LV-1050, Latvia*

Further development of state administration and local government reforms is connected with the use of such issues and principles as decentralisation and deconcentration of public administration, separation of strategy from the provision of services, diminishing the gap between democracy and efficiency, enhancing the citizens participation and mutual trust of citizens in government and vice versa, creation of "entrepreneurial" governments, principle of evaluation, reducing bureaucracy and increasing the openness, principle of diversity and possibility of choice, principle of simplifications, improving the quality of public service improving the political and administrative culture and integration of various institutions, reforms and activities in the context of the EU.

The model of integration has been worked out by the Department of Public Administration of the University of Latvia and the Latvian Statistical Institute. The novelty of the model is that it proposes both vertical and horizontal communications of different institutions and people in the process of implementation of public administration reforms, local governance, national development planning and regional policy, beginning from the European Commission and ending with the citizens.

Raktažodžiai: *valstybė, viešasis administravimas, vietos valdžia, regionas, teritorija, viešoji politika, modelis.*

Keywords: *state, public administration, local government, reform, region, territory, policy, model.*

Introduction

Public administration reforms are implemented in almost all the countries throughout the world in the last two-three decades. New Public Management is quite popular. There are many

Edvins Vanags – Latvijos universiteto Viešojo administravimo katedros profesorius, Latvijos statistikos instituto direktorius, dr. hab. oec., Latvijos mokslų akademijos akademikas. El. paštas: lsi@latnet.lv

Ilmars Vanagsl – Latvijos centrinio statistikos biuro prezidento patarėjas, dr. hab. oec.

Inga Vilka – Latvijos universiteto profesoriaus asistentė, dr. oec.

Straipsnis įteiktas redakcijai 2006 m. rugsėjo mėn.; recenzuotas; parengtas spaudai 2006 m. lapkričio mėn.

similarities and simultaneously also many disparities in different countries in the field of public administration.

The aim of the article is to show the main tendencies and principles of development of public administration throughout the world and in Latvia. In the process of research the authors used such methods as the monographic method, comparison, statistical analysis, the indexes method, documental method, including legal documents, analysis, synthesis and generalisation. The objects of the article are both state administration reforms and local government reforms. The examples taken from Latvia and other European countries as well as from the United States are discussed in the article.

In order to reach the aim of the article the following issues are investigated in the article:

- further decentralisation and deconcentration of public administration;
- separation of strategy and policy decision-making from the provision of services (“steering from rowing”);
- diminishing the gap between democracy and efficiency;
- enhancing the citizens’ participation and mutual trust of citizens in governments and vice versa;
- creation of “entrepreneurial” governments;
- principle of evaluation;
- reducing bureaucracy in public administration and increasing the openness;
- principle of diversity and possibility of choice;
- principle of simplification;
- improving the quality of services;
- improving the political and administrative culture;
- integration of various institutional reforms and activities in the context of the EU.

The above mentioned issues and principles have been used in the process of working out and implementing the model of integration for state administration and local government reforms, the *National Development Plan*, the territorial development plans, the distribution and use of the EU Structural Funds.

1. Further Decentralisation and Deconcentration of Public Administration

One of the most important tasks facing many European countries is to carry out local government reforms. Their goal is the further democratisation and decentralisation of state power and administration to improve the quality of public services rendered to local residents and to involve them in the process of administration. According to PUMA: “Decentralisation is the transfer of responsibility to democratically independent lower levels of government, thereby giving them more managerial discretion, but not necessarily more financial independence” [20, p.18].

The principle of subsidiarity – that solutions to problems should be sought on the lowest level which is the closest to the people – influences the distribution of functions between the state (central government), regional and local governments, and the private sector, as well as non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

In decentralising state functions and transferring them to local government levels, it should be kept in mind that, along with the transfer of functions, corresponding financial resources must be provided, as stated in the *European Charter of Local Self-Government* [5] and in the laws on local governments in many countries, including the Baltic States. There is a high degree of fiscal centralism in the Baltic States and in some Central European countries, too.

In all the countries some of the local government functions are performed jointly with the state administration institutions, NGOs and private structures.

Investigation in Latvia shows that many local governments do not perform all compulsory functions. The main reason is the insufficient financial resources for the implementation and sometimes also a lack of qualified staff. Many European countries, including Latvia, did not receive all necessary additional financial resources simultaneously with widening of the functions of local governments.

The analysis of 10 laws on the towns/cities local governments in the territory of Latvia in the past 130 years shows that the tendencies toward centralisation and decentralisation have alternated all the time (see *Table 1*)

Table 1: Alternations of tendencies to centralisation and decentralization of public power and administration according to the laws on towns (cities) local governments in the territory of Latvia

<i>Year, when law on local government was passed</i>	<i>Tendency to centralisation</i>	<i>Tendency to decentralisation</i>
1877	-	+
1892	+	-
1917	-	+
1930	-	+
1934	+	-
1939	+	-
1940, 1978, Constitution	+	-
1990	-	+
1991	-	+
1994	-	+

Source: Authors’ contribution.

Some tendencies to centralisation have appeared in a few European countries (the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Norway), for example, in health care.

Deconcentration of state administration institutions is being implemented in some countries (France, Estonia, etc.). Deconcentration is the transfer of responsibility from central ministries to the field offices of more autonomous agencies, thereby becoming closer to citizens while remaining part of the central government [20, p.18].

2. Separation of the Strategy and Policy Decision-making from the Provision of Services (“Steering from Rowing”)

Decentralisation facilitates the separation of strategy development and policy decision-making from the provision of services.

The person who rows the boat generally has no time to rock it. Steering and rowing demand different qualifications, methods and characters of people. Top managers must concentrate on strategic management, decision-making and leading, allowing other people to provide services.

A popular institutional form of separation of the strategy and services is public agencies, including state agencies and local government agencies. The pioneers here were the Next Steps Agencies which have been formed in the United Kingdom since 1988. Public agencies provide services. Such agencies are characterised by efficiency and effectiveness. Usually they are specialised in providing one or some relative functions. In the United Kingdom the heads of public agencies were selected mainly from the leaders in the private sector. Some Next Steps Agencies have been privatised after some time, but after the Labour Party came to governance in 1997 the further privatisation of the Next Steps Agencies was stopped.

The *Law on Public Agencies* was passed in Latvia in 2001. The purpose of the law is to separate the implementation of policy at the state and local government level from policy decision-making and supervision. According to the law, the state can establish state agencies and local governments can create local government agencies.

The main functions of state agencies are:

- to provide services to state and local government institutions;
- to provide public services for physical and legal persons;
- to lead and implement state, local government and international programmes [18].

The management agreement determines:

- the qualitative and quantitative indicators of state agency performance;

- the sources and volume of financial resources for the implementation of functions of the state agency;
- the evaluation order and criteria of the results of state agency performance;
- the order of material stimulation of state agency, employees, etc. [18].

The director of the local government agency concludes the management agreement with the chairman of the local government council. Although state agencies in Latvia are more independent than other state institutions that are financed from the state budget, their action is still too restricted, they are too much supervised by the ministry, they must send too many reports to the ministry and other state institutions. Some state and local government agencies in Latvia could be privatised in the future.

The experience of New Zealand, the Netherlands and other countries shows that sometimes the ministries and local governments do not have enough capacity and competence to ensure effective leading of their public agencies. The increasing level of the autonomy of public agencies often are the result of decreasing the policy and programme coordination [28].

3. Diminishing the Gap between Democracy and Efficiency

The core of local government reforms in Latvia is the administrative–territorial reform, which is also relevant for a long period of time. The administrative-territorial division, which Latvia received by inheritance after regaining independence, is still not suitable for the changed economic structure, life-style, development of information technologies, etc. It does not ensure the performance of functions trusted upon local authorities, creates fragmentation of insufficient local government resources and their irrational use. That is why the concept on local government reforms adopted in 1993 provided for the implementation of territorial reform. After long discussions on 21 October 1998 the Saeima adopted the *Law on Administrative Territorial Reform* [13]. The creation of larger and stronger regional self-governments directly elected by the citizens is important for Latvia. The Results of self-evaluation of local government action show that only 49% of the heads of local governments support the creation of regional self-governments, but 45% are against their creation and 6% of the respondents did not answer this question. The reason of such small support is that part of the local leaders is afraid that after the formation of regional

self-governments local governments could fall under their subordination. Some of the local leaders think that regional self-governments could take over some functions from local governments [33].

Investigations and discussions are organised about the optimal size of local governments. Large municipalities offer wider and more qualified services but in the small municipalities the deputies are closer to the population and the citizens are therefore often more active. For example, during the 2005 local government elections in Latvia turnout in small rural and urban municipalities was higher than in the medium-sized and large municipalities. The reforms are successful when the population and local governments support them. The results of self-evaluation of local government performance in Latvia in 2005 show that 69% of the local leaders believe that amalgamation of local governments is not necessary and 71% are convinced that co-operation of local governments can replace amalgamation [33, p.65]. In the process of the administrative-territorial reform the following motto could be used: "Big is efficient and effective, small is close, co-operation sometimes is preferable, and diversity is beautiful".

The *Law on Administrative Territorial Reform* proposes investigation of administrative territories, including the organisation of interviews with the chairmen of local government councils, deputies and staff of local governments and a survey of the population. According to the law, the reform has been implemented in two stages:

- on the initiative of local governments – voluntary amalgamation;
- according to the projects worked out by a responsible state institution – compulsory amalgamation.

Such a mixed method was rather democratic, but in reality the process of amalgamation was slow – only 26 new areas (amalgamated local governments) were created till the end of 2003, the period when the first stage ended.

According to the amendments in the law made on September 22, 2005, the amalgamation must be completed till 2009. The number of local governments will be reduced from 530 to approximately 160-180. For the motivation of local governments to amalgamate the economic method is used: the area local government, formed till January 31, 2009 receives 100 000 Lats for the development of infrastructure for each local government consolidated in the area.

4. Enhancing the citizens' participation

Democracy is impossible without enhancing the citizens' participation and mutual trust of citizens in governments and vice versa.

The results of the survey made in Latvia in 2004 show that only 48% of the respondents trust local governments, 25% trust the central government, and 22% - the Parliament [7, p. 279, 280, 281]. These figures were worse in Lithuania in November 2005, where 33% of the respondents trust local governments, 18% trust the central government, and 8% - the Parliament [24, p.11]. Without such trust it is difficult to enhance the participation of citizens in government activities. In turn, without involving the citizens we cannot speak about a genuine civil society.

Almost half of the leaders of local governments in Latvia consider that participation of the population in the decision-making process is not necessary [35].

Citizens' participation in the state administration and local government actions and decision-making is closely connected with providing them with the necessary information. Only a well-informed citizen can be an active participant in local government activities. An ordinary citizen does not need complicated, abstruse scientific and legal information but simple, concentrated, clear and well-understandable information. Today information, prepared by the EU institutions and central government institutions, is quite often unnecessarily complicated even for professionals, let alone non-professionals. The simple, well understandable information must be prepared specially for citizens (see *Chapter 9*).

5. Creation of "Entrepreneurial" Governments

The efficiency and effectiveness of public administration can be increased by enhanced the creation of "entrepreneurial" governments or by a wide use of business management methods in public administration. Business management methods could be used more widely in the implementation of service functions, and, in a more restricted way, in the implementation of administrative functions.

The perspective is a public-private partnership. In many cases the contracts with the private sector on the provision of services are effective. The principles of corporate social responsiveness could be also used in state administration and local government institutions. "An entrepreneurial" government could be characterised by the slogans:

- “management is management”;
- “let the managers manage”;
- “results over process” [1, p.161 - 162].

6. Principle of Evaluation

Closer attention could be paid to the evaluation of state administration and local government reforms, as well as to the implementation of regional policy by using the output, outcome and impact indicators.

It is effective to evaluate the level of the socio-economic development of territories by using the territorial development indexes, which are calculated from the main statistical indicators.

Latvia has experience of determination of socio-economic development level of regions and local governments by using the territorial development indexes. The last are used for the identification of the assisted regions, differentiation of distribution of the state and local government co-financing to the EU Structural Funds projects, analysis and foresight of socio-economic development of regions and local governments. For the calculation of the level of socio-economic development of regions the eight statistical indicators,

determined by experts, are used. In order to make all indicators comparable and united in one general indicator a metrical system of standardisation of the indicators was suggested with the following calculation of the territorial development indexes. The standardised indicators are calculated from the initial indicators which are expressed in the units of people, money, percentages or other real units. As a result of standardisation, initial measuring the units disappear, therefore different indicators become mutually comparable. Standard values are calculated in the following way: the difference between the concrete value of the indicator for a concrete territory and the mean value of the indicator in the group (rural municipalities, cities (towns, districts, regions) is divided by standard deviation. Then standard values are multiplied by different weights of the importance of the indicator (from 0.05 to 0.3) and results are summed up. The final sum is the territorial development index. The ranked territorial development index shows the place of the territory unit. The Indicators and their weights used for the calculation of the territorial development indexes are shown in *Table 2*.

Table 2: Indicators and their weights used for the calculation of territorial development indexes

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Districts and regions</i>		<i>Rural municipalities</i>		<i>Cities and towns</i>	
	+ or - ^{x)}	weight	+or -	weight	+ or -	weight
Gross domestic product per capita	+	0.3	-	-	-	-
Unemployment level to able-bodied residents (%)	+	0.15	,+	0.25	+	0.3
Personal income tax volume per capita	+	0.1	+	0.25	+	0.3
Non-financial investments per capita	+	0.1	-	-	-	-
Demographic burden level per 1000 able-bodied residents	+	0.1	+	0.15	+	0.2
Number of working enterprises per 1000 residents	+	0.1	-	-	-	-
Population density per one km ²	+	0.05	+	0.1	-	-
Average cadastral value of land	-	-	+	0.1	-	-
Change in the number of residents	+	0.1	+	0.15	+	0.2
Sum of weights	-	1.0	-	1.0	-	1.0

^{x)} “+” means that the indicator is used, but – means that the indicator is not used.

Source: [35].

The results of analysis of socio-economic development of regions and local governments were included in the book “Diverse Latvia: Rural Municipalities, Towns, Districts, Regions. Evaluations, Perspectives, Visions”, published by the Latvian Statistical Institute in 2005 [4].

Territorial development indexes are also used for checking the usefulness (effectiveness) proof of the administrative territorial reform. There is a strong interrelationship between the territorial development indexes and the number of population. For example, in rural municipalities with the num-

ber of the population under 1,000 the average territorial development index is – 0.554, in the rural municipalities with the number of the population from 1,000 to 1,999 it is already positive (0.250), but the highest territorial development index (1,770) is in the biggest rural municipalities, in which 5,000 and more inhabitants live.

In 2005 the first self-evaluation of local government performance was made by the Latvian Statistical Institute. The source of data of self-evaluation is the answers given by the heads of local governments to qualitative questions. In addition to the traditional conjuncture research questions it also includes sociological questions and an open-ended question on the problems and hardships encountered by local governments. The questionnaire consists of five parts: employment, economy and finance, quality of local government performance, population participation, and local government reform. The questions characterise the present tendency (9 questions), future tendency (6 questions), present level (5 questions), future level (1 question), limiting factors (1 question), 13 questions are of the type "yes" and "no" answers. Information from local governments is collected once a year. Eight present tendency questions have a note of future in them, as the answers to these questions, although referring to the whole year, must be given in the middle of the year. The balance of answers is used as an indicator of answers to every question. A composite indicator for the whole survey, the local governments' confidence indicator, is calculated. Quantitative statistical information is used in the process of analysis too. The analysis concerns Latvia as a whole, the five planning regions and the six statistical regions as the NUTS 3 level units. The results of the survey are presented in the form of text, tables and graphs (diagrams). The results of self-evaluation of local governments are successfully used for short time forecasts, analysis and planning of actions of the local governments [33].

7. Reducing Bureaucracy

Reducing bureaucracy in public administration, and increasing the openness are necessary. Today there is too much bureaucracy on all the levels of government, including the European Commission, central governments, regional and local governments. Even small municipalities must fill an enormous number of documents, required by different institutions. All public administration institutions need more freedom.

Bureaucracy can be diminished by using:

- methods of management by results;

- e-government;
- principles of New Public Management, Re-inventing Government, Total Qualitative Management, etc.

Increasing the transparency and accountability of the activities of the politicians and public managers in decision making processes is relevant.

It is advisable to supplement the well known phrase "Think globally, act locally" with the phrase "respond personally".

8. Principle of Diversity and Possibility of Choice

The principle of diversity and possibility of choice is important. Today central and local government activities are overregulated, too restricted and unified. No room is left for analysis of various alternatives and choosing the best.

The saying "less regulation, more advancement and co-operation" holds true in the respect of the relations of:

- EU institutions with the member states;
- central government institutions with local governments;
- local governments' relations with their institutions and the private sector.

In some countries, for example, in the USA, the United Kingdom and Germany local governments have a possibility to choose the form of municipal government: "strong" mayor-council, "weak" mayor-council, council-manager, council-board or their modifications.

In some countries (Germany, the Netherlands) a local government can choose the form of election of mayors: by deputies or directly by citizens.

In Latvia, the inhabitants can choose a family doctor and the parents can choose a school for their children.

9. Principle of Simplification

In the process of self-evaluation of action of local governments hardships connected with getting and use of the EU Structural Funds were named by the heads of local governments as the second most important problem. The quality of the prepared EU projects is often low because the administrative capacity of local governments and other project submitters is insufficient. Besides, the system of project submission, determined by the European Commission and Latvian state administration institutions, is too complicated. Therefore, on one side

the administrative capacity of the project submitters must be strengthened, and on the other side, the EU structural fund project documentation needs simplification.

In our opinion, a new principle of regional development and territorial planning - the principle of simplification, must be formulated together with the well-known EU and Latvian principles such as concentration, programming, additionality, partnership, openness, control, subsidiarity, sustainability, multiform, competition, etc.

Without the implementation of the principle of simplification, the implementation of some other principles, for example, the principles of openness and control is restricted and therefore participation of the population in project preparation is insufficient.

10. Improving the Quality of Public Services

Today in the era of globalisation and great competition one of the most important principles and aim of the large reforms is the principle of improving the quality of public services. It could be achieved by the use of the ISO 9000 system, Total Quality Management, Reengineering, improvement of administrative culture, and by working out and implementing the code of ethics, and innovation.

Innovation has been promoted by governments around the world as a key tool, to improve public services. In the United Kingdom, the Labour Government's public management policies echo these innovations promoted in all public service areas. The Prime Minister's Strategy Unit argues that innovation is a core task of public organisations that improves responsiveness and efficiency [22, p.311].

11. Improving the Political and Administrative Culture

In the process of development of state administration and local government reforms closer attention must be devoted to political and administrative culture. Everything depends on culture. Today the political and administrative culture in many European countries, including Latvia is at a low level. The *Law on the Code of Ethics* for the elected members of the Saeima in Latvia was passed only in 2005. Some important articles of the Code were deleted during the process of discussions on the draft Code.

No code of ethics has been worked out for many ministries and public agencies. Only a few local governments have adopted a code of ethics in Latvia. There is no wide qualified discussion on the problems of ethics in public administration of Latvia.

The investigations and publications by Rasma Karklins from the University of Illinois at Chicago [8] and Jolanta Palidauskaite from Kaunas University of Technology [24; 25; 26; 27] on the problems of political and administrative culture and ethics in public administration are very significant and useful.

Analysing the administrative culture in ten transitional democracies, J. Palidauskaite emphasises: "The general principles of public service indicated in the codes and draft codes are legality, serving the public, loyalty to constitutional government, impartiality, competence/professionalism, honesty/integrity/disinterestedness, political neutrality, and transparency/openness" [26, p.40]. The general principles are to a great extent influenced by Western standards. Both traditional values and the modern values have found a place in the majority of codes [26, p.46].

It is necessary to implement immediately all these principles in the practice of public administration and management, because the improvement of political and administrative culture is a long process. A popular saying goes: "It takes a year to pass a law, five years to change institutions and fifty years to change administrative culture [30, p.80].

12. Integration of Various Institutions, Reforms and Activities in the Context of the European Union

In conditions of globalisation the role of local and regional self-governments has changed. One of the main features of a democratic local government is autonomy. It means autonomy from the exaggerated supervision of local governments by the responsible ministries, local budget's autonomy and independence in decision-making. But today autonomy doesn't mean a separate action of local governments. On the contrary, in the context of globalisation, the performance of local governments must be implemented in close connection with other institutions.

Today in the whole of Europe and in the world, especially in Central and Eastern European countries as well as in the Baltic States, emphasis is laid on further democratisation and decentralisation of public administration and on the reduction of unfavourable regional disparities. Different reforms and activities are carried out. Unfortunately, the state administration reforms, local government reforms, the National Development Plan and the regional policy are being worked out and implemented separately, without mutual co-ordination. There-

fore the Department of Public Administration of the University of Latvia and the Latvian Statistical Institute have joined efforts to develop a model of integration for state administration and local government reforms, the *National Development Plan*, the territorial development plans, the distribution and use of the EU Structural Funds.

The model proposes close harmonisation of all the above-mentioned reforms and activities at different stages of implementation, involving the employers, the NGOs and citizens more widely in the process of implementation of the reforms. The model helps to eliminate fragmentation during the implementation of various reforms and activities and puts into practice the well-known motto “from local government to local governance”. Local governments have become the main co-ordinator of activities between the central government and the local and regional level, among the territorial state administration institutions, NGOs, private business and citizens. They organise a network to seek a solution to common problems together in close connection with other institutions both vertically and horizontally. Vertical communication is connected with the Europeanization of local governments.

The model is orientated towards the creation of an “entrepreneurial government” based on the fundamental principles of the New Public Management and Reinventing Government. At the same time a few new principles are formulated.

In many instances the sub-national levels are better suited to responding to the challenges of globalisation than the central government level [3]. “The introduction of the Single European Market has had a considerable impact on the policy capacities of the EU member states. Because of the increased competition for qualified labour and capital, local and intermediate levels have gained additional importance in decision-making. In addition, through the regional policy the EU has had a greater direct impact on the sub-national governments. The EU provides support to the least developed regions, involving sub-national governments in the decision-making process”, stress Pekka Kettunen and Kungla Tarvo [9, p.360].

The EU regional policy became more significant after the *Treaty of Maastricht* in 1992, when the fact that the Committee of the Regions was established. It consists of elected deputies of local and regional self-governments. Despite the fact that the Committee of the regions is mainly a consultative body with no real decision-making power, its role is essential in the implementation of the EU

regional policy, in defending in the EU institutions the interests of the regional and local self-governments, in preparing an opinion of local and regional self-governments and in the further development of the relations between the EU institutions and sub-national governments.

The adopted principle of subsidiarity, which was announced in the *Treaty of Maastricht* and is used not only in the distribution of the functions between the EU institutions and EU member states, but also between central governments and sub-national governments.

The local and regional self-governments have a possibility directly communicate with the EU institutions not only through the central government level as it was before. The civil servants of the European Commission are interested in receiving information directly from the sub-national governments and involving them in the decision-making process.

The associations and unions of local and regional self-governments as well as the municipalities of large cities have their representative organisations bureaus in Brussels.

The European Commission and other EU institutions support the diversity of local and regional self-governments. They can be different but all of them must be democratic and based on the principles and in the spirit of the *European Charter of Local Self-Government* [5], passed by the Council of Europe in 1985. The control of the taking into the consideration the principles and the demands of the charter is executed by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe. The functions of the congress are rather wide, including:

- helping the creation of effective local and regional self-governments in the new member states of the Council of Europe;
- facilitating the participation of citizens in local and regional democracies;
- representing the interests of local and regional authorities in the European policy;
- observing local and regional elections.

The *European Charter of Local Self-Government* is ratified in more than 40 countries of the Council of Europe. On the base of the *European Charter of Local Self-Government* a draft of world charter has been worked out under the supervision of the United Nations. It is discussed in more than hundred countries.

It is obvious that in the last years the vertical communications among the EU institutions, EU and the Council of Europe member states central

governments, the regional and local authorities have become more democratic.

One of the main principles of the model of integration is the principle of complexity. It means that all reforms and activities, included in the model, must be implemented not fragmentary, separately, but in a complex way in mutual connection. The novelty of the model is that it proposes both vertical and horizontal communications of different institutions and persons in the process of implementing the public administration reforms, local governance, national development planning, and regional policy, beginning from the European Commission and ending with citizens. The academicians and scientists also must be included in the integration process. According to the model the citizens are included in almost all reforms and activities. Professor Demetrios Argyriades stresses: "Probably topping the list, "governance" has, in the past ten years, dominated the discourse. "From government to governance" became the new panacea, offering visions of largely decentralised, cooperative ventures in which the public service and private enterprise, together with civil society, partake in power-sharing" [1, p.157].

Conclusion

In many countries and especially in transitional democracies diverse reforms and activities are being carried out. Unfortunately, these reforms are being implemented separately without necessary interconnection.

As a result of the implementation of the principle of subsidiarity further decentralisation took place and local and regional self-governments have received new functions and more autonomy. It means less supervision by the central government, more independent local budget and more power in decision-making, but in the conditions of globalisation autonomy does not mean a separate action of local and regional self-governments. Today the performance of local and regional self-governments must be implemented in close connection with other institutions both vertically and horizontally. To advance such interconnection the model of the integration of state administration reforms, local governance, national development planning and regional policy, distribution and use of the EU Structural Funds, harmonisation of the state, local and regional self-governments budgets has been worked out. The model proposes wide involvement of the businessmen, NGOs and citizens in the process of implementation of the reforms.

The model is orientated towards the creation of good governance based on the principles of the European Charter of Local Self-Government, the New Public Management and Reinventing Government. Besides, a few new principles have been formulated.

References

1. Argyriades, D. Good Governance, Professionalism, Ethics and Responsibility. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, June 2006, Vol. 72, No 2, 155-170.
2. Bovaired, T. Public Governance: Balancing Stakeholder Power in a Network Society. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, June 2005, Vol. 71, No 2, 217-228.
3. Brenner, N. Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies* 1999, 36(3), 431-451.
4. *Dažādā Latvija*. Rīga: Latvijas Statistikas institūts, 2005.
5. *European Charter of Local Self-Government*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1985.
6. *Eurostat home page*: <http://epp.eurostat.cec.eu.int>
7. *How Democratic is Latvia. Audit of Democracy*. J.Rozenvalds (Ed). Riga: University of Latvia, 2005.
8. Karklins, R. *The system Made Me Do It. Corruption in Post-Communist Societies*. Armonk, New York, London England: M.E.Sharpe, 2005.
9. Kettunen Pekka and Kungla Tarvo. Europeanization of Sub-national Governance in Unitary States: Estonia and Finland. *Regional and Federal studies*. September 2005, Vol.15, No 3, 353-378.
10. King, G.J., Vanags, E., Vilka, I., McNabb, D.E. Local Government Reforms in Latvia. 1990-2003: Transition to the Democratic Society. 2004. *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol.82, No4, 931-950.
11. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on Equalisation of Local Government Finance*, adopted on March 5, 1998.
12. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on Local Governments*, adopted on May 19, 1994.
13. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on Administrative-Territorial Reform*, adopted on October 21, 1998.
14. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on Budget and Finance Management*, adopted on March 24, 1994.
15. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on Elections to the Town/City Dome, Regional Council and Rural Municipality Council*, adopted on January 13, 1994.
16. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on Local Governments Budgets*, adopted on March 29, 1995.
17. *Law of the Republic of Latvia on State Administration System*, adopted on June 6, 2002.
18. *Law on the Republic of Latvia of Public Agencies*, adopted on March 22, 2001.
19. Lebessis, N., Paterson, J. *Developing New Modes of Governance*. Brussels: European Commission, 2000.
20. *Managing Across Levels of Government*. OECD, 1997.

21. Masujima, T. Administrative Reform in Japan: Past Developments and Future Trends. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. June 2005, Vol. 71, No 2, 295-308.
22. Mulgan, G., Potucek, M. Strategy in Government: The United Kingdom Experience. Martin Potucek (Ed.). *The Capacity to Govern in Central and Eastern Europe*. High Level Meeting. Bratislava: NISPAcee, 2004, 31-59.
23. Osborne, D., Gaebler, T. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Addison – Wesley Publishing Co, 1992.
24. Palidauskaite J. Public Service Ethos in the Context of Contemporary Lithuania Political Culture. *Statistikas un pārvaldes problēmas 2006*, Rīga: LSI, 2006, 7-23.
25. Palidauskaite J. *The Development of Lithuanian Political Culture During the Re-establishment and Strengthening of Independence*. A summary of a doctoral dissertation. Kaunas: Kaunas University of Technology, 1996.
26. Palidauskaite J. Codes of Ethics in Transitional Democracies: a Comparative Perspective. *Public Integrity*, Winter 2005/2006, Vol.8, No 1, 35-48.
27. Palidauskaite J. *Viešojo administravimo etika*. Kaunas: Technologija, 2003.
28. Pollitt, C., Bouchaert, G. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University press, 2000.
29. Potucek, M. The Capacities to Govern in Central and Eastern Europe. Martin Potucek (Ed.). *The Capacity to Govern in Central and Eastern Europe*. High Level Meeting. Bratislava: NISPAcee, 2004, 91-108.
30. *Reference Guide for Horizontal Integration*. Bratislava: NISPAcee, 2005.
31. Salminen, A. Accountability, Values and Ethical Principles of Public Service: the Views of Finnish Legislators. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. June 2006, Vol. 72, No 2, 171-185.
32. Vaidere, I., Vanags, E., Vanags, I., Vilka, I. *Reģionālā politika un pašvaldību attīstība Eiropas Savienībā un Latvijā*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2006.
33. Vanags, E., Vanags, I., Krastiņš. *Pašvaldību pirmais pašvērtējums*. Rīga: Latvijas Statistikas institūts, 2006.
34. Vanags, E., Vilka, I. *Public Administration Reform in Latvia*. Riga: University of Latvia, 2001
35. Vanags, E., Vilka, I., *Pašvaldību darbība un attīstība*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte, 2005.

Edvins Vanags, Ilmars Vanags ir Inga Vilka

Viešojo administravimo pagrindinių krypčių ir principų raida pasaulyje ir Latvijoje

Reziumė

Straipsnyje pateikiamas apibendrinamas požiūris į viešojo administravimo pagrindinių krypčių ir principų raidą ir teigiama, kad tolesnis valstybės valdymo ir savivaldos vystymasis turėtų būti siejamas su viešojo administravimo decentralizavimu ir dekoncentravimu, demokratijos ir efektyvumo prieštaravimų mažinimu, piliečių dalyvavimo valdyme skatinimu, valdžios ir piliečių tarpusavio pasitikėjimo didinimu, enterprenerinės valdžios kūrimu, veiklos vertinimo tobulinimu, skaidrumo didinimu, pasirinkimo galimybių plėtra, viešųjų paslaugų kokybės gerinimu, politinės ir administracinės kultūros ugdymu, įvairių institucijų įtraukimu į valstybės valdymą. Analizuojamas Latvijos universiteto Viešojo administravimo katedros ir Latvijos statistikos instituto pasiūlytas integruotas valdymo modelis, kurio naujovė, pasak autorių, yra vertikalios ir horizontalios komunikacijos tarp įvairių institucijų ir piliečių taikymas, vietinis valdymo derinimas su nacionalinio vystymo planavimu ir regionine politika.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.ppa.0.18.27110