



Project no. CIT1-CT-2004-506392

NEWGOV

New Modes of Governance

Integrated Project
Priority 7 – Citizens and Governance in the Knowledge-based Society

Opening Seminar
reference number: 17/D01

Due date of deliverable: 30 November 2004
Actual submission date: 10 May 2005

Start date of project: 1 September 2004

Duration: 48 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:

**Foundation Institute of Public Affairs, Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, Jacek Kucharczyk,
Tomasz Grzegosz Grosse**

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	X
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Summary

The Opening Seminar of the NewGov Project 17 *Democratization, Capture of the State and New Forms of Governance in CEE countries* was dedicated to work on the most important issues related to the project, especially in the light of upcoming research in the four new European Union member states on the social dialogue. A version of social dialogue research hypothesis has been worked out, as well as the social dialogue institutions to be examined during the research.

The meeting serve as an excellent opportunity for the Polish researchers to meet in person with the researchers coming from the Baltic states. A common understanding of the issues has been worked out and this is crucial since the Baltic researchers will work independently in their countries with only remote supervision of the project leaders.

Contents

TIME AND VENUE OF THE OPENING SEMINAR	3
AGENDA	3
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	3
OPENING SEMINAR'S COURSE	4

Time and Venue of the Opening Seminar

10 May 2005 in the conference room of the Foundation Institute of Public Affairs, ul. Szpitalna 5 lok. 22, in Warsaw.

Agenda

10.00 – 13.00 Session One

1. Prof. Lena Kolarska – Bobińska – Opening of the seminar
2. Dr. Jacek Kucharczyk – General presentation of the project and the consortium (i.e. the main partners in the consortium, schedule of the project, the main tasks of the researchers)
3. Dr. Tomasz G. Grosse – New Modes of Governance – basic definitions and information on research, and basic hypotheses for national reports
4. Mateusz Fałkowski – “The impact of socialism on the administrative culture during the transition period – the case of Poland”, the main conclusions for our project
5. Comments by Erik Sootla, researcher from Estonia
6. General discussion on the inception report

13.00 – 13.30 Lunch break

13.30 – 15.00 Session Two

Preparatory workshop for the case studies research – research areas, methodology and timetable moderated by Piotr Maciej Kaczyński

List of Participants

- Prof. Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, leader of project 17
- Dr Jacek Kucharczyk, leader of project 17
- Dr Tomasz Grzegorz Grosse, senior researcher on Poland
- Mateusz Fałkowski, junior researcher on Poland
- Erik Sootla, researcher on Estonia
- Rita Stafejeva, researcher on Lithuania
- Piotr Maciej Kaczyński, project 17 coordinator
- Marta Jasińska, project 17 coordinator assistant

Opening Seminar's course

At the beginning of seminar, Dr. Kucharczyk presented briefly the general overview of the entire New Modes of Governance project managed by EUI, cluster of projects no. 3 and the concept and assumptions of its part realized by IPA (Project 17 *Democratization, Capture of the State and New Forms of Governance in CEE countries*). The two initial hypotheses were described:

1. CEE countries are not ready for NMG, they need first to finish implementing old modes of governance; hence implementation of NMG in CEE could increase some pathologies of the current system.
2. There can be a qualitative leap; CEE can move faster to NMG by bypassing some of the old modes because creation of traditional administrative structures was not completed.

Also two areas of activities of the IPA project were presented: the social dialogue (for first 18 months of the project) and regulatory agencies, alongside explanation of such a choice. The timeline of work has been brought forward: performed or near completion (4 background papers, two finished, two in pipeline), next steps – description of case studies in the countries in question (Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) which are to be completed (together with reports) by October 31, 2005.

The following presentation of the inception report conducted by Dr. Grosse started a discussion on the project assumptions, hypotheses as well as desirable research questions and project outcomes.

The first need for broader explanations occurred by defining the marketisation of certain tasks performed by public administration, mainly in understanding of the policy competition (offering the same services by different public agencies, competing with each other with quality or price at rules similar to market competition).

The unsettled point was the understanding of democratization of public administration. After an intense debate, a need of separation between general directions/values (i.e. participation in decision-making \approx social dialogue, participation in delivering of public services and transparency) and concrete techniques/modes (informal meetings, voluntary agreements, information exchange, formal and informal social dialogue institutions, etc.) occurred. A question on consultancy bodies has been raised, which are very common in Poland and abusive at the same time, as they are created only *pro forma* in most cases and do not constitute a real platform of social dialogue. Nevertheless, they still are a method of democratization and increasing legitimacy and should be included into the above mentioned classification as a separate category of techniques/modes. Mr. Sootla proposed adding another category – networking.

There also appeared a question, what are actually the social dialogue institutions and how are they understood in different countries. Prof. Kolarska-Bobińska claimed a need for a better explaining of this matter. Dr. Kucharczyk suggested that it would be interesting to do a mapping exercise, to enumerate different empirical examples of such practices and then try to categorize them. The decision was made to use mapping as a research technique. Prof. Bobińska proposed examination of reasons of introducing particular methods. She suggested two ways of conducting the research: (1) looking for anything connected with social dialogue and (2) looking for anything connected with contact with citizens and then classifying it. In both cases special attention should be paid to purposes and functions of a NMG. The importance of reasons of introducing a NMG was stressed many times.

A separate problem proved to be the hypotheses, which were also broadly discussed. On the basis of this debate several reflections and postulates were formulated, among which the most

important was that nearly all hypotheses should be revised and reworded as they are more recommendations or descriptions than hypotheses. In some cases they even described ‘common knowledge’ (e.g. the trade-of between efficiency and legitimacy). Hypotheses should more refer to impact of some processes, and not to state/describe the conjuncture. The other postulates were the following:

- the research should be formulated in a way which will allow for verification of all hypotheses,
- research on the tri-party commission and a regulatory agency, as declared in project, has to prove the validity of all hypotheses,
- hypotheses should be related to the capture of the state, all NMG and the specific of public administration in CEE,
- it should be decided which problems are the most important ones.

After this discussions the participants have decided that the most important thing at this stage is to concentrate on choosing the most important hypotheses and conceptualizing the proper research questions. Another conclusion was that the most important aspect of the research are the aims of introducing particular NMG as it should not be evaluated in a general context.

As to the research areas a decision was made to analyze NMG related to functioning (not introduction) of the institutions of social dialogue.

After lunch participants attempted to formulate research questions for the social dialogue case studies, bearing in mind as the basis the tri-partite commission as institution of social dialogue. After a brainstorm a group of initial and indicative questions (provided on a separate paper), has been elaborated that will prelude the actual research questions.

At the end of the meeting some final organizational conclusions were made:

1. Timing: list of questions will be ready by June 7, interview questions and a list of people to be interviewed: June, field research in Estonia: July, all reports to be ready by the end of October 2005
2. Background papers on social dialogue to be distributed – Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia.
3. Comments on similarities and differences in social dialogue and suitability of the proposed research questions for Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia on the basis of distributed background papers - to be received from recipients.
4. Check the compatibility of IPA’s theses with the consortium’s ones.