

**Minutes of the IPSP meeting
Copenhagen, 2-3 May 2012****2 May 2012**

Welcome and opening by Ms. Tine Vedel Kruse, the IPSP Chair, and Mr. Mads-Biering Sørensen, the Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration, Denmark.

Ms. Tine Vedel Kruse welcomed to the second IPSP meeting of the Danish presidency. Mr. Mads Biering-Sørensen summarised the topics discussed at the first IPSP meeting and presented the agenda for the first day of the second IPSP meeting which focused on the impact of the reform agenda.

Presentation by Mr. Christian Bason, Director of Mindlab, Denmark: Better outcomes, lower cost: Radical innovation through co-production

Mr. Christian Bason introduced co-production as an important tool to respond to the fiscal crisis' demand for cost reduction (outcomes). He also introduced the concept of 'wicked problems' for the public sector – problems of debate and without easy solutions, which will never disappear. He presented co-production and co-creation as a way of handling these types of problems; instead of doing things for people, the public sector should redefine the public support and do things *with* people. He characterized co-production as a way of involving citizens in public projects as experts on how to handle problems concerning. Lastly he listed five ways of co-production: redefinition, facilitation, investment, use of network resources and systematic co-production.

Presentation by Ms. Françoise Waintrop, Direction Générale de la Modernisation de l'État, France: How to trigger innovation in ministries, activating users' and employees' listening

Ms. Françoise Waintrop's presentation focused on how to trigger innovation in the public sector by involving users, staff technologies and partnerships. The need for innovation was based on the governments' demands and expectations from users and staff while having to balance the budget. Ms. Françoise Waintrop presented an example of user-involved innovation, where the French agency (inspired by the UK government) had mapped the customers' contact with the public administration with the objective to simplify the administration process. She pointed out, that the most challenging part of the innovation process wasn't to find issues to change, but to

negotiate with other agencies and ministries. Therefore, the French administration has appointed a committee to coordinate innovation across ministries.

Following the two first presentations there was a discussion on how to innovate and co-produce and how to handle the risk of involving the users as co-producers in the innovation process. **Poland** raised the question how the authorities could stay in control while involving a number of other actors, and how to know if the society is ready for user-involved innovation? **Mr. Christian Bason** responded that the public sector already lacks control and pointed to a paradigm shift. He suggested that we as civil servants must distinguish between the need for control and when we are able to let go.

Norway asked how you can be systematic about innovation, when Mr. Christian Bason in his book has pointed out that innovation happens randomly. **Mr. Christian Bason** answered, that to co-create you need a common language in the public administration and you need the courage to innovate. **Ms. Françoise Waintrop** added that to innovate you need support from senior management and you have to keep trying and keep making it interesting for other agencies.

Finland, Ireland and Sweden commented on the drivers for involving the citizens. **Finland** pointed out, that the public sector should pay more attention to the users' needs instead of to what the public administration think they need. **Ireland** stressed that it is essential that the citizens are involved more than once in the beginning of the process. The **Swedish** representative said, that he thought of the citizen involvement as a trend that signified more than cost savings and enhanced freedom for the citizens. **Mr. Christian Bason** responded that citizen involvement captures more good qualities for the citizens, but that essential is to find out where the good ideas come from.

The Netherlands and **Portugal** both stressed the question of *how* to innovate. **Mr. Christian Bason** commented that no organization systematically measure outcome. By measuring outcome, he said, you can better measure efficiency and cost saving as a result of innovation.

Presentation by Mr. Martin Troy, eGovernment Policy Unit, Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, Ireland: eGovernment In Ireland - Supporting Public Service Reform

Mr. Martin Troy talked about the need for Public Service Reforms in Ireland do to the challenges facing their public finances. He focused on how eGovernment in Ireland was an important element in supporting the Public Service Reform. He pointed out three key goals for the Irish eGovernment Strategy: enhanced information provision, enhanced electronic delivery of services and enhanced use of shared approaches, and he explained how it is important for the agency to market the eGovernment Strategy and making sure other agencies know of them. As an example

he mentioned the website Merrian Street, where you can find all news on government.

Denmark asked how the Irish agency selected the services to digitalize. **Mr. Martin Troy** explained that much depended on the roadmap for 2025 and the difference between what can be done now and what must wait until later. **Finland** and **France** both pointed to the question on how to clearly state that some services from now on only can be found online, and how to test and measure the migration from personal appearance to online platform. **Mr. Martin Troy** responded that in Ireland the incentive to digitalize has a lot to do with the cost savings it would create. Therefore they had a general mandate to digitalize. He further explained that for now the migration had not yet been measured, but that it would be looked into in the future.

Finally **France** and **Turkey** explained how all agencies in the two countries have created their own online service, creating a great number of websites and no coordination. **Mr. Martin Troy** thought of this as a significant issue. He said that in forming an eGovernment Strategy it is important to look at how to share information and barriers.

Tour-de-table

Mr. Mads Biering-Sørensen presented the Tour-de-table and urged member states to mention challenges for their public sector, which had not previously been discussed during the IPSG meetings.

Bulgaria commented on how to reduce the administrative burdens and innovate government practices by cooperating with businesses and organisations. **Portugal** asked what defines a good team and furthermore mentioned opening government for innovation and incorporating tools to create new ideas within government. **Denmark** and **Poland** both commented on the need for renewing the public sector as a whole and pointed in this respect to the question; what the public sector and the state need.

Presentation by Mr. Patrick Staes: Towards CAF 2012 and the 5th CAF User Event

Mr. Patrick Staes presented the changes to the CAF-model based on contributions from the member countries. The renewal had focused on how customers behave, social responsibility, public organisations role in the network and the accessibility for the new users. He then reminded the group of the 5th CAF Users Event in September in Oslo.

3 May 2012

Welcome and presentation of the agenda by Mr. Jens Qvesel, the Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration of Denmark

Mr. Jens Qvesel summarised the topics discussed at the first IPSP meeting regarding top executives and presented the agenda for the second day of the second IPSP meeting which focused on recruitment, selection and development of top executives.

Presentation by Mr. Daniel Aunay, Directorate General for State Modernisation, Ministry for the Budget, Public Accounts and State Reform, France: Top Executives as Leaders for Change

Mr. Daniel Aunay presented the French program for top executives ("leadership program") according to which each ministry identifies and train high-potential executives. The recent creation of a dedicated interministerial unit (at the PM level) should enable greater cross-ministry transparency and mobility when recruiting top executives. Thereafter followed an explanation of programs designed to assess, develop and support the top executives when appointed. Mr. Aunay emphasised that in France, the minister has the last word and can choose not to approve of the ministry's proposal.

Several countries asked about the content of the leadership seminars and the responsibility for the leadership training. **Mr. Daniel Aunay** responded that the seminars are stretched over a period of 2 to 6 months. They want for future programs to train the high-potential executives earlier, but it was not possible for the first program. Furthermore he explained that both private consultants and public administration are involved in the training process.

Luxembourg and **Poland** asked about the political involvement. **Mr. Daniel Aunay** responded that in France you would need mandate by law to exclude the political level from the recruitment. **Norway** thereafter asked how the agency pushed the agenda for top executives in the government as a whole. **Mr. Daniel Aunay** responded that a new process had just been designed and that its full implementation would require time and will.

Presentation by Mr. Ivo Blommaart, Senior Policy Advisor, The office for the Senior Civil Service, ABD, Ministry of Interior and Kingdom Relations, the Netherlands: The Senior Civil Service – Quality as the common denominator

Mr. Ivo Blommaart talked about the main tasks for the Senior Civil Service in the Netherlands regarding investment in the quality of top management. Leading up to today's challenges the Senior Civil Service first focused on creating unity and a corporate approach (esprit de corps) in the government, creating mobility between

the departments and intensifying corporation with departments to use resources in the best way. **Mr. Blommaart** explained how the Senior Civil Service today focuses on management development and cut backs. He mentioned a number of programs designed to develop and educate the senior civil servants, for example the Candidate program where the goal is for the candidates, nominated by the ministries, to become top executives within a four year time period.

France inquired how to achieve no politically appointed top executives in the future. **Mr. Ivo Blommaart** responded that the Netherlands do not have political appointed top executives now, but the final appointing decision is made by the counsel of ministers. The process in the Netherlands now is for persons to apply for the programs and for the Senior Civil Service to make suggestions for suitable persons to apply. Thereafter the agency selects the best candidates for the pre-selection committee which gives an advice about the suitability of the candidates to the ministry and the minister of the Interior.

Sweden asked about the Dutch idea about creating one unit; how successful is it to break up silos? **Mr. Ivo Blommaart** answered that it created an increased mobility between the departments and that it makes the departments work together rather as opponents.

Walk-and-talk

Mr. Jens Qvesel presented the walk-and-talk and suggested the groups to talk about the most interesting topic from the two presentations.

After the walk-and-talks several groups commented on the topics of the Danish presidency's IPSP meeting which had focused on management as well as HR issues. From the Danish presidency it was commented that HR issues was included in the IPSP meeting because top executives need to be able to perform on aspects regarding both management and leadership.

From the presentations the groups focused on how to retain employees – especially young people – in the public sector. It was also noticed how different the recruitment processes is in the different countries, how much the political level is involved in the selection of the top executive and whether it is possible to avoid political influence in the selection process. Finally the need for and the cost of management development was pointed out as important issues.

Presentation by Mr. Ove Kaj Pedersen, Professor, Department of Business and Politics, Copenhagen Business School: The Challenges that Top Executives face in the Welfare State

Mr. Ove Kaj Pedersen's presentation focused on the challenges following the change from the welfare state to the competition state. He initiated the presentation

by focusing on the differences between the welfare state and the competition state saying that the task of the competition state focused on mobilising labour and capital, preventing the labour force from becoming non hirable and creating incentive for investment of capital and labour. Regarding the public sector he focused on the need for a centralised competitive state, where managers have the autonomy to manage based on their own perception. Finally he differentiated between executives close to the political leaders and executives with management responsibilities. Executives close to the political level have to be loyal to the politicians, create strategies and shape the organisation whereas the executives with management responsibilities are in a constant conflict between upper and lower levels, which means they must generate trust, ensure proactive approaches and ensure the organizations performance, efficiency and productivity.

Following the presentation **Spain** asked what the main challenges for the top executive are when reducing government. **Mr. Ove Kaj Pedersen** responded that one should focus on the efficiency rather than the size of the public sector and that the question of reduction often is a political decision.

France commented that to find a way to innovate and ensure transformation, you must also find a leader willing to innovate. **Mr. Ove Kaj Pedersen** responded that transformation always involves conflict and contradictions and that one of the implications of the move to the competition state is a change in the organisational hierarchy.

Presentation by Mr. Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen, Professor of Public Administration at the Institute of Political Science, Aarhus University: Performance and Executive Pay in Government

Mr. Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen presented the Danish performance contract model which was introduced in the 1990'es first in the central government and later in the local government sector. The performance contracts were seen as an instrument for improving efficiency and effectiveness by specifying performance demands to be met at the executive level, in terms set down in a mutual agreement by agency heads. The incentive to meet the performance contracts lies in the agencies' heads' access to financial bonuses, if the contracts are meet.

Mr. Grønnegård Christensen ended the presentation questioning the Danish performance contact system saying, that there is no linkage between performance and pay, that the system is not fully used, that it operates in quite a different way than it was thought out and that it is demanding do to the resources spend on running and developing the system. He proposed to simplify the system by quantifying demand and making demands comparable across all agencies or to skip the whole idea of performance contracts.

Norway asked why the performance contracts were implemented. **Mr. Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen** responded that the idea came from UK and New Zealand. The interesting question would be why the Danish public sector sticks to the idea? **The European Commission** questioned the focus on compliance rather than impact and **Bulgaria** commented that the performance contracts force the executives to create concrete goals. **Mr. Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen** responded that the performance contracts were created as a way to create concrete goals and to improve cost efficiency, but there is no change in the cost efficiency caused by performance contracts.

Lastly **Greece** asked what management level the performance contracts are suitable for. **Mr. Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen** responded that the contracts in Denmark primarily exist between the permanent secretary and the agency heads, but that some ministries use them as internal system between the permanent secretary and lower levels of management.

Introduction by Cyprus to Cyprus Presidency's work on the Top Executives theme

Cyprus presented the frame for the Cyprus presidency focusing on continuity in the TRIO presidency. Cyprus explained that the Cyprus presidency intend to elaborate on the topics that have already been taken up by the Polish and the Danish presidencies by focusing on strategies for implementing initiatives and to ask what the member states have learned.

Joint session with HRWG: DISPA

Presentation of DISPAs work on Innovation in Public Service Delivery by Mr. Nikolaj Lubanski, Director at Metropol: Theme: Innovation in Public Sector Delivery

Mr. Nikolaj Lubanski introduced the DISPA network and the agenda for the meeting in Copenhagen in 2012. The theme for the Copenhagen meeting related to the work programme of EUPAN, but with the focus on how to train and prepare civil servants to the impact of the economic crisis and the new mindset of doing more with less.

Joint session with HRWG: Draft DG-agenda and documents

Ms. Ida Krarup, head coordinator of the Danish Presidency of EUPAN, presented the draft for the DG agenda that focused on:

- Top Executives
- The Crisis' impact on human resources
- Reforms in public administration
- Informal social dialogue

Ms. Krarup noticed that there were still a number of details not finally settled, and that delegates would receive an updated version of the agenda as soon as possible. The Danish Presidency would continue elaborating the thematic reflection papers after the meeting in order for them to be submitted to the DGs in June.

Joint session with HRWG: Presentation of the Cyprus Presidency

Presentation of the Cyprus Presidency by DG Representative Mr. Philippos Soseilos: Cyprus Presidency - EUPAN

Mr. Philippos Soseilos presented the plans for the Cyprus Presidency and underlined that the presidency intend to continue the current work of EUPAN by building bridges to both the Polish and the Danish presidencies. The natural next step in the work of the TRIO would be to tune in on the role of top executives in implementing HR and other reform initiatives. The incoming Cyprus Presidency invited members of EUPAN to consider relevant national cases within this frame, and looked forward to welcome members of the EUPAN working groups to Cyprus in October 2012.

Joint session with HRWG: AOB and closing of the meeting

The meeting was closed and **Ms. Ida Krarup** thanked the delegates for their participation in and valuable contribution to the meeting.

