

Performance and regulation in public administration **Assoc.Prof.JUDr.Olga Vidláková, Ph.D.**

What is regulation and regulatory reform and performance

Performance and regulation are the principal terms of this paper and most important is their significance for public administration and governance. The Czech Republic became member of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in December 1995 as the first post-communist country of all Central and Eastern European countries (CEEC). Therefore I shall mostly use the experience gained from our membership in the OECD, where I was active from 1995 until the end of 1999 as the delegate of the Czech government in OECD/ PUMA Committee and as the national coordinator for SIGMA project in the Czech Republic.

There is no generally accepted definition of regulation applicable to the very different regulatory systems in 30 OECD member countries¹⁾. In the OECD work, regulation refers to the diverse set of instruments by which governments set requirements on enterprises and citizens. Regulations include laws, formal and informal orders and subordinate rules issued by all levels of governments, as well as rules issued by non-governmental or self-regulatory bodies to whom governments have delegated regulatory powers. Regulations fall into three categories:

- *Economic regulations* which intervene directly in market decisions such as pricing, competition, market entry, or exit. Reform aims to increase economic efficiency by reducing barriers to competition and innovation, often through deregulation and use of efficiency-promoting regulation, and by improving regulatory frameworks for market functioning and prudential oversight.
- *Social regulations* which protect public interests such as health, safety, the environment and social cohesion. The economic effects of social regulations may be secondary concerns or even unexpected, but can be substantial. Reform aims to verify that regulation is needed, and to design regulatory and

other instruments, such as market incentives and goal-based approaches, that are more flexible, simpler, and more effective at lower cost.

- *Administrative regulations* which are paperwork and administrative formalities – so-called “red tape” – through which governments collect information and intervene in individual economic decisions. They can have substantial impacts on private sector performance. Reform aims at eliminating those no longer needed, streamlining and simplifying those that are needed, and improving the transparency of application.

In 1998 the OECD’s Regulatory Reform Programme was launched in response to a mandate by OECD Ministers. This reform was used in the OECD work to refer to changes that improve regulatory quality, that is, enhance the performance, cost-effectiveness or legal quality of regulations and related government formalities. Reform can mean revision of a single regulation, the scrapping and rebuilding of an entire regulatory regime and its institutions, or improvement of processes for making regulations and managing reform. Deregulation is a subset of regulatory reform and refers to complete or partial elimination of regulation in a sector to improve economic performance.

The past two decades have witnessed an influx of new ideas and initiatives in the field of public management in OECD member countries. Most OECD public administrations have become more efficient, more transparent and customer oriented, more flexible and more focused on performance. The performance movement has increased formalised planning, reporting and control across many governments. Most OECD member countries have introduced performance management and budgeting. The main trends in control across OECD member countries are the move from ex ante to ex post control, and the development of stronger processes of internal control.

“Performance” is a term that encompasses many different concepts. Performance means the yield of results of activities carried out in relation to the purposes being pursued. Its objective is to strengthen the degree to which governments achieve their purposes.

The desire to improve government performance is not new. Governments have always wanted results from their spending and regulation. What is new is that, increasingly, governments are facing overall spending constraints. With no new money to spend, more attention must be given to achieving better results from existing funds. At the same time new ideas have emerged about how to re-organise and better motivate public servants to achieve results.

In the traditional public sector bureaucracy, performance was driven by ensuring compliance with set rules and regulations, controlling inputs and adhering to the public sector ethos. This system generally worked well when governments had less complex and more standardised tasks to perform – and when complying with the rules was considered more important than efficiency or effectiveness. The system has been criticised, however, because employees tended to become more focused on process than on results, and there were weak incentives to use funds efficiently to achieve objectives. Modern public administrators not only have to serve collective interests of fairness and probity, but also have to meet individual needs and address complex social problems. Traditional public administrative systems were not designed to be flexible and adaptive in a modern society with customised services, the need for constant adaptation, pressure for efficiency, and the increased use of private agents. There is a call for sharper performance incentives than those provided by traditional bureaucracy. Furthermore, governments have taken on more challenging and complex tasks, which do not lend themselves to the traditional approach.

Performance information is important for governments in assessing and improving policies:

- in managerial analysis, direction and control of public services;
- in budgetary analysis;
- in parliamentary oversight of the executive;
- for public accountability – the general duty on governments to disclose and take responsibility for their decisions.

OECD member countries use a variety of mechanisms to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of programmes and agencies. These include performance measures, benchmarking and evaluations. The term “performance information” includes both evaluation and performance measures. With performance information it is difficult to apply a “one size fits all” approach across government. Governments carry out a large variety of diverse functions. Three types of programme can be distinguished: tangible and non-tangible individually tailored services and non-tangible ideal services. Performance indicators are more easily applied in programmes which involve the delivery of a tangible good or service with observable outputs. Performance indicators are very difficult to apply to activities such as policy advice where the service is non-tangible and outcomes are not visible. In these areas where process is readily observable, a more obvious approach is to assess and control organisations on the basis of compliance with procedures. In some activities and organisations, where neither outputs nor outcomes are observable, performance indicators are not a suitable option.

The design of measures is made difficult by finding measures for specific activities, and relating what an agency or programme actually contributes towards achieving specific outcomes. Output and outcome measures each present a different set of challenges. Outcomes are technically more difficult to measure; they are complex and involve the interaction of many factors, planned and unplanned. Also, there are problems with time lag issues and in some cases the results are not within the control of the government. Outcomes, however, have a strong appeal for the public and politicians. Most countries appear to have adopted a combination of outputs and outcomes.

Across OECD member countries governments are becoming in the last years more open and more transparent, accessible and consultative. This phenomenon has found expression through new legislation and institutions and a wide array of policy measures. Today 90% of OECD member countries have a Freedom of Information Act and an Ombudsman office. All governments are to varying degrees engaged in public sector modernization. It is no longer an

option, but a necessity, if governments are to respond to changing societal needs and to maintain a competitive economy in an uncertain international environment. One of the most important changes in the period of the past decade has been a move towards more open government. This trend reflects the changing nature of the relationship between citizens and the State. In the past decade, the majority of OECD member countries have undertaken initiatives to make government more open. These initiatives have included the creation of new institutions and the passage of new laws. There is a greater demand for officials not only to give a public account, but also to bear personal consequences of any misuse of power or resources. Today, public consultation on law making and rule making is increasingly accepted as a valuable means of improving the quality of public policy while strengthening its legitimacy.

Openness in itself does not necessarily improve governance, nor does it override all other public values. It should be balanced against other values of efficiency, equity and responsibility. A significant challenge facing governments today is balancing the need to ensure greater national security with the need to preserve openness. For OECD member countries a key issue is how to integrate performance measurement system with the particular country's traditional accountability system and how to balance the need for control with managerial flexibility.

Governments have always struggled with finding a balance between flexibility and control in their administrative systems. Too much discretion for public servants may result in abuse of authority, distortion of policies, self-interested judgment or even increased corruption. Limiting discretion extensively through rules and regulations can result in inefficiency, ineffectiveness and an unresponsive public service. Across OECD member countries in general there is no clear pattern of input controls being lightened as performance indicators are strengthened. There is a continuing struggle to find the right balance between control and flexibility, which is dependent on the individual country context.²⁾

Assessment and measurement of performance

Two models of performance assessment and measurement are used in public administration in many countries. *The EFQM Excellence Model* was created by the European Foundation on Quality Management. The model represents a system of self-assessment, by means of which is possible to determine organisations with the best results; it means that the given organisation can be labelled as the “model of excellence” and the results of this process can be used for comparison with other organisations. The model is based on nine criteria by which can be shown, how the results (four criteria of results: satisfaction of clients, employees, impact on the society, and key results of performance) correspond with preconditions of the organisation (five criteria of precondition: leadership, policies and strategies of the organisation, human resources, partnership and resources, and processes). Thus the criteria of precondition show, how the organisation performs its key activities, and the criteria of results, on the other hand, what are the results of these activities.

From the essence of the EFQM comes the *CAF Model (the Common Assessment Framework Model)*. It is a simple self-assessing instrument enabling public administration organisations to identify their strengths and weaknesses and areas for improvement. An advantage of the CAF Model in comparison with the EFQM Model is just its simplicity and lower cost of its implementation. Moreover, such an assessment of the organisation can be carried out by its own employees, respectively a group of employees selected from the whole organisation or the office.

In the Czech Republic the project called “Implementation of the CAF Models into Organisations of territorial Public Administration” was adopted in 2004, intended for Regional Offices, Municipal Authorities of Statutory Cities and Municipal Offices of municipalities with extended powers. The project was about to run in the following three years – in 2005 it started with the training of the so-called quality managers selected from every one of the mentioned offices, the training of the project team and the subsequent application of the CAF Model. The following two years will be devoted to the demonstration of

measurable improvements in activities of offices and at the end of the triennial cycle the given offices will have the opportunity to participate in the competition for the National Award according to the CAF Model. One of the outputs is also the formulation of the methodology of appreciation of organisations participating in the project.

Last year, when the implementation of some projects of the Governmental Concept of the Reform and Modernization of Central State Administration in the Czech Republic³⁾ started, one of these projects was the "Introduction and development of quality management in central state administration". The Office of the Government published an application handbook of the CAF Model for central administration authorities which is used in the training courses for state administration employees organized by the Institute of State Administration. The term for the application of the CAF Model into central state administration has been fixed for 2008 – 2010; currently it is practised in the Office of the Government and the Ministry of Finance.

Ethics and preventing corruption in public administration

Administrative ethics is important for a number of reasons, but most issues of public service ethics are derived from the basic question of bureaucratic discretion. Many authors emphasize that discretion is the essence of administrative ethics⁴⁾. Discretionary decision makers normally operate within the constraints of official hierarchy that ensure accountability; but towards the end of the twentieth century features on the new public management have resulted in public services being offered outside the traditional structures of government departments. Not only have agencies being created to give greater flexibility and autonomy to parts of government, some functions have been contracted out to business organizations.

The breaking down of barriers between public and private sectors – through the privatisation of services, public/private partnerships and exchanges of personnel – has created grey zones and opportunities for corruption. Decentralisation and devolved public service management have reduced

controls and given greater flexibility for discretion by officials. While the increased use of private sector methods has enhanced public sector efficiency and effectiveness, it also has led to a fragmentation of traditional public service values and ways of operating. This led to the situation in which many OECD member countries experienced in the 1990s an apparent decline of confidence in government and public administration. Citizens seemed to be losing trust in decision makers with corresponding negative implications for the legitimacy of government and its institutions. This so-called confidence deficit was fuelled by well-publicised “scandals” stemming from what could be seen as “inappropriate actions” on the part of public officials to full-scale corruption. Public servants carried out their tasks in a rapidly changing environment and exercised discretionary power in their everyday work in several ways: in their stewardship of public resources, at the interface with citizens and in the context of their policy-making functions. While public management reforms (NPM - New public management) in the 1980s had realised important returns in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, some of the adjustments may have had unintended impacts on ethics and standards of conduct of public officials. To the goals of the three E’s: Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness should be added a fourth “E”: Ethics, and good ethical conduct of the whole public administration is needed as much, if not more than before the NPM reform.

In 1996 and 1997 OECD/PUMA Committee conducted two surveys on the management of ethics and conduct in the public sector involving 23 member countries, including the Czech Republic, the results of which are reported in the book “TRUST IN GOVERNMENT – Ethics Measures in OECD Countries” OECD, Paris 2000. On 23 April 1998 the OECD Council adopted the Recommendation on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service, including twelve principles for managing ethics in the public service:

1. Ethical standards for public service should be clear.
2. Ethical standards should be reflected in the legal framework.
3. Ethical guidance should be available to public servants.
4. Public servants should know their rights and obligations when exposing wrongdoing.

5. Political commitment to ethics should reinforce the ethical conduct of public servants.
6. The decision-making process should be transparent and open to scrutiny.
7. There should be clear guidelines for interaction between the public and private sectors.
8. Managers should demonstrate and promote ethical conduct.
9. Management policies, procedures and practices should promote ethical conduct.
10. Public service conditions and management of human resources should promote ethical conduct.
11. Adequate accountability mechanisms should be in place within the public service.
12. Appropriate procedures and sanctions should exist to deal with misconduct.

The aim of these principles is to help countries to review the institutions, systems and mechanisms at their disposal for promoting public service ethics. The principles identify the functions of guidance, management or control against which public ethics management systems can be checked. They draw on the experience of OECD member countries, and reflect shared views of sound ethics management. The principles may be used by management across national and sub-national levels of government. Political leaders may use them to review ethics management regimes and evaluate the extent to which ethics is operationalised throughout governance. They are not sufficient in themselves – they should be seen as a way of integrating ethics management with the broader public management environment.

Nowadays the ethics is generally considered to be a key issue of good governance and three principles are used for maintaining and improving the ethical conduct of public officials:

1. education in ethics of future officials before their recruitment into public service and further training of ethics during their employment;
2. adoption of codes of ethics for public officials;
3. influence of model role of leading officials.

Codes of ethics became very important documents both in the public and in the private sectors. In the public service, a code of ethics/or conduct can be either a legal document or purely administrative statement prescribing the expected levels and quality of performance of the employees it covers. Whether

as a legal or an administrative instrument, codes mainly play a guiding role in an ethics infrastructure. Most codes generally have a dual disciplinary and aspirational function. The main function of ethical codes is to guide civil servants and to increase awareness in relation to the moral aspects of their tasks. One of their major goals is to increase ethical sensitivity and judgment and to provide clarity regarding responsibility. The two following European Codes can be presented as very good examples of codes of ethics/or conduct: Code of Good Administrative Behaviour, adopted by the European Parliament on 6 September 2001 and Model Code of Conduct for Public Officials – RE No. R (2000)10, adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 11 May 2000.

For preventing corruption conflict of interest has become a key issue in public debate worldwide in recent years, both in the private and in the public sectors. Conflict of interest arises when public officials have to make decisions at work that may affect their private interests. The key question is whether a public official is in a situation where his/her private interests might improperly influence the way he/she does his/her job. While a conflict of interest is not *ipso facto* corruption, there is increasing recognition that conflicts between the private interests and public duties of public officials, if inadequately managed, can result in corruption.

The OECD surveyed the policies and practices of member countries and developed practical instruments for governments to modernise their conflict-of-interest policies. In June 2003 the OECD Council endorsed the *Guidelines for Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service*, which were developed under the direction of the OECD Public Management Committee⁵⁾. The Conflict of interest is defined in the Guidelines as “a conflict between the public duty and private interests of public officials, in which public officials have private-capacity interests which could improperly influence the performance of their official duties and responsibilities”. The Guidelines set comprehensive standards for policy design and implementation, and encourage partnership between the public sector and the business and non-profit sectors by suggesting the

responsibilities of each sector for improving integrity and strengthening the business environment.

The OECD Guidelines set four core principles for public officials to follow in dealing with conflict-of-interest situations in order to maintain trust in public institutions: serving the public interest; supporting transparency; promoting individual responsibility; and creating an organisational culture that does not tolerate conflict of interests. Public organisations should also create and sustain a culture of open communication and dialogue to promote integrity, while providing guidance and training to promote understanding.

The Guidelines provide the following six key policy recommendations on how to identify, prevent, manage and resolve conflict-of-interest situations:

1. Identify relevant conflict-of interest situations.

Provide a clear and realistic description of what circumstances and relationships can lead to a conflict-of-interest situation. Ensure that the conflict-of-interest policy is supported by organisational strategies and practices to help identify concrete conflict-of-interest situations at the workplace.

2. Establish procedures to identify, manage and resolve conflict-of-interest situations.

Ensure that public officials know what is required of them in identifying and declaring conflict-of-interest situations. Set clear rules on what is expected of public officials in dealing with conflict-of-interest situations, so that both managers and employees can achieve appropriate resolution and management.

3. Demonstrate leadership commitment.

Managers and leaders in the public service should take responsibility for the effective application of conflict-of-interest policy by establishing a consistent decision-making process, taking decisions based on this model in individual cases, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the policy and, where necessary, enhancing or modifying the policy to make it more effective.

4. Create a partnership with employees.

Ensure wide publication, awareness and understanding of the conflict-of-interest policy through training and counselling. Review “at-risk” areas for

potential conflict-of-interest situations. Identify preventive measures that deal with emergent conflict-of-interest situations. Develop and sustain an open organisational culture where measures dealing with conflict-of-interest matters can be freely raised and discussed.

5. Enforce the conflict-of-interest policy.

Provide procedures for establishing a conflict-of-interest offence, and consequences for non-compliance, including disciplinary sanctions. Develop monitoring mechanisms to detect breaches of policy and take into account any gain or benefit that resulted. Co-ordinate prevention and enforcement measures and integrate them into a coherent institutional framework. Provide a mechanism for recognising and rewarding exemplary behaviour related to consistent demonstrated compliance with the conflict-of-interest policy.

6. Initiate a new partnership with the business and non-profit sectors.

Involve the business and non-profit sectors in elaborating and implementing the conflict-of-interest policy for public officials. Anticipate potential conflict-of-interest situations when public organisations involve persons representing businesses and the non-profit sector through boards or advisory bodies. Include safeguards against potential conflict-of-interest situations by making other organisations aware of the potential consequences of non-compliance and reviewing together high-risk areas.

However, the test is the observation of such recommendations in real-life situations. Even identifying a specific conflict-of-interest situation in day-to-day work practice can prove very difficult. If public organisations should be able to follow these recommendations, they need practical instruments to help public officials understand how to apply the conflict-of-interest policy in concrete situations. The OECD has developed and tested a Toolkit to meet this need.

The Toolkit provides a set of practical ways to help managers and officials put the policy into practice. Instead of giving a set of complex administrative definitions and processes, the Toolkit provides practical solutions to enable officials to identify, manage and resolve conflict-of-interest situations. It also provides model legislative provisions and procedures, covering gifts,

registration of assets and relevant private interests, as well as protecting whistleblowers.

The 2003 OECD Recommendation on Guidelines for Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service requests the PUMA Committee to report back to the Council on progress made by member countries in implementing the Recommendation. A progress report, scheduled for 2006, will analyse how the Guidelines are applied in a rapidly changing public sector environment. The OECD Guidelines and the Toolkit have increasingly served as a benchmark against which policy makers and managers can review, compare, assess and further develop existing policies.

Prevention of conflict of interest and well understood and applied ethics in public service are the main instruments for reducing the corruption in public administration and improving the trust in government at national, regional and local levels in all countries. Public officials and politicians with this knowledge can also contribute to good performance and well prepared regulation in public administration.

Better regulation and use of RIA (Regulatory Impact Assessment) in the Czech Republic

In March 2004 the Czech Government adopted the Resolution No.237 by which it approved the first conceptual document on the reform and modernization of central state administration. This document presents five main directions of the reform:

1. Rationalization of processes in central state administration;
2. Improvement of central state administration management;
3. Quality improvement of central state administration;
4. Implementation and improvement of civil service in central administrative authorities;
5. Rationalization of central state administration financing.

Within the framework of each of these five directions several specific projects have been designed. The individual projects will be launched

successively so that the whole reform will be terminated in 2010 at the latest. Up to now the greatest stress has been laid on the third main direction which has three projects, including “The regulatory reform in central state administration” which was prepared by the Office of the Government and submitted to the Government at the beginning of the last year. In April 2005 the Government approved it and issued two Resolutions, one concerning the draft progress of the inclusion of the evaluation method of the impact on entrepreneurial environment into the process of the regulation preparation – RIA – Regulatory Impact Assessment and one concerning the Action Plan for the reduction of the administrative burden of entrepreneurs ⁶⁾.

In 1995 the Council of the OECD issued the Recommendation on Improving the Quality of Government Regulation which emphasized the role of RIA in systematically ensuring that the most efficient and effective policy options were chosen. The 1997 OECD Report on Regulatory Reform recommended that governments “integrate regulatory impact analysis into the development, review and reform of regulations”. A list of RIA best practices was discussed in detail in the Regulatory Impact Analysis: Best practices in OECD Countries, OECD, Paris, 1997. In 2000 OECD recommended to the Czech Republic some improvements in governmental regulation and RIA implementation ⁷⁾. The Czech Government has taken into account these recommendations and adopted a Resolution in June 2002 on the amendment of The Legislative Rules of the Government. In 2004 the new amendment of the Legislative Rules concerning the RIA was implemented. However, these changes were not followed by appropriate control mechanisms and the drafting of appropriate guidelines, as a result of which these provisions are frequently not observed or observed only formally.

That is why the introduction of RIA by the 2005 Government Resolution is so significant. Experience of the countries which have introduced RIA and which include a number of EU member states has shown that a correctly devised and implemented impact assessment system assists in the improvement of effectiveness and efficiency of governance and, in a broader

context, contributes also to the improvement of the performance of economy and the improvement of the functioning of economic competition. European Commission in its Action Plan "Simplifying and Improving the Regulatory Environment", COM (2002) 278 final, linking up with the White Paper on European Governance COM (2001) 428 final, undertakes to implement a consolidated instrument for the Impact assessment of legislative and strategic initiatives. In its Communication of 16 March 2005, called "Through better regulation to economic growth and employment in the European Union" the Commission further recommends all EU member states to generate a system of Impact assessment for an integrated assessment of economic, social and environmental impacts, including supporting (institutional) structures adjusted to national conditions. On 15 June 2005 the Commission issued Impact Assessment Guidelines SEC (2005) 791 which replace the 2002 Impact Assessment Guidelines, set procedural rules for Impact Assessment in the Commission and explain how to practically conduct the required analysis.

The document on RIA adopted by the Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic is based also on the experience of some EU member states, particularly the United Kingdom and Italy. With regard to the two-phase character of the legislative process in the Czech Republic the RIA is broken up into "minor RIA" and "major RIA". Minor RIA will be required for all reasoned intents of Acts submitted to the Government by ministries and other central state administration authorities. During its review of the reasoned intent of the Act on the basis of "minor RIA" results the Government will decide, whether the "major RIA" should be performed before the submission of the full text of the proposed Act. The document comprises a detailed draft of the procedure of RIA implementation. If in the course of the second phase RIA will prove to be an efficient and functional instrument supporting Government decision-making, the obligation to apply the RIA Impact assessment will be extended also to secondary regulations (Orders of the Government, Ordinances of the Ministries and further central state administration authorities) and to principal conceptual materials drafted by ministries and other central state administration authorities.

The draft of assessment method approved by the Resolution of the Government deals also with the risks of the successful RIA implementation and their prevention. The number of risks includes: formalization of the procedure outlined in the Guideline; establishment of superfluous new institutional structures; prolongation and higher costs of the preparation of legislative materials; negation of proposed solutions in the process of regulation approval in the Parliament; unwillingness of extragovernmental subjects to co-operate with state administration; and inaccuracy of performed estimates.

The Guideline for Regulation Impact Assessment has six parts:

1. DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this part is to describe with the greatest accuracy possible the given problem, to propose the desired result of its solution and to substantiate why this problem must be solved by the measures on state administration level.

2. SELECTION OF SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES

This part should identify the most varied possibilities of the solution of the defined problem. The number of regulation alternatives includes particularly self-regulation, co-regulation and other variants.

3. COST- BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The content of this part should identify the advantages (benefits) and disadvantages (costs) of the proposed solution. It involves a detailed evaluation of expected benefits and costs of all variants with the purpose of selecting the best and most cost-effective alternatives. The solution should be adopted only, if the benefits exceed the costs involved.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The analysis is based on the consultations with the parties concerned, because the RIA method assumes that all possible impacts cannot be estimated “from the desk”. The consultations also comply with the principle of openness and transparency of public administration.

5. FINAL REPORT

6. IMPLEMENTATION, ENFORCEMENT AND REVIEW

This part is intended only for the recommended solution or, alternatively, for all possible solutions concerned, as the case may be.

The adoption of the appropriate Government Resolution in April 2005 was followed by the drafting and subsequent organization by the Institute of State Administration of training courses concerned with the practical application of the RIA method, including the methods of collection of the necessary data, their evaluation, statistical-economic analyses, etc.

This Resolution of the Government is a concrete example of the way in which “better regulation” will be organized in the Czech Republic, because the RIA is one of the principal instruments of regulation improvement.

Notes

1. OECD has 30 member countries, out of which 19 are EU member countries (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom), 4 other European countries (Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey) and 7 countries of other continents (Australia, Canada, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand and USA). Also the Commission of the EU takes part in the work of the OECD.
2. Modernising Government – The Way forward, OECD, Paris, 2005.
3. The first conceptual document on the reform of central state administration has been issued just before the accession of the Czech Republic to the European Union by the Government Resolution of 17 March 2004 No.237 “The progress and main directions of the reform and modernization of central state administration comprising the solution of the management and organisational support”.
4. For example: Prof.B.Guy Peters “Is Democracy a Substitute for Ethics? Administrative Reform and Accountability” in: R.A.Chapman (ed.): Ethics in Public Service for the New Millennium, Ashgate Publ., Aldershot, England 2000.
5. Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service, OECD Guidelines and Country Experiences. OECD, Paris, 2003.
6. The Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic of 13 April 2005 No.420: “Draft progress of the inclusion of the method for the regulatory impact assessment on entrepreneurial environment into the process of the regulation

preparation”; and the Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic of 13 April 2005 No.421:” Action Plan for the reduction of the administrative burden of entrepreneurs”.

7. Regulatory Reform in the Czech Republic, OECD, Paris, 2001

References

Chapman R.A. (ed.), Ethics in Public Service, Edinburgh University Press, 1993

Chapman R.A. (ed.), Ethics in Public Service for the New Millennium, Ashgate Publ., England, 2000

Hondeghem A. (ed.), Ethics and Accountability in a Context of Governance and New Public Management. EGPA Yearbook, IOS Press, 1998

OECD: Trust in Government, Ethics Measures in OECD Countries. OECD 2000

Pomahač R., Vidláková O., Veřejná správa (Public Administration), C.H.Beck, Praha 2002

Vidláková O., “How to fight corruption with particular reference to the new EU Member countries”, chapter in the book: Jenei G., Barabashev A., Frits van den Berg (eds.): Institutional Requirements and Problem Solving in the Public Administrations of the Enlarged European Union and Its Neighbours, NISPAcee, Bratislava, 2005