

# French autonomous public bodies and their relationship with the State

Dr. François Lafarge  
Ecole nationale d'administration  
University of Strasbourg  
[francois.lafarge@ena.fr](mailto:francois.lafarge@ena.fr)

High Level Conference "Structuring Government in the 21st Century: Managing  
and Controlling Public Agencies at National and EU-level in Times of Crisis"

COST - COBRA

Bruxelles 26 - 27 May 2011

1 General characteristics of the autonomous public bodies

2 The « classical » relationship with the State

3 The « new » relationship with the State

# 1 General characteristics of the autonomous public bodies

## 1.1 Position in French public administration

574 units

366 000 State agents (FTE) out of 2,4 million

around 10% of the State expenditure as subventions

## 1.2 Reasons for creation

the usual one

the legal one

## 1.3 Heterogeneity

Legal status: *Etablissements publics* and others

The sub categories of the établissement public

Size

## 2 The « classical » relationship with the State

### 2.1 A twofold relationship

### 2.2 *Rattachement*

Rattachement means the dependency relationship between the State and the bodies: creation, finances, competencies

Implications: representation of the State into the board, strategic supervision, participation to the main decision making process

Problems: multiple *rattachements*, under strategic supervision

### 2.3 *Tutelle*

Tutelle means control on decisions

Financial tutelle (by *ad hoc* bodies of budget ministry agents)

Standard financial tutelle: most of the spending decisions

Adapted financial tutelle: main spending decisions

Administrative tutelle

*Ex ante* control on main administrative decisions

Problems: over control

# **3 The « new » relationship with the State**

## **3.1 Paths of change**

The 2001 constitutional bylaw on budget acts (LOLF)

Allocation of all the State activities into missions, programmes and actions

The on going programme review of all the State activities (RGPP)

# 3 The « new » relationship with the State

## 3.2 Contents of change

Four changes and a question

**First change: toward a State strategic steering (or reinforcement of the *rattachement*)**

A new category: the State's operators

Integration of the bodies into the LOLF programmes

Contractualization (three levels)

The objectives of the LOLF programmes

The contract between the State and the operator

The mission letter

Coordination within the parents ministries

A committee within each ministry

A coordinator for each multi principals operators

# 3 The « new » relationship with the State

## 3.2 Contents of change

### Second change: relaxation of *tutelles*

#### Relaxation of financial tutelle (as a LOLF consequence)

Standard financial tutelle: shift toward analysis of financial risks, follow up of budget execution and limitation of financials decisions submitted to *a priori* approbation

Adapted financial tutelle: shift toward analysis of financial risks and evaluation of performance

#### Administrative tutelle

Board's decisions needing ministerial approbation are enforceable if silence is kept for more than one month

### **3 The « new » relationship with the State**

Strategic steering through contractualization

+

Relaxed but maintained *tutelle*

=

Two tracks relationship with the State

# 3 The « new » relationship with the State

## 3.2 Contents of change

### **Third change: toward operator's « substantial management »**

State's operators are requested to reform themselves according to three priorities

#### Strengthening of the boards

#### Development or reinforcement of performance management

Scoreboards

Standardized annual reports

Generalization of control management or internal control

External audits or self evaluation

#### Timely delivery and quality of accounts

# **3 The « new » relationship with the State**

## **3.2 Contents of change**

### **Fourth change: submission to State cost rationalization and cost cutting standards**

Operating expenditure have to be reduced by 10%

Target productivity gains have to be met

Sharing of support functions

Mapping and evaluation of assets made compulsory

Number of agents employed by operators capped by budget acts

# **3 The « new » relationship with the State**

## **3.2 Contents of change**

**Questions: does this new relationship imply accountability toward other « principals »?**

Growing attention from the Parliament as an effect of the  
LOLF