

COUNCIL

Council

IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Monitoring of the Implementation of Recommendations

For further information or queries, please contact Kevin Williams (Kevin.Williams@oecd.org;
+33 1 4524 1867)

JT03295205

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format



Introduction

1. The conclusions of the In-depth Evaluation of the Public Governance Committee (PGC), which were reported in July 2009, were that the Committee had been producing good quality work in a policy area where a recent resurgence of interest among Members had occurred. However, difficulties in communication and co-ordination among the different policy communities within the Committee structure had contributed to lowering its efficiency. Furthermore, the Committee's work had lacked visibility with the result that its potential for impact had been diminished.¹ Against this backdrop, Council addressed seven recommendations to the Committee:²

- **Recommendation N°1:** The Public Governance Committee should further improve the transparency of the process through which it develops its overall strategy and programme of work, in order to increase ownership by delegates, and in particular at the level of the Committee itself.
- **Recommendation N°2:** The Public Governance Committee should take steps to increase participation in its Network of Senior E-Government Officials, including an examination of the continued relevance of conducting this work at sub-committee level.
- **Recommendation N°3:** The Public Governance Committee should assess the continued relevance of the work of the Public Employment and Management Working Party in view of the breadth and level of participation in meetings and the challenges of functioning that it faces.
- **Recommendation N°4:** The Public Governance Committee should review the rationale, role within the Committee and functioning of the Network of Senior Officials from Centres of Government.
- **Recommendation N°5:** The Public Governance Committee should, with a view to enhancing co-ordination, build on existing practices within the PGC and other OECD bodies to improve delegates' understanding of the aims, structure and activities of the Committee as a whole.
- **Recommendation N°6:** The Public Governance Committee should evaluate the effectiveness of its Global Relations activities, including the OECD-MENA Programme, and take into account the results of evaluations of the SIGMA Programme conducted by the European Commission when examining the coherence of these two Programmes.
- **Recommendation N°7:** The Public Governance Committee should establish and implement a communications strategy aimed at fully exploiting the potential of its work to impact on policy.

2. On the invitation of Council, an Action Plan in response to the seven recommendations was developed by the PGC and presented to the Evaluation Committee in March 2010. After having reviewed the Action Plan, the Evaluation Committee requested that it be revised to provide greater clarity and precision.

1. Following the rating framework for In-depth Evaluation results, the extent to which the Committee's work programme and policy objectives had been relevant to the needs of policymakers was assessed as *high*, while its performance in terms of its impacts and achievement of its objectives (effectiveness) and its efficiency were both rated as *medium to high* [C(2009)95].

2. C/M(2009)24, Item 241.

3. The revised Action Plan, which integrates the results of a review of PGC's sub-structure³ and feedback on progress in implementing recommendations, was reviewed by the Evaluation Committee in July 2010. It reports that:

- Recommendations N°1, N°4 and N°5 are being responded to on an ongoing basis through actions that place a strong emphasis on improving coordination and information flows within the committee structure, as well as a range of other operational improvements.
- Recommendations N°2 and N°3 have given rise to the conversion of two sub-bodies into virtual networks using electronic means to support discussions. At the same time there is a recognition that these bodies need not be permanently active and different ways to better incorporate issues delegated to them directly into the discussions of the Committee itself are to be tested over the next two years.
- Against the backdrop of Recommendation N°6, the PGC revised its Global Relations Strategy and the results of a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of the MENA Programme being conducted by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) will be reported to the PGC in 2011.
- The response to Recommendation N°7 is the development of a communications strategy, approved by the PGC in April 2010.

4. The revised Action Plan and details of the Public Governance Committee's response to the evaluation recommendations can be found annexed to this document.

Proposed Action

5. In the light of the preceding, Council is invited to adopt the following draft conclusions:

THE COUNCIL

- a) noted document C(2011)4;
- b) noted that the response of the Public Governance Committee to the evaluation recommendations has been appropriate;
- c) invited the Chair of the Public Governance Committee, in the framework of her next dialogue with the Council, to report on any further progress made in implementing the recommendations.

3. GOV/PGC(2010)14.

**DRAFT ACTION PLAN IN RESPONSE TO
THE IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

Background

6. At its 40th session held on 22-23 October, the Public Governance Committee (PGC) designated a Task Force to draft and submit an action plan by 25 January 2010 for responding to the recommendations of the In-Depth Evaluation (IDE) carried out in 2009 and approved by the Council on October 22, 2009.

7. The results of the In-Depth Evaluation of the Public Governance Committee were presented in document C(2009)35 (12 June 2009) and C(2009)35/CORR2 (9 October 2009). In its conclusions to the In-Depth Evaluation, Council:

- invited the Public Governance Committee to take the appropriate measures for the implementation of recommendations c) i) to vii) [...], and to present an action plan corresponding with them to the Evaluation Committee before the end of **March 2010**;

8. The Committee approved and provided the action plan [GOV/PGC(2010)1/FINAL] requested in decision [C(2009)35 and /CORR2]) to address recommendations 1 to 7, arising from the In-Depth Evaluation of the Public Governance Committee, and recommendations 1 to 2, arising from the In-Depth Evaluation of the Group on Regulatory Policy in March 2010. This action plan was discussed at a meeting of the Evaluation Committee on 18 March 2010. The Evaluation Committee asked the Committee to revise its action plan with a view to providing greater clarity and precision.

9. In this document, the Committee presents the revised action plan.

Implementation of Recommendations 1 to 7

<p>RECOMMENDATION N° 1</p>	<p><i>The Public Governance Committee should further improve the transparency of the process through which it develops its overall strategy and programme of work, in order to increase ownership by delegates, and in particular at the level of the Committee itself.</i></p>
<p>SUGGESTED ACTION(S)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a more integrated and streamlined programme and structure, starting with identifying clear areas of work in the mandate for 2010-2014 to help increase transparency and ownership. 2. Better associate member countries via their permanent representations and relevant ministries in developing the strategy and work programme. 3. Improve the preparation of the PWB, enhancing communication between the PGC and its subsidiary bodies to avoid “silo working” and improve coordination: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. consult with all the subsidiary bodies when setting the strategic framework (e.g. the mandate) and when preparing the PWB. This entails asking for input and ideas upstream as well as on more developed drafts. b. design a PWB made up of cross-cutting themes, based on country priorities and in line with the OECD’s overall strategy and priorities, to maximise integration and co-ordination with and among subsidiary bodies. 4. Use the PGC Web Portal to encourage on-line discussion among PGC and sub-body delegates on key strategic and substantive issues. 5. Involve the PGC in the work conducted by its subsidiary organs, and vice versa. It is essential that the Committee further associates the PGC subsidiary bodies by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring progress on and disseminating results of key outputs of the sub-bodies, and holding in-depth discussions of some of these outputs, when the Committee can bring a broader governance or whole-of-government perspective to the work. • consulting the Chairs of the working parties as well as the Chair of the new Regulatory Policy Committee, to discuss ongoing co-ordination and key areas of co-operation, including inviting them to participate and contribute to the PGC and PGC bureau meetings. <i>Note:</i> a first joint Bureau meeting of the RPC and PGC was held in April 2010. • involving relevant sub-body delegates in comprehensive public governance reviews (as was done for the Finland review in 2010) 6. Organize regular symposia under the auspices of the PGC, including relevant delegates from sub-bodies as well as external stakeholders. Such sessions should build on one of the various multidisciplinary issues referred to in the PWB and mandate, and be oriented to possible concrete implementations in countries.

EXPECTED RESULTS	Reinforced authority and visibility of the PGC vis-à-vis its subsidiary bodies and greater visibility vis-à-vis other OECD committees through stronger political commitment, enhanced information and coordination between the committee and its entities and clarified areas of work.		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	Continuous
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	<p>This recommendation is closely linked to Recommendation 5, as better co-ordination can also support transparency and ownership. Further improving working methods to involve delegates at appropriate points in the process should increase transparency and ownership, building on the document “Improving Committee Meetings” [GOV/PGC(2008)4] approved by the Committee in 2008.</p> <p>The PGC draft mandate for 2010-2014 and its PWB for 2011-2012 provide part of the answer to this recommendation. It is essential to articulate future work around key policy priorities, based on the Committee’s mandate.</p> <p>Many linkages among working groups can be identified. The comprehensive public management reviews and <i>Government at a Glance</i> are two vehicles for better co-ordination, as they draw upon the full spectrum of public governance issues addressed by the different subsidiary bodies.</p>		

RECOMMENDATION N° 2	<i>The Public Governance Committee should take steps to increase participation in its Network of Senior E-Government Officials, including an examination of the continued relevance of conducting this work at sub-committee level.</i>		
SUGGESTED ACTION(S)	<p>A virtual network of experts and practitioners dedicated to the development of e-government in public administrations is needed to provide data for <i>Government at a Glance</i> and to carry out peer reviews on e-government. However, such a network does not need to be permanently active, but should punctually engage with specific policy priorities defined in the PWB and in the mandate. The expertise of practitioners in e-government is essential for the Committee to cope with important future developments in the public sector.</p> <p>Based on the review of the sub-structure [GOV/PGC(2010)14], the Task Force proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert the Senior E-Government Officials to a Network on E-Government with a mandate until end 2010 to provide specific outputs on e-government identified in the current work programme. • Use the next two years as a “test period” to find ways to better incorporate e-government issues directly into the discussions of the Committee itself. A reporting to the PGC, once a year, should be held to ensure correct implementation of the measure. • Create a Web 2.0 based platform for collaborative work and discussion on e-government issues. 		
EXPECTED RESULTS	<p>Reasserted responsibility of the PGC as the main driver of the public governance work programme.</p> <p>Reinforced ability of the PGC to analyse and discuss public governance issues from a cross-cutting, integrated perspective, with more flexibility for tackling new challenges and responding to emerging needs.</p> <p>Improved co-ordination among the different stakeholders.</p>		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	End 2011
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	<p>The implementation of this recommendation should also take into account the results of the review of the Committee’s overall sub-structure [<i>see GOV/PGC(2010)14</i>]. Where relevant for the programme of work, this Expert Group can deepen analysis and discussion of essential strategic and policy issues related to e-government, where there is not enough time or expertise in the PGC.</p>		

RECOMMENDATION N° 3	<i>The Public Governance Committee should assess the continued relevance of the work of the Public Employment and Management Working Party in view of the breadth and level of participation in meetings and the challenges of functioning that it faces.</i>		
SUGGESTED ACTION(S)	<p>A virtual network of experts and practitioners dedicated to public employment and human resource management in public administrations is needed to provide data for <i>Government at a Glance</i> and to carry out peer reviews on HRM. However, such a network does not need to be permanently active, but should punctually engage with specific policy priorities defined in the PWB and in the mandate.</p> <p>Following the review of the sub-structure, the Task Force proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert the Working Party to Network with a mandate until end 2010 to provide specific outputs on HRM identified in the current work programme. • Use the next two years as a “test period” to find ways to better incorporate HRM issues directly into the discussions of the Committee itself. A reporting to the PGC, once a year, should be held to ensure correct implementation of the measure. • Create a Web 2.0 based platform for collaborative work and discussion on HRM issues. 		
EXPECTED RESULTS	<p>Reasserted responsibility of the PGC as the main driver of the public governance work programme.</p> <p>Reinforced ability of the PGC to analyse and discuss public governance issues from a cross-cutting, integrated perspective, with more flexibility for tackling new challenges and responding to emerging needs.</p> <p>Improved co-ordination among the different stakeholders</p>		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	End 2011
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	<p>The implementation of this recommendation should also take into account the results of the review of the Committee’s overall sub-structure [<i>see GOV/PGC(2010)14</i>]. While many delegates of the PGC are HR officials, they are not specialists in statistics. One quarter of the data in <i>Government at a Glance</i> covers the HR area.</p> <p>Where relevant for the programme of work, this Expert Group can deepen analysis and discussion of essential strategic and policy issues related to public employment and management, where there is not enough time or expertise in the PGC.</p>		

RECOMMENDATION N° 4	<i>The Public Governance Committee should review the rationale, role within the Committee and functioning of the Network of Senior Officials from Centres of Government, notably with a view to improving participation in the Network.</i>		
SUGGESTED ACTION(S)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To fully realise the potential for mutual enrichment, the substantive and personal linkages between the PGC and CoG must be reinforced. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Systematic two-way communication between the groups, e.g. of the agenda, documentation and results of meetings, should be established following the example set in the context of the 2009 COG meeting. ○ It would also be desirable that PGC members establish and/or strengthen their direct contacts with their national participants of the CoG to facilitate a regular flow of information on projects and results of the PGC to their national CoG representatives. ○ In developing its work programme, the Committee should identify areas where it may wish to seek input from the CoG, or where it may wish to propose possible items for the agenda of CoG meetings. ○ It is proposed that the PGC Chair attend CoG meetings. • COG meetings are reserved for the heads of the centres of governments of the member countries (and participating non-member countries). If the head of the centre of government is unable to attend, the country may be represented by an appropriate high-level replacement. PGC members should support the host country in facilitating the attendance of the representative of their centre of government or seek to ensure other high level national participation. 		
EXPECTED RESULTS	Reinforced ability of the PGC to analyse and discuss public governance issues from an integrated, whole-of-government perspective, with more flexibility for tackling new challenges and responding to emerging needs. Improved co-ordination among the different stakeholders Better dissemination of key PGC outputs to the political level, resulting in a greater impact on policy making.		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	Continuous
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	<p>CoG can be an asset to the Committee, and also to the OECD as a whole, as it provides access to decision-makers at the political level.</p> <p>It can be a powerful tool for dissemination, raising awareness and increasing the impact of the Committee's work.</p> <p>At the same time, it can provide the PGC with indications of priorities and concerns at the centre of government that could inform the Committee's programme of work.</p> <p>The PGC has always sought greater communication on the results of this network and a clarification of its contribution to the OECD's work on public governance.</p>		

C(2011)4

	<p>An indication that some progress has already been made since the in-depth evaluation is the increased participation at the last meeting held in Paris in October 2009, the report on the meeting's results, and the great interest for its activities demonstrated by the Secretary-General. Four countries have expressed their interest in hosting COG meetings in 2010 and beyond.</p>
--	--

RECOMMENDATION N° 5	<i>The Public Governance Committee should, with a view to enhancing co-ordination, build on existing practices within the PGC and other OECD bodies to improve delegates' understanding of the aims, structure and activities of the Committee as a whole.</i>		
SUGGESTED ACTION(S)	Implement new working methods , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation and organisation of future Committee meetings, including more advance discussion and circulation of proposed agenda topics; • Circulation and communication of documents (for information, approval or exploitation) well in advance of meetings to both PGC and working party delegates, in particular the circulation of the mandate, circulation of [and consultation on] early drafts of the programme of work, and rapid circulation of summary records; • Consolidating, updating and widely disseminating the “Committee Handbook” and the “Improving Committee Operations” document into one Handbook, in conjunction with the review of the substructure; • Encouraging more active participation by delegates of all PGC bodies, including commenting on draft reports, etc. via the Web Portal and other channels; • Logistical organisation of expert networks (for improved exchanges via new ICT); • Round table meetings with Chairs and bureau members from subsidiary organs to discuss future work programmes; • Inviting Chairs of the subsidiary bodies to report to PGC on the substance of their work, for example in presenting a high-profile project, and to discuss future work priorities of the PGC. 		
EXPECTED RESULTS	Improved coordination between entities of the public governance “family” and greater sense of ownership and understanding by delegates of the overall meaning, purpose and direction of the public governance agenda.		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	Continuous
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	This recommendation is linked to Recommendation 1. The PGC should strengthen its role as the main driver of the work programme. To successfully pursue and benefit fully from an integrated public governance programme, the Committee will have to give itself the means to identify and discuss these issues, and ensure that the results of its discussions reach all relevant parts of government.		

RECOMMENDATION N° 6	<i>The Public Governance Committee should evaluate the effectiveness of its Global Relations activities, including the OECD-MENA Programme, and take into account the results of evaluations of the SIGMA Programme by the European Commission when examining the coherence of these two Programmes.</i>		
SUGGESTED ACTION(S)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to the recent Council Guidelines on Committee's relations with Enhanced Engagement countries, the Committee approved at its 42nd session on 16th November 2010 a progress report on the activities related to the integration of the EE5 countries in the Committee's work, a proposed plan of action to deepen enhanced engagement, and a set of milestones that can be used to report back to the Secretary General and Council [GOV/PGC(2010)17]. • This document is a supplement to the Committee's revised Global Relations Strategy 2010-2014 [GOV/PGC(2010)9], which reviews the results of the Committee's strategy and global relations activity so far and proposes a revised strategy for a more proactive engagement with non-members. • The renewal of the MENA programmes (2011-14) was discussed by the PGC in spring 2010 based on a review of past achievements, and in the context of its new global relations strategy. The first comprehensive impact evaluation of the Mena programme conducted by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), planned for 2010, will be available in early 2011, and will be the key input of PGC discussions in the April 2011 meeting. • The Committee discusses the results of its global relations activities at each session. • While the SIGMA programme should be seen as outside the direct purview of any PGC evaluation of Global Relations, the Committee should be informed of, and take into account, evaluations of the programme carried out by the European Union, and may wish to coordinate with them on the issue of coherence between the two initiatives. 		
EXPECTED RESULTS	Reasserted importance of the PGC's global relations, and defined parameters for evaluating them.		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	April 2011
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	<p>The effectiveness of the PGC's Global Relations work is crucial, as governance affects how governments co-operate. The importance of work in the Good Governance for Development in MENA countries initiative was recently underscored at the ministerial-level meeting in Marrakech.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> The Committee approved a revised Global Relations Strategy at its meeting in April 2010.</p>		

RECOMMENDATION N° 7	<i>The Public Governance Committee should establish and implement a communications strategy aimed at fully exploiting the potential of its work to impact on policy.</i>		
SUGGESTED ACTION(S)	<p>The Committee approved a communications strategy at its April 2010 meeting [GOV/PGC(2010)7]. This strategy includes the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the start of the biennium, identify which outputs would have policy messages that it would like to review and spend time on developing ways to effectively communicate those messages. The information communicated has to be specially designed to its audience (synthesized, oriented towards possible political implementation) • Produce summarised documents such as "Policy briefs" accessible to non-expert audiences, as well as concise, concrete “toolkits” or “policy guides” for use by policymakers and practitioners; • Provide delegates with information packs and mailing lists for communicating the Committee’s results within their own countries; • Make judicious use of new Web 2.0 technologies to reach a wider audience; • Address the language issue (bilingualism is a requirement of the Charter). At least the Executive Summary of all documents should be available in both languages for Committees; • Publish at least once a year a “public governance newsletter” presenting the main outputs of the Committee working groups, for wide distribution, including all subsidiary organs, committee and bureau members as well as other relevant entities. 		
EXPECTED RESULTS	Enhanced impact of PGC publications on national administrations and decision-makers and increased political interest around the OECD public governance agenda.		
START DATE	2010	COMPLETION DATE	April 2010
COMMENTS & OBSERVATIONS	The Committee approved its communication strategy at its April 2010 meeting to improve the impact and reach of its work, looking at both how to better package its products so that they are useful for policymakers and practitioners, and how to raise awareness of its work through more effective dissemination. It is important to regularly attract the attention of policy-makers on relevant work of the PGC (this is one role of a ministerial meeting) and its subsidiary bodies.		

ANNEX -- GUIDELINES AND METHODOLOGY

Objectives

10. A Task Force was designated at the Public Governance Committee's 40th session, held on 22-23 October 2009, to draft and submit an action plan by 25 January 2010 for responding to the recommendations of the "In-Depth Evaluation". A revised draft will be submitted to the PGC for approval in February, before consideration by the Evaluation Committee in March.

11. As part of this action plan, the Committee should carry out a review of its sub-structure and its continuing relevance, in line with the rules of procedure concerning mandate renewals. A key component will therefore be strengthening co-ordination with other Committees, in particular the new Regulatory Policy Committee and the Territorial Development Policy Committee, as well as with and among the Committee's subsidiary bodies.

Roadmap

12. The Evaluation Committee's report on the In-Depth Evaluation and the PGC draft mandate (2010-2014) contributed to establishing a roadmap for the Task Force together with the Secretariat's suggestions on the approach, the methodology and the timetable to respect (*see room document on the "Terms of Reference"*).

Composition of the Task Force

13. It was proposed that the Action Plan Task Force be made up of the Bureau and any other interested members of the Committee. The following delegates have accepted to join the Task Force:

- **Mr. Bernard BLANC** (FRANCE), head of the Task Force, Head of International Relations Office at the Ministry for the Budget's Directorate General for State Modernisation;
- **Ms. Elisabeth DEARING** (AUSTRIA), Director of Administrative Development Office at the Federal Chancellery;
- **Mr. Jacques DRUART** (BELGIUM), International Coordination Advisor at the Federal Public Service Personnel and Organisation;
- **Ms. Andrea Lewis** (UNITED STATES), Labor and Governance Advisor, Permanent Delegation of the United States to the OECD;
- **Dr. Pia MARCONI** (ITALY), Director General of the Department of Public Administration's Office for Public Administration Modernisation;
- **Ms. Carmel McGREGOR** (AUSTRALIA), Public Service Commissioner.

14. The Secretariat would also participate in and support the Task Force.

Consultation

15. The Task Force should also associate to its work:

- all Members of the PGC Bureau
 - **Ms. Katju HOLKERI** (PGC Chair, FINLAND)
 - **Ms. Ilgin ATALAY** (TURKEY)
 - **Ms. Vassiliki MOUSTAKATOU** (GREECE)
 - **Mr. Koos ROEST** (NETHERLANDS)
 - **Mr. Andreas WEGEND** (GERMANY)
- the Secretariat of GOV – Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate
 - **Mr. Rolf ALTER** (Director)
 - **Ms. Andrea UHRHAMMER** (Executive Secretary)
 - **Mr. Barry ANDERSON** (Head of Division – Budgeting and Public Expenditures)
 - **Mr. Josef KONVITZ** (Head of Division – Regulatory Policy)
 - **Mr. Christian VERGEZ** (Head of Division – Innovation and Integrity)
 - **Mr. Martin FORST** (Head of Division – Public Sector Management and Performance)
 - **Mr. Joaquim OLIVEIRA MARTINS** (Head of Division – Regional Competitiveness and Governance)
- Chairs of the PGC Working Groups and other sub-committees, if possible.
 - **Mr. Gerhard STEGER** (Working Party of Senior Budget Officials, AUSTRIA)
 - **Ms. Louise MCGIRR** (Working Party on Public Employment and Management, IRELAND)
 - **Dr. Michael WETTENGEL** (Network of Senior Officials from Centres of Government, GERMANY)
 - **Mr. William PERRIN** (Network of Senior E-Government Officials, UNITED KINGDOM)
 - **Ms. Catherine MACQUARRIE** (Expert Group on Conflict of Interest)

Please Note:

16. The other Committees depending on GOV – Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate should also be consulted:

- **Mr. Mark DRABENSTOTT** (Territorial Development Policy Committee)
- **Mr. Jeroen NIJLAND** (Regulatory Policy Committee)

17. Could be consulted as well:

- **Mr. Kevin WILLIAMS** (Evaluation Committee Coordinator)

Main conclusions of the evaluation

18. Although the relevance of the PGC work has been assessed as “high” by the Evaluation Committee, and its impact on policymakers rated as “medium to high”, the Evaluation Committee has made seven recommendations to improve the performance of the PGC in the coming years. Those recommendations, adopted by the Council on 22 October 2009, concerned particularly the Committee’s substructure, co-ordination with the subsidiary bodies, and communication of results.

19. Indeed:

- the Committee is not fulfilling its potential, with varying degrees of participation levels and quality of delegates’ interventions;
- the impact of the PGC work on member countries’ administrations could be improved;
- relations between the Committee and its sub-structures are not well defined, and communication and co-ordination with and among the bodies are insufficient;
- PGC publications are often too long and technical, which limits their accessibility to non-expert audiences.

Set of principles

20. The following set of principles should be kept in mind:

- i) Refrain from submitting a counter-report calling into question the conclusions of the In-Depth Evaluation report;
- ii) Submit concrete measures liable to implement the recommendations;
- iii) Heed past interventions and mechanisms aimed at improving the relevance and efficacy of the public governance agenda:
 - creation of PUMA in 1990, renamed PGC in 2003;
 - launching of TDPC in 1999;
 - launching of RPC in 2009;
 - creation of *ad hoc* working groups and networks dedicated to specific sector areas (budgeting, human resources, regulatory quality, centres of government, e-government, integrity and conflict of interests).
- iv) Complement the current bottom-up strategy (which gives much leeway to PGC sub-groups) by a top-down approach liable to enhance the Committee’s legitimacy and coordinating role.
- v) Adopt an open and all-inclusive approach by putting forward for each recommendation several options with a cost/benefit analysis and submitting to delegates an overall functioning scheme for consideration and approval.
- vi) Go beyond the analysis of the In-Depth Evaluation, focused on the input of each Working Group (number of networks, level and quality of representation, etc.) by reviewing and assessing their output (results, impact, publications, etc.).
- vii) See to it that the overall system in place is enhanced and improved.