



INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES
(IIAS)

•

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTITUTE FOR TURKEY AND THE MIDDLE
EAST
(TODAIE)

**International Aid and Public Administration
Aide internationale et Administration publique**

4TH International Specialised Conference
4^{ème} Conférence internationale spécialisée

Report
Rapport

Ankara, Turkey, 23-27 June 2008

THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

The IIAS is an international association with scientific purpose whose seat is in Brussels. Established in 1930 by the International Congress of Administrative Sciences held in Madrid, the IIAS is the first of the specialised institutions to affirm, worldwide, its scientific willingness to resolve the problems and challenges of national and international administration. It is today the only international institution specialised in administrative sciences and public administration, the primary meeting place for research and co-operation, and open to academics and practitioners from all regions of the world.

The Institute is represented in approximately one hundred countries and counts among its members States, National Sections, International Organisations, Corporate and Individual Members. The Institute also has Consultative Status with Unesco and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and is a member of the International Social Science Council. It thus develops its programmes in synergy with the major organisations to promote international co-operation in the field of Public Administration.

The purpose of the IIAS is to promote the development of administrative sciences, the better operation of public administrative agencies, the improvement of administrative methods and techniques and the progress of international administration. A large part of IIAS activities is devoted to *analysis and research* (Conferences, Working Groups, Seminars, etc.) *information* (its publications, quarterly International Review of Administrative Sciences - published in Spanish, English and French, Newsletter, website) and *expertise and consultancy* (the Institute responds to specific requests of governments, international organisations, or any other agency).

The Institute's Specialised Association and Regional Group also develop and follow-up research in their specific field of interest. The International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA) aims to respond to the institutional development needs of public management and public administration. The European Group of Public Administration (EGPA) is responsible for the development of public administration and administrative theory relative to the European environment.

Most IIAS research activities are carried out in the framework of its Working Groups and annual Major Meetings (Congresses, Conferences, Round Tables).

INTRODUCTION

It is widely thought that good governance is a precondition for development, especially in “failing” or weak states. As a former Development Minister of the UK, Claire Short, said “It doesn’t matter what the question is, the answer is always ‘governance’”. But as a recipe for action, that begs many questions.

The World Bank has developed a set of “Governance” indicators, which, since they are used to direct assistance, have normative value. But as norms they suffer from some defects, most notably that they are too ambitious for many target countries, are too generic and composite, and are difficult to use in practice. Major assistance efforts have been directed to improving governance but the results have not always followed, and where there have been improvements, they cannot always be ascribed to assistance. Further, if good governance reforms are pursued as preconditions for economic development, we can identify economic success stories which were not preceded by good governance reforms; and we can see efforts to improve governance which have not led to economic success.

Are aid efforts mismanaged, are they chasing wrong targets, are they simply too ambitious? Isn’t it time to rethink the governance agenda? Professor Merilee Grindle has pointed to a promising line of development with her papers on “Good Enough Governance”. This IIAS conference will be devoted to exploring the topic and taking first steps along the road towards a new doctrine of governance for development and governance assistance.

The IIAS, with its unique global coverage, its focus on administrative science and its mix of practitioners and academics is ideally placed to develop a new doctrine for assisting governance reform in poorer countries. Its access to global institutions (especially its observer status at the UN) provides leverage to influence the good governance agenda. If the conference is successful, IIAS may seek to present its findings to the Expert Group of the UN as well as to the World Bank and OECD’s Development Assistance Committee. The IIAS Executive Committee may also wish to consider engaging in a longer term process to deepen and make more robust its analysis.

“Good Enough Governance” argues that the usual content of the Good Governance agenda is too ambitious and complex for poorer, weakly institutionalised countries; and that good governance proponents (especially in aid agencies) do not pay sufficient attention to searching for best ways to carry forward a limited agenda in specific country contexts. Thus a key issue for discussion is to identify the content of a “Good Enough Governance” agenda – what are the most important issues that must be tackled and in what sequence? The following topics were addressed

1. Why is governance important to development?
2. Drivers of failure -- aid agencies and aid technology?
3. Aid to Governance -- the record?
4. Making the Good Governance agenda realistic
5. Improving the assistance process

**KEYNOTE ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MERILEE S. GRINDLE
EDWARD S. MASON PROFESSOR OF
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY**

Pathways to Good Governance*

Good governance is a very good idea. We would all be better off, and citizens of many developing countries would be much better off, if public life were conducted within institutions that were fair, judicious, transparent, accountable, participatory, responsive, well-managed, and efficient. For the millions of people throughout the world who live in conditions of public insecurity and instability, corruption, abuse of law, public service failure, poverty, and inequality, good governance is a mighty beacon of what ought to be. But the good governance agenda is far too ambitious. What “ought to be” should not be confused with “what is” or with “what can be.” Let me explain.

Due to its intuitive appeal, good governance has grown rapidly to become a major ingredient in analyses of what’s missing in countries struggling for economic and political development. Researchers have adopted the concept as a way of exploring institutional failure and constraints on growth. Putting governance right has become a major aspect of development assistance. Advocates have linked the advancement of a variety of issues to improved governance. In developed as well as developing countries, good governance has become a rallying cry for those who want government to perform better.

Certainly good governance is a seductive idea—who, after all, can reasonably defend bad governance? Nevertheless, I believe the popularity of the idea has outpaced its capacity to be helpful as we think about the tasks of public sector management and reform.

Getting good governance calls for improvements that touch virtually all aspects of public life—from institutions that set the rules of the game for economic and political interaction, to decision making structures that determine priorities among public problems and allocate resources to respond to them, to organizations that manage administrative systems and deliver goods and services to citizens, to human resources that staff government bureaucracies, to the interface of officials and citizens in political and bureaucratic arenas. Getting good governance at times implies changes in political organization, the representation of interests, and processes for public debate and policy decision-making. In sum, getting good governance requires thinking deeply about the nature of the state and its relationship to civil society.

A Long and Lengthening Agenda

Let me emphasize this important point: the good governance agenda is overwhelming. It has evolved in part through research, when scholars have found an association between particular kinds of policies and institutional arrangements associated with growth or poverty reduction, or when analysis indicates that factors

such as corruption and instability constrain development. The agenda has also evolved through practice, when initiatives to improve governance have revealed additional institutional weaknesses that need to be addressed. The good governance agenda has also expanded as a result of advocacy by committed partisans of democratic government, universal human rights, sustainable development, empowerment of the poor, free trade, participatory development, and other desirable conditions. Indeed, much of the agenda has emerged from the research, experience, and advocacy of international financial institutions, multilateral and bilateral donors, international NGOs, and reformers in donor and developing countries. This agenda has a very large constituency in developing and transitional countries among government reformers, NGOs and civil society organizations, intellectuals, and concerned citizens. Individually and collectively, many have embraced the importance of good governance as a precondition for effective development and have added to the list of factors that are essential for it.

As a simple and incomplete example of this tendency, a simple table demonstrates how the concept evolved over a number of years in the World Bank's *World Development Report*. The table indicates that the list of what is needed for good governance has grown significantly over the years. It summarizes statements about "what must be done" to achieve good governance that appeared in *World Development Reports* from 1997 to 2002/2003. These included the characteristics of good governance and the institutions, laws, policies, services, and strategies that are needed to achieve it. In the 1997 report, developing countries were advised to pay attention to 45 aspects of good governance; by 2003, the list had grown to 116 items. Even allowing for considerable overlap among categories in the table, it seems that countries in need of good governance must undertake a great deal to get it—and the longer they wait, the more things they will need to do to get it!

**The Good Governance Agenda
(Based on Items Referred to in *World Development Reports*)**

	1997	1998	1999/2000	2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003
Characteristics of good governance ¹	18	17	16	19	21	25
Institutions for good governance ²	8	11	10	17	21	21
Specific laws ³	4	14	6	9	16	9
Specific policies ⁴	6	10	13	20	22	20
Specific services ⁵	7	17	12	22	11	20
Broad strategies for achieving specific goals ⁶	2	9	9	19	9	21
Total	45	78	66	106	100	116

Examples of items listed:

¹ Good governance means: checks and balances in government, decentralization, efficient/equitable/independent judiciary, free press, sound regulatory system, etc.

² Institutions for: bank and finance regulation, civil service, market efficiency, managing decentralization, participation, transparent budgeting, etc.

³ Laws for: trademark protection, enforcement of contracts, biodiversity, foreign

investment, labor standards, intellectual property rights, etc.

⁴ Policies about: land reform, land policy, capital markets, community development, downsizing bureaucracy, fisheries, insurance, social safety nets, etc.

⁵ Services for: HIV/AIDS, communications, public transportation, safe water, legal aid for the poor, micro-credit, targeted transfers, etc.

⁶ Strategies for: asset creation for the poor, capacity building in the public sector, empowering the poor, engaging the poor, environmental protection, knowledge development, private sector development, etc.

Source: Grindle 2004

Why is this extensive—and growing—agenda a problem? In large part, the agenda is problematic because it places an unrealistic burden on many of the poorest countries in the world and on those who seek to improve their quality of government. Almost by definition, institutions in such countries are weak, vulnerable, and imperfect; their decision making spaces are constricted by the presence of international actors with multiple priorities, their public organizations are bereft of resources; those who work for government may be poorly trained and motivated. At times, the legitimacy of poor country governments can be questionable and their capacity to govern undermined by political discord; their civil societies may be divided and ill equipped to participate effectively in politics. Social demand for good governance may be weak and poorly informed. In such contexts, getting good governance can overwhelm the commitment of even the most energetic reformers.

At a practical level, the long and lengthening agenda often means that for any given country, a multitude of governance reforms is being undertaken at the same time, differentially supported by a plethora of donors, often with little thought to their sequencing, their interdependence, or their relative contributions to the overall goal of creating governments that are more efficient, effective, and responsive. The agenda does not set priorities or define sequences of actions. It does not separate activities that are easier to undertake from those that are more difficult, those that can be achieved in the short term from those that will take years if not decades to accomplish. It does not provide insight into the dynamics that surround efforts to change current conditions. It does not take seriously the contentious nature of the changes it recommends. And it does not separate an ideal state of good governance from one that is possible in the real world. I believe more attention needs to be given to these kinds of issues if good governance is to be a realistic goal for countries around the world.

The 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness recognized the importance of addressing some of these issues. Yet at the same time, more and more emphasis has been given to the idea of good governance as a precondition for growth, for democracy, and for poverty alleviation. This has simply reiterated the importance of fixing everything before any real progress in development can be made. This is not what happened historically and not necessarily what is happening in developing countries today. Just a few examples: there are rapidly growing countries that score very low on many governance issues; there are democratic governments that have poor governance; and there are countries with good governance that cannot be considered development successes. There are countries generally considered to have good governance that suffer from profound governance failures, such as what occurred in the United States with Hurricane Katrina. Does this suggest that the linkage between good governance and other aspects of development is not as strong as we have been led to believe?

Is a More Realistic Agenda Possible?

Given these problems with the governance agenda, is there anything that can be done to make it less overwhelming? I believe that moving toward a more realistic agenda for good governance means accepting a more nuanced understanding of the evolution of institutions and government capabilities and being explicit about tradeoffs and priorities in a world in which all good things cannot be pursued at once; learning about change from what's working rather than focusing solely on governance gaps; and grounding action in the contextual realities of each country. There are no technical or easy fixes to what is inevitably a long, slow, reversible, and frustrating path toward better performing governments, but there may be ways of reducing the burden on those attempting to undertake the journey.

First, it is important to be very explicit that good governance is a long term objective, and efforts to achieve it will often be halting and reversible. Countries currently facing the challenge of instituting good governance are not the first to have faced this challenge. Thus, I believe that historical analysis and country case studies can provide insights about reducing the list of things that “must be done” as well as suggest sequences for putting governance reforms in place. More attention to the historical experience and to the lessons that can be drawn from specific countries or groups of countries as they faced up to governance deficits would help clarify good governance as a work in progress.

Second, we can take different approaches to research being carried out currently, by asking different questions. The good governance agenda has been largely developed by assessing what's not working or what's working imperfectly. Given the very large number of things that don't work particularly well—or don't work at all—it is not surprising that the to-do list is long and growing longer. Yet in almost all countries, some activities of government work better than most. Consulting this experience can provide valuable lessons about why this is the case, what factors make for better (even if not good) performance, and what needs to be changed for progress to occur. Such lessons can suggest the types of reforms that have better than average chances of making a difference, the kinds of conditions that surround more successful activities, and the specific ingredients important to efforts to improve performance.

Third, we need to address priorities from a contextual perspective. At the practical level, setting priorities for good enough governance is extremely important, yet is extremely difficult because it means sorting out activities across a series of criteria. It involves discriminating the short term from the longer term, sequences and hierarchies of reform activities, feasibility and capacity, and political as well as efficiency impacts. Priorities will certainly differ by country, and even by political administrations within countries. Efforts to define priorities will also undoubtedly generate conflicts. Despite these difficulties, determining priorities within specific country contexts is essential if progress is to be made. Reforms need to be incremental and build upon one another.

Fourth, we need to think about what can be accomplished, given existing capacities in different countries. Currently, many governments are under intense pressure to introduce a range of changes that can easily outpace their capacity to manage reform and the conflicts it produces. Certainly there is much that needs to be done in

most countries, and the poorer they are, the more likely they are to require extensive change before their governments work well. But it is unlikely that much can be accomplished when such countries are overloaded with commitments to change large numbers of conditions at the same time. This is particularly true with reforms that are implementation intensive, as many good governance reforms are. From this perspective, it is better to assess capacities and feasibility more carefully, target fewer changes, and work toward reasonable rather than ideal conditions of governance.

And fifth, we need to pay more attention to the international sources of poor governance. Conditions such as the international arms trade, money laundering, and trade in illegal products contribute to governance failures in developing countries but do not originate there. More benign, but often very destructive, are donor policies that place undue stress on recipient countries in terms of the time and energy they require and the opportunity costs they may be imposing.

In conclusion, let me emphasize again that I fully support the importance of good governance. Yet I also believe that the current good governance agenda is unrealistically long and can even be destructive of efforts made by countries to move toward good governance. Among the governance reforms that are advocated to encourage development there is little guidance about what's essential and what's not, what should come first and what should follow, what can be achieved in the short term and what can only be achieved over the longer term, what is feasible and what is not. I believe more attention needs to be given to these kinds of issues if good governance is to be a realistic goal for countries around the world. This, I believe, is a challenge to researchers and practitioners who care about good governance.

*This paper is based on material taken from the following sources:

Grindle, Merilee S., 2004. "Good Enough Governance: Poverty Reduction and Reform in Developing Countries," *Governance*, Vol. 17, no. 4 (October), pp. 525-548.

Grindle, Merilee S., 2007. "Good Enough Governance Revisited," *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 25, no. 5 (September), pp. 533-574.

Grindle, Merilee S., forthcoming. "Good Governance: The Inflation of an Idea." In Bish Sanyal (ed.), *The History of Planning Ideas*.

RAPPORTS DES RAPPORTEURS

A. Professor Bob Bonwitt – General Rapporteur

INTRODUCTION

- Thank fellow Rapporteurs
- Asked to report on what conference said about the project proposal
- **REMINDER**: Proposal that IIAS carries forward a process to produce a policy paper to influence governance reform and aid to governance reform
- Serious responsibility with important implications for the Institute
- I report as a cold hearted professional not as the recipient of the honour to be asked to be a Rapporteur
- I will try to speak truth to power and restrain my own enthusiasm

This is difficult task because:

- Issue not discussed directly in Conference
- Participation/papers not balanced relative interests touched by the proposal
- Subject of conference narrowed issue relative to the project
 - The title was Public Administration not Governance, whereas the problem is clearly larger than administration
 - And, most importantly for me
 - Governance reform must be an endogenous process
 - It is wrong to discuss it in terms of Aid
 - Aid is, both empirically and normatively, marginal (when it is not harmful)

However, some things can be said on basis of

- Exec Comm
- Inference from the sessions
- Rapporteurs discussions outside sessions
- Contents of suggestions box – but only 3 contributions received
 - *(How to read that? Lack of interest, disagreement or not sure how to answer?)*
- NB website open forum for ideas

I think we can include that

1) Fresh thinking is needed on

- What functions of Governance are essential for development
- How can Governance reform be assisted through aid

2 IIAS is a unique resource for that thinking because it

- Spans practitioner/academic
- Has global/Regional Structure

3) A good operational policy paper would be welcomed

- This project comes at a very appropriate time when there is a demand for new ideas and approaches
- It fits with the thrust of IIAS's reinvention of itself with a committed Executive Committee and a dynamic new Director General

In short I think the moment is right.

Therefore my tentative recommendations is that IIAS should pursue the project idea and launch the Ankara Process

BUT

It needs a lot more thought as was made clear in the conference.

RISKS

- Risks are high
 - Politically charged issue; it will be difficult to protect scientific neutrality of Institute
 - Addresses many strong vested interests (Not least “Aid to Governance” Industry in the North)
 - Requires innovative, out-of-box thinking
 - It must be multidisciplinary, not limited to Administrative Science
 - May receive only weak interest or take up of output
 - Timescale for relevance and Window of demands is tight, and others are also working on the issues
 - Requires Policy Thinking and Advocacy

All of this demands a high level of Innovation and Attention from a body that is already in throes of radical change with a team still in construction

I think risks can be managed, but I would strongly recommend

Don't start unless reasonable chance of success

If you do go ahead, there are a series of issues to address

- You will need to work hard before going further
- You will need to design a project which meets the goals but is in your production capacities
- In short, if I may coin a term,

Do not Grindle yourselves – i.e. overload your agenda content

You need to do a lot of work to define the topics.

Some of the issues were discussed but not as a potential research agenda

Since not discussed, I infer and invent some ideas.

I suggest 3 areas could be defined and looked at separately although in there will need to be bridges between them:

• **GOVERNANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT**

I refer to report of Professor de Vries

- We need to better understand what basic institutions are necessary for growth
- What should be in the “shrunk” agenda

- What are the historical pathways
- What does work in poorer countries with weak states (local, Unassisted success stories)
- How should the recommendations of the “growth committee” (growth is the best way to relieve poverty) be taken into account while recognising distributional (equity) issues
- In our definition of scope (“governance”) we must include political systems and security issues

- **DEVELOPMENT (NOT REFORM) OF GOVERNANCE**

Here I make a plea for a change in terminology which reflects a major substantive concern – complex systems develop (evolve). As our colleague from Brazil said – there has been change and been change and there have been reforms, but not sure that they are connected.

“Reformism” is a dysfunctional and outmoded concept – the very structure of reform projects may explain many of the failures of governance reform (in all countries) and of assistance

- How do systems of governance develop?
- What effect do reforms have?
- How can evolution be constrained, accelerated, oriented?
- Sequencing prioritisation etc...
- What are the dynamics of reform in particular areas of governance (especially security)
- How can learning be facilitated

- **AID TO GOVERNANCE DEVELOPMENT AND NEW PARTNERSHIP BASED ON MUTUAL INTERESTS**

Here I want to echo the remarks of Minister Fraser-Moleketi – the donor/beneficiary terminology is outmoded and patronising. I would go further and say that this also applies to inter-personal relationships. We bureaucrats (even if we are international) should never forget that we are just bureaucrats, with no democratic legitimacy.

Our counterparts are often ministers and, however poor and aid-dependent the country, we owe them the respect that we would accord a minister in our own country. That rule may be obvious but it is not (always) observed, and when it is not, it undermines our lessons about democracy.

- Redefinition of ownership and how to make it reality
- Rethinking of aid management technologies and move to a service model
- Improvement in the analysis of context and its incorporation into decision making.
- Development of feedback loops and learning
- This area also includes the governance of aid (see report of Professor Bozkurt) and especially its democratic deficit and quality

END GAME

PRODUCT

- I would recommend a policy paper (not a 'declaration') – perhaps IIAS could produce a **White paper on 'Governance for Development'**
- This should be preceded by Policy papers on second tier topics (eg Security Reform)

MARKETING

- Backed by reputation of Institute
- Publicised widely and submitted to appropriate instances (Governments, International Institutions etc)

You will need to think through targeting and co-optation strategies from the beginning.

And also develop a communication strategy to ensure openness and contributions (eg wikis, town hall meetings etc...)

This is another area where the Institute has limited experience.

And all this will be useless unless you have a product.

PRODUCTION PROCESS

I would like to share my views on this conference.

In this proposal, such conferences were to be an essential element of the production process.

Do not take these remarks as negative – the conference fulfilled valuable functions.

My remarks are more a reflection of my ignorance of before the meetings.

You to decide if accurate and if they are particular to this event:

- Papers not all of quality needed
- Papers not sufficiently targeted
- Possibility of direct scientific advance in congress limited
- Not all participants fully committed

Leads me to conclude you need a parallel processes:

- Highly structured and driven policy analysis and development process
- Regional based with strong central coordination
- Submission for contributions and quality control to IIAS meetings/networks
- Parallel use of IIAS to engage a wider audience for inputs and commenting

All of this requires:

- High visibility, high substance leadership from the South
- Strong Scientific Committee (NB Members not limited to Executive Committee)
- Strong quality control

- Full support resources
- Professional goal driven (commissioned) research programme
- Networked with main players (OECD, WB, UN etc)
- Regional Network involvement (including of VPs) (but not responsibility for production)
- Involvement of Executive Committee for legitimacy and control
- Money

FINANCING

This will not be cheap and must be externally funded.

Resources should be available if sponsors approached professionally (WB, OECD, Bilaterals, Foundations...). However, this is another area of innovation for the Institute.

NEXT STEPS

NB this has to be done quickly:

1. Engage (at least moral commitment) project leader
2. Set up Scientific Committee
3. Prepare Project proposal to be agreed by PRAC and Exec Comm
4. Approach funders
5. Recruit support staff (Project Manager)
6. Visit regional networks to win engagement and identify expertise

CONCLUSION

These were some first thoughts.

Success depends on Institute and that means Brussels and members.

In 5 years, I hope the Ankara process will produce change in Governance for development and in aid policy and I hope each of you will be able to say "I was there at the beginning".

B. Michiel S de Vries – Fellow Rapporteur

This conference has come to an end now and it is up to us as rapporteurs to make some final comments. For me it was an extra-ordinary conference in the sense that next to the confusion much discussion was visible on its main topics that is Governance, Aid and establishing a research agenda. I loved those discussions, because they were open, they were sometimes sharp, but always filled with substantive arguments instead of strategic, power and interest based arguments. Such discussions are seen far too seldom in conferences and even in scholarly conferences.

If this conference succeeded in one way, it was to make me think and I hope to make you think also. So that is the good thing, or might I say the good enough thing.

For me as a rapporteur that makes for a difficult position. Because the discussions are not finalized substantive conclusions are not yet possible. All I can do is summarize and reflect and give the basic questions at stake. But even that is somewhat redundant, because most sessions were plenary sessions. You all attended and you all know what was said. So let me just give a short resume regarding the governance issues and summarize the basic questions at stake.

It started with Mrs Grindle's approach a wonderful article.

She told us that the governance agenda is overloaded. Given the scarce resources too much of these resources is going to improve government in such a way that it approximates the ideal governance structure

We should diminish this overload Merilee Grindle said and just strive for good enough governance. There are so many other urgent problems to address like poverty, health and education problems. The problem is that we - the developed countries - have imposed an agenda for developing countries that is impossible to accomplish. It is an agenda which we ourselves did not even follow

Downsizing the agenda or adding to it

What happens is of course similar to trying to downsize governments. You know the saying that if you want to reduce administration with 15% you probably end up with an increase of 15% because of all the project groups steering committees, working groups and planning groups you need in order to make a good policy on downsizing the apparatus. The same happened during this conference also. Instead of reduction of demands on governance, some additional demands entered the discussion. What about security? Should it be added to the agenda or is it a too political issue to touch upon. What about equality? Should it be something that should be included in the agenda?

So the alternative was "good enough governance"

Then the discussion emerged. What is needed for growth? Is good governance with the 140 indicators as mentioned by the World Bank and summarized under such aggregates as Government effectiveness, political stability, regulatory quality, Voice and Accountability, Control of corruption really necessary? Or on the other extreme "can bad governments" also do a good job and what can we learn from that, as Pat Gray told us?

There are also some dangerous sides to such a concept

To introduce a concept like good enough governance one makes a sliding scale, a continuum, of the quality of governance. Where to put the dividing line? Are we satisfied if a government scores high enough on all dimensions? F.I. beyond a critical point? Or are we to focus on some important dimensions? I do hope it is the second point. Because one can not achieve everything simultaneously. It has in my opinion to be done consecutively. You focus on the most urgent problem and when that is solved you address the next most urgent problem.

But then the question arose what are the most important aspects and who should decide?

Some suggestions about the most important aspects came from analysis

Empirical research (Kim Moloney) suggested that we could focus on government effectiveness and stability because these are the two that impact most. And we had discussions about the necessity of such analysis, but because I was part of that discussion I will not make comments upon this as rapporteur.

Ownership of the agenda

Perhaps the whole discussion is just based on the question who should own the agenda.

Everybody wants to own it. Developing countries don't want the developed countries to impose their values on them. That is the question of power and interests, which is a political question.

I can understand that this question arises, but I am first of all a scholar, who wants to analyze what gives optimal results in one way or another

Then we discussed good governance

Is it about reforming government? Is it about establishing principles of New Public Management? Or about involving the civil society? Is it about the public side of public administration or the administration side thereof? Is it about nation building? Or is that a contradiction in terms, as our general rapporteur tends to argue, because nations and governments emerge evolutionary? And the discussion became quite fundamental. What is governance anyway?

In my view the answer depends on how you interpret the emergence of the concept in the 1990s.

Was it a new attempt to further reduce the role of government after the Washington consensus of the early 1980s with its emphasis on efficiency and promoting the free market and the need to downsize government? Or was the concept of governance a first attempt a way to smuggle government back in?

According to me it was the second, but I don't want to restart the discussion right now.

Goal or means

Good governance has become a value in itself. What is it? A goal or an instrument? Nowadays I think most donor-countries see good governance as a goal in itself. Hardly caring about economic growth, implicitly, good governance has become a goal in itself. And a goal not primarily there to serve the interests of developing countries but to serve developed countries' interests.

But good governance is a means. It is the intermediate variable so to speak. The lightning bolt that prevents not the lightning to strike but prevents it from causing a

fire. Governance should provide the instruments that problems become less dependent on factors one cannot influence.

Some problems are caused by factors you could influence. Good governance should address these factors. But there are also other factors, sometimes out of the control of government and governance. In those cases government and governance should try to break the link between those factors and the problems caused by them that is act like a lightning bolt.

In the end we were both optimistic and pessimistic.

Scholars in Public Administration can help to strive for good 'enough' governance. To respond effectively to new developments and to achieve practices of good enough governance but we have a long way to go. I would argue that perhaps many countries don't have good governance; perhaps practices change very slowly; but we in Public Administration still lack the information to understand the problems, to explain and to improve. That seems to be one of the undisputed conclusions of this conference.

C. Ömer Bozkurt – Fellow Rapporteur

Cette 4ème Conférence spécialisée de l'IISA sur l'aide internationale et l'administration publique, se propose d'être, vous le savez bien, le point de départ d'un processus que nous appellerions le Processus d'Ankara et qui durerait sous l'égide de l'IISA quelques années et qui aboutirait, nous espérons, à des résultats tangibles qui contribueraient à la formulation de meilleurs politiques en matière de la l'aide internationale.

Avant de passer en revue certains éléments relatifs à l'aide internationale que nous avons soulevés lors de nos travaux pendant ces trois derniers jours, je voudrais m'arrêter quelques instants sur un point particulier : Il s'agit de réfléchir pour un moment sur un couple de termes qui acquiert une importance capitale. Il s'agit d'une part de l'aide à la gouvernance et de l'autre la gouvernance de l'aide elle-même.

Pour mieux faire ressortir la nuance et éviter toute confusion vous me pardonnerez de prononcer les équivalents en anglais et en turc de ce couple de concepts tels qu'ils sont inscrits dans notre livret de programme, et qui quelques fois lors de nos travaux se trouvaient confondus. Ou plutôt avec lesquels nous avons pour ainsi dire jonglé à notre guise.

Vous avez donc d'une part « *aid to governance* » (*yönetişime yardım*) qu'on devrait très légitimement traduire comme aide à la gouvernance et de l'autre vous avez « *aid governance* » (*yardım yönetişimi*) qu'on devrait traduire comme la gouvernance en matière d'aide ou dans notre contexte, de l'aide internationale, ou tout simplement la gouvernance de l'aide.

Je pense que cette distinction est importante et pertinente. D'ailleurs lors de nos travaux on a été toujours confronté à cette dualité peut-être sans le préciser explicitement. Depuis le discours d'ouverture de Mme. Grindle, jusqu'à la présentation magistrale du Professeur Arie Halachmi, en passant par celles de Mme. Kate Jenkins - M. William Plowden, de Mme. Caroline Brassard et de tant d'autres. Je crois même que je peux avancer sans devoir affronter un grand risque d'erreur que c'était là, un des aspects qui rendaient notre conférence extrêmement intéressante. En effet par exemple la dénonciation de manque de transparence dans les dépenses des organismes internationaux ou bien la déclaration de la nécessité de vision endogène émanant des pays en développement ne sont-elles pas des signes de mauvaise gouvernance en matière de l'aide ?

Cependant je dois immédiatement ajouter que cela n'était point une simple coïncidence, mais belle et bien voulu lors de la conception du thème et du format de cette conférence. Donc c'est maintenant un constat de réussite que j'ai le plaisir de formuler.

En effet il me semble, et d'ailleurs cela ressort de nombreuses contributions que nous avons entendues lors de ces trois journées, que pour être efficace, pour pouvoir contribuer effectivement à la croissance des pays qui reçoivent l'aide, il faut aussi que cette aide soit fournie selon certains principes de la bonne gouvernance. Ainsi, une grande partie de critiques adressées aux organismes d'aide, et des critiques concernant l'efficacité de l'aide n'auraient plus de lieu.

Tout au début de notre 4ème Conférence spécialisée, Mme. Grindle a souligné très pertinemment le poids et la disparité que représentent les très nombreux critères ou prérequisites de la bonne gouvernance, émanant de diverses sources et tendant à proliférer encore plus. Elle avait déjà, fort justement plaidé pour un ordre du jour plus réaliste. Car selon elle « la popularité de l'idée de la gouvernance avait dépassé sa capacité d'être utile. »

Elle a attiré l'attention sur le fait que dans la pratique tous ces prérequisites, « ces choses qui doivent être réalisées » pour la bonne gouvernance n'étaient pas « ordonnées » ; et il n'était pas tenu compte des liens d'interdépendances qui existerait entre elle. Elle a affirmé que l'agenda, l'ordre du jour, n'établissait pas des priorités ou ne les ordonnait pas selon une logique, et qu'il faisait abstraction du milieu et des dynamiques sociales par lesquels ces efforts de réformes étaient entourés

Elle a enfin demandé qu'on accepte que la bonne gouvernance ne peut être qu'un objectif de long terme ; qu'on réfléchisse et essaye de trouver pourquoi certaines activités sont mieux gérées que d'autres et d'agir en conséquence; et enfin et surtout d'établir des priorités même si celles-ci peut engendrer des conflit, selon le contexte spécifique au pays.

Selon la division de travail que nous avons effectuée avec mes collègues rapporteurs, j'envisagerai notamment parmi les éléments important que j'ai relevés, ceux qui se rapportent surtout à la nature et aux processus de l'aide.

Dans ce chapitre on pourrait relever parmi les idée émises par exemple l'idée de réduire le coût de l'aide pour les pays receveurs; car quelque fois le prix a payer par le receveur et si élevé qu'on peut très légitimement se demander à qui sert vraiment l'aide. Toujours dans cette perspective les dépenses très élevées engendrées par l'emploi des experts étrangers et aussi des équipements très dispendieux ont été soulignées.

Une autre idée émise concernant la nature de l'aide fut d'accorder ou de fournir une aide demandée et ne pas imposer telle ou telle autre aide. La nécessité de réduire les effets négatifs de la médiocre qualité de l'environnement a été également soulignée. Pouvoir ou devoir cibler l'aide au plus démunis a été plusieurs fois soulevé

Quant aux recommandations pour les donateurs on devrait retenir l'idée que le processus d'aide devrait se poursuivre sous forme d'une relation entre les égaux. (Jenkins) Que les donateurs devraient modifier leur méthodes et d'être plus réaliste, plus modeste et patients quant aux résultats escomptés. Il faudrait améliorer les relations entre les donateurs et les receveurs, de remplacer la concurrence entre les donateurs par une collaboration entre ceux là. Il faudrait aussi attacher une importance particulière aux feedbacks reçus.

D'autre part, on a souligné l'importance des actions collectives mieux gérées de la part des pays donateurs. (Bathylle Myssica). *Et l'impact des considérations politiques* notamment en matière d'aide pour le développement a été traité. En effet si on ventile la nature, les montants et la continuité des aides selon les pays on aperçoit des fluctuations importantes qui sont en corrélation avec certains évènements ou

changement politiques. Ce qui est surtout vrai pour l'aide au développement (ODA) tandis que l'aide technique se trouve être plus stable. (De Vries et Ivona Sobis)

Enfin l'importance et la primauté de la formation des formateurs pour contribuer au développement des pays démunis. (Arie Halachmi)

Lors de la conférence une comparaison intéressante nous a été présentée entre l'approche ou la doctrine de la gestion de développement (development administration) très en vue lors des années 60 et 70 dans les organismes d'aide internationale et des milieux universitaires, et ainsi que son corollaire: l'administration publique comparée d'une part et de l'autre la gouvernance. L'identité dans les deux approches de la norme essentielle choisie : a savoir les systèmes et processus occidentaux a été évoquée. Et une différence fondamentale existante entre les deux approches a été soulignée: tandis que dans la première, l'Etat central a un rôle important, la seconde qui est surtout associée au déclin de l'importance du gouvernement central, se concentre sur la société civile et le secteur privé. (Akdogan)

Je voudrais maintenant, dans une seconde partie, m'arrêter quelques instant sur le panel du pays hôte, qui avait pour thème l'aide internationale et l'administration publique turque auquel ont participé les représentants de six organismes gouvernementaux.

A savoir :

- Office d'Etat de Planification, (DPT)
- Le Secrétariat pour l'Union Européenne (ABGS)
- Le Sous-secrétariat pour le Commerce Extérieur,
- Le Ministère des Affaires Extérieures
- L'Agence Turque de Coopération et de Développement (TIKA)
- Le Croissant Rouge de Turquie

Les deux premiers étant des gestionnaires de l'aide reçue, tandis que les quatre autres pourvoyeurs de l'aide.

Les éléments essentiels qu'on peut retirer de ces exposés pourraient être résumés comme suit :

- a) la Turquie est depuis quelques années un pourvoyeur de l'aide extérieur net. C'est-à-dire elle donne plus qu'elle ne reçoit ; le pourcentage de l'aide extérieure a son PNB étant plus élevé que certains pays de l'UE, et pas seulement de nouveaux membres. (714 millions de USD en 2006)
- b) La distribution géographique de cette aide s'élargit et comprend à l'heure actuelle, les pays des Balkans, de la Transcaucasie, de l'Asie centrale et de l'Afrique ;
- c) Enfin un point essentiel : cette aide est surtout basée sur les besoins des receveurs (need based aid)

Ces exposés de nature plutôt descriptive ont été, après une question émanant de l'auditoire, complétés par certains éléments portant sur les modalités, l'efficacité, les difficultés et les dysfonctionnements relatifs au processus de l'aide

Pour ce qui est de l'aide reçue, on a souligné l'importance de développement de la capacité de préparation des projets et d'obtenir la participation des bénéficiaires au processus.

Pour l'aide accordée, le représentant du Sous-secrétariat au Commerce extérieur a précisé qu'ils visaient surtout la promotion de la capacité commerciale des pays receveurs, et qu'ils pourvoyaient de l'assistance technique en vue de faciliter au pays receveurs l'accès aux marchés internationaux. Le représentant du Ministère des Affaires étrangères a souligné les difficultés émanant des particularités de certains régimes politiques et il a relaté les difficultés rencontrées récemment pour l'aide à Myanmar.

Les efforts pour réduire le coût de l'aide ont été également mentionnés. Et il a été affirmé que le coût de l'aide fournie par la Turquie se trouve être beaucoup plus réduit que celle, par exemple, fournie par les autres pays de l'OCDE.

Le représentant de TIKA a en outre souligné l'importance et l'efficacité de l'aide ponctuelle pour des projets concrets et la concentration sur des objectifs limités. Il a insisté sur la nécessité de réduire le coût des experts sur le terrain.

Enfin le représentant du Croissant rouge de Turquie a soulevé le problème de la chute de confiance envers les organismes internationaux auprès du public, et a montré comme exemple inquiétant l'attaque contre le siège de la Croix-Rouge international à Bagdad.

Pour terminer deux idées qui paraissent intéressantes : Lors de ce panel le représentant du Croissant rouge turc a dénoncé une aberration capitale en évoquant que dans certaines circonstances mêmes les armes ou les mines antipersonnel étaient comptabilisées dans le poste des aides fournies. D'autre part, la perte de confiance de la part des organismes internationaux d'aide a été également soulevée. Et l'attaque perpétrée contre le siège du Croix rouges internationale a été citée comme un signe inquiétant.

LIST OF PAPERS

Congress Theme: Why is Governance important to development?

1. Pat Gray, United Kingdom
Can bad governments make good policy? Russia and policymaking in the authoritarian developmental state.
2. Sirma R. Turgut, Turkey
INTERNATIONAL AID SUPPORT AS THE NEW HOPE OF İSTANBUL PROJECTS AND THE “LACK OF PLANNING” STANDING ON ITS PATH
3. Jose R. Castelazo, Mexico
International Coordination and Governmental and Social Co-Responsibility
4. Peggy Lau, Canada
Development through local governance: the Role of Aid in reconstructing Afghanistan
5. Carlo Flamment, Italy
Une gouvernance de qualité mais réaliste pour les pays plus démunis : réformer l'aide à la gouvernance

Sub-theme 1: Aid to Governance – the record

1. Arie Halachmi, China
Governance and Development: The Dual Challenge
2. John Ivan Fosu, Ghana
Good enough Governance in the Development process of Ghana (2001-2003) using Aid to finance Development budget
3. Kim Moloney, USA
Public Administration and Governance: A Sector-Level Analysis of World Bank Aid
4. Mohameden Ould Bah Ould Hamed, Mauritania
Aide internationale et Administration publique
5. Hüseyin YAYMAN, M. Akif OZER, Turkey
A Deviation from Classic Management Thought: Governance-Transformation and Third World View
6. Argun Akdoğan
Development Administration and Good Governance: Where are we after 50 years?
7. Cui Jun, China
Improve the Approach of International Aid Management and Enhance the Overall Level of International Aid through the Application of Public Administration Theory

Sub-theme 2: Making the Good Governance agenda realistic

1. Alan Doig, United Kingdom/Turkey
Dimensions of the Reconstruction of the State and the Emergence of a National Integrity system (NIS)
2. Derick W. Brinkerhoff and Ronald W Johnson, USA
Getting good enough governance in fragile states: the role of center-periphery relations and local government, RTI International
3. Emilia Sičáková-Beblavá, Turkey
Why is governance important to development
4. Çınar ÖZEN, Arzu OFLASLI, Burak TANGÖR, Turkey
International Aid with Anti-terrorist conditionalities
5. Desi Fernanda, Indonesia
Experience of Indonesian Governance Reforms: is Good Governance a myth or reality?
6. Sajjad Hassan, India
Breaking the vicious circle: Fostering good governance in very weak states
7. Hanan Ibrahim Elnaggar, Egypt
Factors for Success in "Resala" Organization for Poverty Reduction
Analytical Study of a Non-Governmental Organization (NGs)

Sub-theme 3: Drivers of outcomes: aid agencies and aid technology

1. Yang Changju, China
The Role of Foreign Expertise in China's Development
2. Michiel S de Vries, The Netherlands, Iwona Sobis, Sweden
Technical Cooperation within the Context of Foreign Aid:
Trends for the CEE-countries in transition (1991-2004)
3. Chung-Yuang Jan, Taiwan, China
The good governance and international aid the case of ICDF in Taiwan
4. Guner Ozkan, Mustafa Turgut Demirtepe, Turkey
Transformation of a Development Aid Agency: TICA in a Changing Domestic and International Setting
5. Nalan Demiral
Good Governance for Turkey in the Process of European Union Accession

Sub-theme 4 : Improving the assistance process

1. Caroline Brassard, Singapore
Towards a Measurement of Aid Governance in Developing Countries in Asia

2. Hiroko Kudo, Japan
Evaluation of Aid Projects - from successful and unsuccessful Experiences of Japanese Aid Policy
3. Léon Bertrand NGOUO, Cameroun
La Déclaration de Paris sur l'efficacité de l'aide et le renforcement des capacités des pays bénéficiaires pour mettre en œuvre le modèle de gestion axée sur les résultats de développement : où en sommes-nous avec l'expérience au Cameroun et quelles sont les perspectives?
4. Zhang Yonghui, China
International Aid and Consultative Governance: Practices of International Nongovernmental Organizations in China
5. *Paolo de Renzio, United Kingdom*
The Elusive Quest for 'Good Enough' Indicators of Governance
6. Ufuk Ayhan, Turkey
Thoughts on Future Mission Planning and Donor Funding
7. Zehra ODYAKMAZ, Turkey
Suggestions on the Application of Dispute Resolutions for the Conflicts which can arise between the Donour Organisation and the Aid Recipient State
8. Lippold Freiherr von Bredow and Christoph Patzelt, Germany
The role of parliamentary administration in the process of establishing good governance
9. Miroslav Beblavý, Slovakia
Effective and realistic anticorruption instruments: Case study of Slovakia

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ALGERIA

Prof. Tounsi Benameur
Doyen
Université Benyoucef Benkhedda Fac
de droit Ben Aknoun
Algeria
idribou56@hotmail.com

Prof. Slimane Mohamadi
Université Benyoucef Benkhedda Fac
de droit Ben Aknoun
Algeria
mohamadi_slimane@yahoo.fr

ARGENTINA

Mr. Hugo Alberto Amburi
Director de Administración y
Contabilidad
Presidencia de la Nación - Jefatura de
Gabinete de Ministros
Argentina
amburiah@jgm.gov.ar

BELGIUM

Mr. Rolet LORETAN
Directeur général
IIAS
Belgium
loretan@iiasisa.be

BOSNIA HERZEGOVINIA

Ms./Mrs. Marina Kavaz-Sirucic
Expert adviser
Public Administration Reform
Coordinator's Office
Bosnia and Herzegovina
marina.ks@parco.gov.ba

Ms./Mrs. Aneta Raic
Head of Unit for donor coordination,
finance, monitoring and evaluation
Public Administration Coordinator's
Office
Bosnia and Herzegovina
aneta.raic@parco.gov.ba

BRAZIL

Dr. Enrique Saravia
Prof.Dr.
Getulio Vargas Foundation / EBAPÉ
Brazil
esaravia.fgv@gmail.com

CAMEROON

Mr. Léon Bertrand NGOUO
Professeur/Consultant
Institut Supérieur de Management
public
Cameroon
lbngouo@yahoo.fr

CANADA

Ms./Mrs. Peggy Pui Ki Lau
York University
Canada
pklau@yorku.ca

Ms./Mrs Ann Masson
Canada

CHINA

Mr. Jun Cui
Associate Professor
Renmin University of China
China
cuijun@mparuc.edu.cn

Mr. Bin Hao
Deputy Director-General
Ministry of Human Resources and
Social Security
China
Haobin@mop.gov.cn

Ms./Mrs. Li Ma
Shanghai Administration Institute in
P.R. China
China
mamaryli@hotmail.com

Mr. Jiang Wu
Director-General
Ministry of Human Resources and
Social Security
China
danielgaos@sohu.com

Ms./Mrs. Feng Xiao
shanghai administration institute
China
course_xiao@163.com

Mr. Changju Yang
Director-General
State Administration of Foreign Experts
Affairs
China
cyang@safea.gov.cn
Prof. Chung-Yuang Jan
National Chengchi University
Taiwan, China
cychan@nccu.edu.tw

EGYPT

Mr. Adel Abdel-Baki
Councilor
Egyptian section of IIAS
Egypt
adelabdelbaki@link.net

Prof. Hanan Ibrahim El-Naggar
Prof of Finance
Al-Azhar University
Egypt
hnaggar@yahoo.com

M. Mohammed Othman
Egypt

FINLAND

Ms./Mrs. Katju Holkeri
counsellor
Ministry of Finance
Finland
katju.holkeri@vm.fi

Ms./Mrs. Johanna Maria Nurmi
Counsellor
Ministry of Finance
Finland
johanna.nurmi@vm.fi

FRANCE

Mr. Bob BONWITT
OECD
France
Bob.bonwitt@oecd.org

Mr. Thierry LE ROY
Conseiller d'Etat
Conseil d'Etat, France
France
thierry.le-roy@conseil-etat.fr

Ms./Mrs. Bathylle Missika
France

GERMANY

Mr. Lippold Freiherr von Bredow
Regierungsrat z.A.
Administration of the German
Bundestag
Germany
lippold.bredow@bundestag.de

Prof. Klaus-Eckart Gebauer
General Director (ret.)
German University of Admin.Sciences
Germany
klaus-eckart.gebauer@t-online.de

GREECE

Ms./Mrs. LILIKA BERDESI
DIRECTOR OF DIVISION
GENERAL SECRETARIAT FOR
YOUTH
Greece
l.berdesi@neagenia.gr

Ms./Mrs. DESPOINA DIMITRAKI
GENERAL SECRETARIAT OF
YOUTH
Greece
dimitraki@hotmail.com

Mr. Athanasios Karakatsanis
Director
General Secretariat of Social Security,
Ministry of Labour and Social Security
Greece
knicolas@mail.ntua.gr

Prof. Sotiris Lytras
Professor of Administrative Law
University of Athens
Greece
salytras@otenet.gr

Ms./Mrs. LEANDROS RAKINTZIS
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION
GENERAL INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION - GREECE
Greece
n.dou@gedd.gr

INDONESIA

Mr. Desi Fernanda
Deputy for Research and Development
on Development Administration and
Public Administration Automation
National Institute of Public
Administration
Indonesia
bakln_lanri@yahoo.com

Ms./Mrs. Erna Irawati
Head of Multilateral Cooperation Sub
Division
National Institute of Public
Administration
Indonesia
ernairawati99@yahoo.com

Ms./Mrs. Tini Martini
S.H., M.Soc.Sci
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Indonesia
tini_martini_2005@yahoo.com

Mr. Sapta Nirwandar
DR
Ministry of Culture and Tourism
Indonesia
sapta@budpar.go.id

Mr. Sunarno Somowijoto
Chairman
National Institute of Public
Administration
Indonesia
vivi_ndut@yahoo.com

Ms./Mrs. Sri Hadiati Wara Kustriani
Deputy For Performance Evaluation on
Government Institution and Apparatus
National Institute of Public
Administration
Indonesia
rainy_tea@yahoo.com

JAPAN

Dr. Yutaka Iwami
Associate Professor
Kokushikan University
Japan
iwami@kokushikan.ac.jp

Prof. Yuko Kaneko
Professor
University of Yamagata
Japan
ykaneko@human.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp

Prof. Hiromitsu Kataoka
Professor Emeritus
Waseda University
Japan
kanekoh@f4.dion.ne.jp

Prof. Hiroko Kudo
Prof.Dr.
Chuo University
Japan
hirokod@tamacc.chuo-u.ac.jp

Dr. Akira Nakamura
Professor of Public Administration
Meiji University
Japan
nakamura@isc.meiji.ac.jp

Dr. Itoko Suzuki
professor
kobe women's university
Japan
suzuki@suma.kobe-wu.ac.jp

Mr. Takashi Tachi
Deputy Director
Ministry of Internal Affairs and
Communications
Japan
t.tachi@soumu.go.jp

Mr. Motoi Uematsu
Ministry of Internal Affairs and
Communications
Japan
m2.uematsu@soumu.go.jp

KUWAIT

Dr. Essam Saad ALRubaiian
associate professor
kuwait university
Kuwait
abuhamad161@hotmail.com

MAURITANIA

Mr. Mohameden oudbahhamed
Administrateur
Ministère Fonction Publique et
Modernisation de l'Etat
Mauritania
mbhamed@modernisation.gov.mr

MEXICO

Mr. José R. Castelazo
Chairman
National Institute of Public
Administration
Mexico
presidencia.inap@gmail.com

MOROCCO

Prof. Mohammed Benyahya
Professeur universitaire
Revue Marocaine d'Administration
Locale et de Développement
Morocco
benyahya@csm.gov.ma

Prof. Ahmed BOUACHIK
REMALD
Morocco
bouachik@menara.ma

Prof. SEBHALLAH EL RHAZI
Professeur
Université Mohammed V
Morocco
elrhazis@yahoo.fr

Mr. Abdelahad FASSI-FEHRI
Directeur
Institut Supérieur de l'Administration
Morocco
m_aboulethar@isa.ma

Dr. Said Miri
REMALD
Morocco
miri@menara.ma

Prof. ALI SEDJARI
Professor at University
Faculté de Droit -Agdal Rabat
Morocco
sedjariali@yahoo.fr

M. Mohammed Harakat
Morocco

NETHERLANDS (The)

Prof. Michiel S. DE VRIES
Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
Netherlands
m.devries@fm.ru.nl

Dr. Theo van der Krogt
EAPAA
Netherlands
t.p.w.m.vanderkrogt@utwente.nl

RUSSIA

Ms./Mrs. Elena Guseletova
Head of Department
State University-Higher School of
Economics
Russia
eguseletova@hse.ru

SINGAPORE

Dr. Caroline Brassard
Assistant Professor
National University of Singapore
Singapore
sppbc@nus.edu.sg

SLOVAKIA

Dr. Miroslav Beblavy
Executive Director
Slovak Governance Institute
Slovakia
beblavy@governance.sk

Dr. Emilia Sicakova-Beblava
TIS president
Transparency International Slovakia
Slovakia
ema@transparency.sk

SOUTH AFRICA

Ms./Mrs. Geraldine Joslyn Fraser-
Moleketi
Government Minister: Public Service
and Administration
Ministry for Public Service and
Administration
South Africa
natasha@dpsa.gov.za

Dr. Saloshini Muthayan
Chief Director
South African Management
Development Institute
South Africa
Sal@samdi.gov.za

Ms./Mrs. Hanlie Van Dyk-Robertson
South Africa

SOUTH KOREA

Dr. Pan Suk Kim
Yonsei University
South Korea
pankim@yonsei.ac.kr

SPAIN

Mr. Fernando Pozuelo
Technical Adviser
Instituto Nacional de Administración
Pública (INAP)
Spain
fernando.pozuelo@inap.map.es

SWEDEN

Ms./Mrs. Iwona Sobis
PhD, senior lecturer
University of Skövde
Sweden
iwona.sobis@his.se

SWITZERLAND

Dr. Albert E. HOFMEISTER
Délégué du DDPS pour les contacts
internationaux
Département fédéral de la défense, de
la protection de la population et des
sports (DDPS)
Switzerland
Albert.Hofmeister@vtg.admin.ch

TUNISIA

Dr. Jürgen Theres
Hanns-Seidel-Foundation
Tunisia
hsstu@hssma.org

M. Boussata
Tunisia

M. Jjenayah
Tunisia

TURKEY

Dr. Argun AKDOGAN
TODAIE
Turkey
aakdogan@todaie.gov.tr
Mr. Tekin AVANER
TODAIE
Turkey
tavanern@todaie.gov.tr

Dr. UFUK AYHAN
TRAINING COORDINATOR
POLICE ACADEMY
Turkey
ufukayhan2000@yahoo.com
Ms./Mrs. Dudu Barkınay
Director
KKTC Başbakanlık Personel Dairesi
Müdürlüğü
Turkey
dudubarkınay@hotmail.com

Prof. Kamil Ufuk BİLGİN
TODAIE
Turkey
kbilgin@todaie.gov.tr

Prof. Ömer BOZKURT
TODAIE
Turkey
obozkurt@todaie.gov.tr

Mr. Çiçek Cemil
Deputy Prime Minister
Ministry of State
Turkey
c.cicek@basbakanlik.gov.tr

Dr. SEFA CETIN
DEPUTY GOVERNOR
MALATYA GOVERNORSHIP
Turkey
sefacetin@hotmail.com

Mr. Can Umut CIMER
TODAIE
Turkey
ccimer@todaie.gov.tr

Ms./Mrs. Nalan Demiral
Research Assistant
Hacettepe University
Turkey
ndemiral@hacettepe.edu.tr

Dr. Mustafa Turgut Demirtepe
Assistant Professor
Aksaray University
Turkey
turgutdem@yahoo.co.uk

Prof. robert alan Doig
professor of public services
management
University of Teesside
Turkey
r.a.doig@tees.ac.uk

Ms./Mrs. Ümral Tözün Eray
Administrative Officer
KKTC Başbakanlık Personel Dairesi
Müdürlüğü
Turkey
umraltozun@hotmail.com

Prof. Eyüp Günay İSBİR
TODAIE
Turkey
eisbir@todaie.gov.tr

Ms./Mrs. Necla Işık
Administrative Assistant
KKTC Başbakanlık Personel Dairesi
Müdürlüğü
Turkey
necla3@yahoo.com

Mr. Kerem izmen
Administrative Officer
KKTC Başbakanlık Personel Dairesi
Müdürlüğü
Turkey
kerem_izmen@yahoo.com

Prof. Türksel KAYA BENSGHİR
TODAIE
Turkey
tkayabensghir@todaie.gov.tr

Dr. Max Georg Meier
Dipl. Paedagoge
Hanns-Seidel-Stiftung e.V.
Turkey
hss.meier@gmail.com

Prof. Zehra ODYAKMAZ
TODAIE
Turkey
zodyakmaz@todaie.gov.tr

Dr. Arzu OFLASLI
Research Assisstant
TODAIE
Turkey
aoflasli@todaie.gov.tr

Prof. Cinar ÖZEN
TODAIE
Turkey
cozen@todaie.gov.tr

Dr. Mehmet Akif Özer
Gazi Un. Ankara Turkey
Turkey
akifozer@yahoo.com

Dr. Guner Ozkan
Assistant Professor
Mugla University
Turkey
gunerozkan005@yahoo.com

Prof. Seriy SEZEN
TODAIE
Turkey
ssezen@todaie.gov.tr

Dr. Burak Tangor
TODAIE
Turkey
btangor@hotmail.com

Prof. Oktay TANNSEVER
TODAIE
Turkey
otannsever@todaie.gov.tr

Dr. Sırma Turgut
Assistance Prof. Dr.
Yıldız Technical University
Turkey
sirmaturgut@gmail.com

Mr Ergun Turgay
TODAIE
Turkey

Mr themi Thas
Turkey

UNITED KINGDOM

Ms./Mrs. Claire Cameron
Director
Public Administration International
United Kingdom
claire.cameron@public-admin.co.uk

Prof. Gavin Richard Drewry
Professor of Public Administration
Royal Holloway, University of London
United Kingdom
g.drewry@rhul.ac.uk

Mr. Patrick Gray
senior lecturer in public administration
london metropolitan university
United Kingdom
p.gray@londonmet.ac.uk

Prof. Kate JENKINS
London School of Economics
United Kingdom
k.jenkins@lse.ac.uk

Prof. William PLOWDEN
London School of Economics
United Kingdom
w.plowden@lse.ac.uk

USA

Dr. Derick Weston Brinkerhoff
Senior Fellow in International Public
Management
RTI International
United States
dbrinkerhoff@rti.org

Prof. Merilee GRINDLE
Harvard University, David Rockefeller
Center for Latin American Studies
United States
merilee_grindle@harvard.edu

Dr. Arie Halachmi
Professor
Tennessee State University
United States
ahalachmi@tnstate.edu

Mr. KAUZYA John-Mary
Chief
Department of Economic and Social
Affair
United States
kauzya@un.org

Dr. Ronald W. Johnson
Senior Policy Advisor
RTI International
United States
rwj@rti.org

Ms./Mrs. Kimberly Moloney
Ph.D. Candidate
American University
United States
contact@neilkim.com

Prof. Allan ROSENBAUM
President of IASIA, Director
Florida International University
United States
rosenbau@fiu.edu

Ms./Mrs. Kathrin Plangemann
USA

VIETNAM

Dr. Thi Minh Tuyet Dinh
Dean of Faculty
National Academy of public
Administration Vietnam
Viet Nam
tuyetminhnapa@yahoo.com

Dr. Thi Van Hanh Le
Dean of Faculty
National Academy of public
Administration Vietnam
Viet Nam
hanhlinh@fpt.vn

Dr. Ngoc Dao Nguyen
Vice Dean
National Academy of public
Administration Viet Nam
senatordaonapa@yahoo.com.vn

Dr. Quang Huy Pham
Vice President of NIPA
National Academy of public
Administration Vietnam
quanghuyhcqg@yahoo.com.vn

