



## Coordination practice

### THE COORDINATION OF GOVERNMENT-WIDE, CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMMES: THE CASE OF FLANDERS IN ACTION

Prof. Dr. Koen Verhoest  
University of Antwerpen

Astrid Molenveld and Dorien Buttiens  
University of Leuven

*Under the banner of New Public Management (NPM), many OECD countries have disaggregated their large government organisations into many specialised, (semi-) autonomous single-objective agencies. This specialisation, but also fragmentation, leads to a bigger challenge for governments to arrange tasks and actions of horizontal or government-wide policy programmes in a manner that they are coherent and consistent. The study reported in this coordination practice addresses a major cross-cutting policy programme of the Flemish government “Flanders in Action” and its coordination dynamics. It offers insights into the challenges of managing long-term horizontal policy projects.*



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
European Research Area



Funded under Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities

## **Preface**

This coordination practice is a result of research within COCOPS Work Package 5: The Governance of Social Cohesion: Innovative Coordination Practices in Public Management.

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 266887 (Project COCOPS), Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities.

The COCOPS project (Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future) seeks to comparatively and quantitatively assess the impact of New Public Management style reforms in European countries, drawing on a team of European public administration scholars from 11 universities in 10 countries.

The specific objectives of Work Package 5 are:

- To search and identify emerging coordination practices and related steering instruments in public management in European public sectors.
- To compile a case study catalogue of such coordination practices with direct utility to public managers and the research community.
- To analyse the functioning of such coordination practices and to assess their value in countering public sector fragmentation and delivering public value.

Work Package leader:

**Prof. Dr. Per Lægreid**

University of Bergen

Department of Administration and Organization Theory

Norway

Please visit the COCOPS website: <http://www.cocops.eu/>

## 1. THE COORDINATION LANDSCAPE

### Main country characteristics: BELGIUM

General political-administrative structure

Belgium is a parliamentary democracy and the electoral system is part of a proportional tradition. Proportional systems allocate seats more or less in line with the electoral result (in terms of votes). Coalition formation is a common practice in Belgian politics, at the federal as well as at the regional level.

Belgium is a federal state with communities and regions, each of which can have their own parliament, government and administration. Flanders decided at an early stage to merge the Flemish Community and the Flemish Region into one Flemish Parliament, Flemish Government and Flemish administration. Flanders can be characterised as a consensual and pillarised society, and the politicisation of the administration is considerable.

The reform agenda of “Better Administrative Policy” (BBB) hived off policy implementation to agencies of different types (e.g. semi-autonomous ones). BBB also redefined the role of central departments (such as the Departments of Finance or Administrative Affairs) and increased the managerial autonomy of the line departments. BBB restructured the Flemish government in 2006 into thirteen homogeneous policy domains. A policy domain is a collection of policy issues that were shaped into a coherent whole with an associated department and multiple agencies. In addition, there is no longer a hierarchical relationship between the department and the agencies – which is rather unique in Europe – implying that departments cannot steer or give any instruction to agencies.

Ministers coordinate the department and agencies in vertical policy domains by using a policy strategy document based on the coalition agreement (6 years), and an annual policy letter. Objectives in these policy documents should be translated by these organisations into multi-annual performance contracts which are determined by the minister and his department and agencies, and into an annual business plan. Additionally, ministers should organise and chair a policy council which brings together all heads of departments (or Secretaries-general) and agencies’ CEOs (or Administrator-General) in the involved policy domain. However, in several policy domains these policy councils do not function optimally, which is due to a lack of ministerial engagement. Moreover, in the management group, the secretary-general of the department and the agencies’ CEOs discuss policy issues in preparation in the policy council and make more operational decisions about policy implementation and management issues.

There are a limited number of horizontal coordination platforms. At the political level, the cabinet itself is a major horizontal-coordination platform

	<p>between ministers. At the administrative level, the Board of Senior Officials (CAG) and the SG (Secretaries-General) forum are the main horizontal coordination arrangements. The CAG, which is comprised of one senior civil servant per policy domain, is a permanent forum aimed at political-administrative dialogue and coordination on major orientations with respect to the organisation-wide policies (focused on management issues). To prevent different discussions and overlap within forums, the CAG is at the top of its hierarchical relationships with different strategic discussion forums. There are also a number of informal consultative bodies for alignment and coordination across the policy domains, such as the SG forum.</p> <p>In the case of “vertical” policy issues, this “BBB structure” has created several coordination instruments and platforms; however, for some policy issues that cut across policy domains or that are government-wide, policy coherence requires extra efforts. Nonetheless, the coordination instruments created by BBB are predominantly vertically oriented.</p>
Coordination discourse	<p>The current debate in the Flemish community is on policy coherence and governance. The OECD writes: “the government difficulties with BBB are maybe less due to the BBB per se but maybe more to the mismatch between old governance procedures and habits and the new governance paradigm.” The Economic and Social Council of Flanders (SERV) writes that one of the major challenges after BBB is to decrease compartmentalisation and achieve better policy coordination. Scholars indicate a lack of mutual trust between the political and administrative levels. Besides that, other challenges include insufficient support of ministers and cabinets for the functioning of new steering and monitoring instruments, a lack of the necessary collaborative culture between departments and autonomous agencies and no attention for the power allocation between the senior officials and the need for organisational culture changes. This critique was taken up by several high-level platforms and has made its way to the coalition negotiations in 2009. The Flemish coalition agreement of 2009-2014 pays considerable attention to issues such as counteracting compartmentalisation, working in an integrated fashion, developing a collaborative culture and achieving a cross-policy domain and multi-level collaboration.</p>
Policy area	<p>The current Flemish Government (for the period 2009-2014) is led by Minister-President Peeters and has nine ministers. The Flemish Parliament has 124 MPs. The coordination practice under review is a strategic government-wide, cross-cutting policy programme; “Flanders in Action (FiA)”. Minister-President Peeters is the responsible minister for “Flanders in Action”.</p> <p>All departments and agencies within the Flemish government, political actors (government, ministers, ministerial cabinets) and various civil-society organisations are involved, to a lesser or greater extent, in Flanders</p>

	in Action.
--	------------

<b>2. COORDINATION PRACTICE: The coordination of government-wide, cross-cutting programmes: The case of Flanders in Action</b>	
<b>2.1. Substance</b>	
Country	Belgium, Flanders
Area	Central (regional) government
Main characteristics of the practice	<p>The coordination practice we describe in this paper was specifically designed to bring about more horizontal coordination and policy integration.</p> <p>Flanders in Action (FiA) was initiated in 2006 by the Flemish Minister-President as the future-oriented project for Flanders with a time horizon stretching to 2020. The main aim was for Flanders to become one of the top five best developed regions in Europe by 2020. FiA is firmly anchored in the Flemish coalition agreement (2009-2014). There is also a strong link between FiA and the EU 2020 programme for Flanders: Each EU country had been commissioned to establish a National Reform Programme of action to reach the EU 2020 targets. Flanders, as a Belgian region also proposed its own Flemish Reform Programme. Flanders in Action includes an improvement mission to <i>“sensitize the Flemish civil servant for long term policy-making and -execution and to set out a new course for cross-cutting policy within the Flemish central government”</i>.</p> <p>To achieve the programme, the Flemish Government derived 88 strategic objectives from the coalition agreement of Flanders. These objectives were developed in 335 key projects to achieve the goals of Flanders in Action. These projects are grouped around “breakthroughs”: 1: The open entrepreneur; 2: Flanders learning society; 3: Innovation Centre Flanders; 4: Green and dynamic urban region; 5: Europe’s smart hub; 6: Caring society 7: Decisive governance. Much attention is given to the so-called flagship initiatives, which are clusters of very specific action programmes. Flagship Initiatives are the key projects/strategic objectives that a minister has categorised as a particularly important project in the context of the implementation of the FiA breakthroughs.</p> <p>As an example, we will elaborate on the breakthrough “Decisive Governance” and its goals and underlying actions, since it is too far-reaching to enumerate all 335 specific projects.</p> <p>Breakthrough 5: Decisive government is shaped as a multi-annual programme (MAP) based on four strategic objectives through specific key</p>

	<p>projects. The emphasis is on cooperation, efficiency, quality and effectiveness. The Flemish Government ordered the Council of Administrators-General to establish this multi-annual programme. The Minister for Public Governance was assigned the political responsibility, while the implementation is coordinated by a programme office situated within the Department of the Services for the General Government Policy (DAR).</p> <p>We will go into detail on the coordination of one of the government-wide actions that falls under this breakthrough: <i>“towards Measurable and Auditable Efficiency Gains”</i> (or in short: efficiency gains). In 2010, under the “second generation” of performance and strategic agreements (2011-2015) an insertion of “generic principles” or “government-wide principles” was required within the multi-annual performance contracts. The two government-wide principles that were imposed state that the agencies and departments themselves have to define explicit trajectories for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the increase of the maturity of the organisation;</li> <li>- the achievement of measurable efficiency gains.</li> </ul> <p>A very large part of the multi-annual performance contracts of departments and agencies include organisational objectives referring to the government-wide goal. The government-wide goal is translated, in organisational objectives, in fifty of the agreements. Five agreements do not include an internal translation of the government-wide goal. The level of description and internal translation in the agreements, however, is rather limited. According to another study, 10% of the projects within the trajectories were, according to the agreements, implemented by the end of 2011. This good score might reflect a shift from an emphasis on long-term projects to short-term, on-going projects (FiA had an original time horizon stretching to 2020) and the innovativeness of the projects. Complementary to the latter, this seems to suggest that existing or on-going projects were included in the agreement to achieve the government-wide goal.</p>
<p>Background and initiation of the practice</p>	<p>Flanders in Action (FiA) is a future-oriented, strategic, cross-cutting Flemish government-wide policy programme. The goal of Flanders in Action is that Flanders will become one of the top five best developed regions in Europe by 2020.</p> <p>FiA was, at first, in the policy preparation phase – essentially an externally focused political process, with horizontal forums and involvement of civil-society organisations and stakeholders. The administration was only minimally involved to the extent that they could deliver some information, but had no advisory role. The horizon of the programme was the year 2020, which is beyond the parliamentary term (2009-2014), and a lot of innovative policy ideas and strategies were proposed (e.g. primary education should in the future be entirely reformed, company vehicles must become environmentally friendly, the bundling and improvement of the promotion of cultural activities abroad, the incorporation of ICT in</p>

	<p>home care, etc.). In this initiation phase and in drawing up the joint strategy, political support was strong and the level of conflict between coalition partners was very low. Moreover, the communication with the media was well-coordinated and intensive, which resulted in the high media exposure of these initial workshops.</p>
<p>Time frame</p>	<p>In the first phase, in spring 2006, the Flemish government first considered a business plan called “Flanders in Action”. The substantive scope of the plan was, at the suggestion of the Economic and Social Council of Flanders (SERV), extended to socio-economic development. “Flanders in Action” was initiated as a platform where Flemish policymakers, social partners and civil-society organisations could jointly express their vision for Flanders.</p> <p>The initiation phase began in 2006 with the first discussions on Flanders’ future. On 17 December 2007 a FiA forum was organised where 250 “captains of society” came together, including representatives of civil-society organisations, academia and the administration (with a limited, informative role). Several workshops were organised with civil-society organisations in 2008 and 2009 to start the first exchange of ideas. These workshops were debates where actors from the government formulated the “breakthroughs” which were proposed during the FiA Forum in January 2009. On 20 January, the Flemish government and major societal stakeholders signed “Pact 2020”, which detailed the main objectives to be reached through the FiA strategic plan by 2020.</p> <p>After the initiation phase, the resigning Flemish government decided in the spring of 2009 to integrate the breakthroughs of FiA into the coalition agreement of the upcoming government. In June 2009, the contributions of the Flemish administration, which in general terms referred to the breakthroughs, were submitted to the new Flemish Government. Shortly afterwards, the government proposed the new coalition agreement for the period of 2009 to 2014. The second phase (i.e. the translation phase) started with the “administrative translation” of the FiA goals (in fact, the coalition agreement) into concrete actions from the fall of 2009 onwards. The seven breakthroughs, which were the output of the first phase, were finally translated by the administration into 88 strategic goals and 335 key projects by May 2010 and were defined in the FiA/coalition agreement monitoring instrument.</p> <p>The Flemish Government decided in May 2011 that thirteen major themes of FiA will be governed through “transition management” to create a “sustainable change”, and to enhance coordination and coherence. In the transversal phase, to revitalise the cross-cutting dynamic, adjustments were made to the strategic plan and its governance structure. The breakthroughs, associated actions and goals were placed under a transversal theme, a re-clustering which is expected to encourage the policy domains to collaborate across policy domains and strengthen the external component.</p>

2.2. Structure and actors	
Basic features	<p>As indicated, FiA was a political project in the initiation phase, and the administration was hardly involved. Therefore, we can describe the policy design as a top-down initiated process, although the involvement and input of interest groups and other societal groups was substantial at the beginning of the process.</p>
Main tools	<p>The instruments (underlined in the description below) of Flanders in Action are not mandatory. There is a budget allocated for the preparation of Flanders in Action’s meetings at the level of the Minister-Presidents’ political staff, but there is no extra budget for the implementation of the FiA goals. So, implementation of FiA has to be done within the budgets allocated to organisations and policy domains.</p> <p>During the initiation phase, there were several coordinating instruments used to formulate the FiA breakthroughs. The political staff of the Minister-President had the coordinating role in the first months. The main tasks were arranging consultations with stakeholders, such as the aforementioned workshops, information processing and combining the Pact 2020 targets with FiA. We can classify the Minister-President and his political staff under the hierarchical or authority-based tools: they had a coordinating function. In addition to providing feedback and following up on the progress of the breakthroughs, the ministerial cabinet also approved the projects. The FiA workshops that led to the breakthroughs were chaired by (one or more) expert(s) and had a steering committee. This committee prepared papers as an impetus for the debates at the workshop. In the workshops there were a wide range of representatives of stakeholder groups present. Each of the workshops provided a series of concrete policy proposals for each domain, which could also be consulted on the website of FiA. These workshops can be classified under network-based tools. The involvement of the administration was strengthened after the formulation of the breakthroughs in the spring of 2009. The administration, on its own initiative, arranged a two-day meeting during which senior officials (Secretaries-General and Administrators-General) discussed the objectives of FiA and clarified the task of the administration as the main actor in FiA. This meeting was typically a network-based coordination tool, because of the importance laid on consensus and mutual exchange.</p> <p>For the seven FiA breakthroughs seven Secretaries-General (SG – head manager at a department) were appointed “champions” by the Flemish government, based on their thematic expertise. Initially these SGs, or “champions”, were perceived as the main coordination tools of FiA. “Champion” refers to a visible, powerful and prestigious civil servant who organises or boosts the translation and the dynamics. The key projects are</p>

led by a project manager within the administration, who is responsible for coordinating actions, though they are not provided with extra resources. On a regular basis, the “champions” of each “breakthrough” consult with their responsible minister or ministers on the implementation of FiA in so-called breakthrough groups, which are chaired by the “champion”. The groups are designed to address the various projects and actions that the breakthrough has to accomplish and to coordinate the actions with civil-society organisations (also a member of the breakthrough groups). These breakthrough groups can be classified under network-based tools.

Four tools are used for the overview of the goals and actions: the steering committee, the DAR, the interdepartmental working group and the monitoring tool. The steering committee (later Council of Wise) consists of experts and representatives of civil-society organisations and two representatives of the administration. It was already appointed in the initiation phase as a facilitator of the process and initial sounding board for discussing the results and breakthroughs that the workshops had created. The Council of Wise reports to the Minister-President of the Flemish Government. The steering committee had a decision-making function in the initiation phase, which developed during the translation phase into a network-based tool when it became the “Council of Wise”. The staff unit of DAR, a unit within the Services for the General Government Policy, was given the task to coordinate FiA within the government and to support the Secretariat of the Council of Wise. Their coordinating function entailed that they chaired the interdepartmental working group (see below) and assisted in monitoring the progress of the implementation of FiA. However its authoritative power over line departments and agencies remains very low. The collaboration of line departments and agencies is mainly gained by convincing, as well as by intervention of the government, the Minister-President and his political staff and the College of Administrators-general (CAG). The latter body was assigned the task of monitoring the implementation of FiA.

The main instrument for coordination, in the implementation or translation phase, is the interdepartmental working group, which monitors FiA and the coalition agreement. The members of the interdepartmental working group are present as representatives of the policy domain, and decisions are made by consensus (network-based). The second most important tool in the implementation of FiA is the monitoring tool. The monitoring tool was developed within the interdepartmental working group for the monitoring of the coalition agreement/FiA. Results are reported and made public twice a year. This means that the monitoring instrument is also a communication tool to show how individual projects, as well as the overall FiA programme, are progressing. This monitoring instrument is based on information-sharing and can be classified under network-based tools.

In the transversal phase, the Minister-President took the initiative to appoint a process manager for the overall implementation of FiA. The

	<p>process manager is a contact person that can channel the progress on transversal themes and questions to the Flemish Government. This person is working for the Services for the General Government Policy. Currently, each of the thirteen transversal issues now also has an “integrator” and a “transition manager”. The integrator ensures that the transition manager gets the right people and resources to work on a transversal theme. The transition manager is responsible for the day-to-day management of the themes. All “tools” in this phase are network-based, and there is no formal hierarchical relationship between actors.</p> <p>The FiA Away Day (March 2011) occurred during the transversal phase. This, in addition to the process manager and the integrators, can be considered a tool to enhance coordination. The day aimed at re-establishing the link between all the on-going projects and the indicators and to enhance the engagement between all partners. This project day was attended by the following participants: “champions” from the administration, members of the Council of Wise, Flemish ministers (and ministerial cabinets), signatories of Pact 2020, experts and the research centre of the Flemish government. As with the aforementioned platforms, the “Away Day” is also a network-tool.</p>
Main actors	<p>In Flanders in Action there are only (formal) hierarchical relationships between the political and administrative levels (government, ministers and the departments and agencies that are under their remit). Explicit political support increased the estimated importance of Flanders in Action and thereby also the cooperation of all stakeholders (although this support and involvement differed across the phases, see below).</p> <p>The administrative translation phase affected FiA along several dimensions: whereas in the initiation phase fundamental long-term changes were envisaged, the administrations proposed projects that had to be implemented in the short term and which included, to a substantial degree, policies and projects that were already on-going in the different policy fields. Moreover, the emphasis was increasingly on projects within a ministerial portfolio or within single organisations, with projects that foster collaboration between policy domains becoming less prominent. It was a way to bring these policies into the existing administrative structures and implementation apparatus, and hence to pursue implementation, but, this phase reduced to some extent the horizontality, the innovativeness and the long-term focus of the programme. The involvement of external stakeholders was rather limited, except for their monitoring role in the Council of Wise (see above). In this phase, the FiA project lost, to some extent, its political momentum, and within the government coalition, political support for the FiA project was becoming somewhat less univocal. Moreover, during this phase the media exposure of FiA was less prominent and less coordinated, which strengthened the perception of diminishing political support for the programme.</p>

	<p>The current phase (2011-2012), which we call the “transversal phase”, aims to overcome some of these concerns by trying to revive the original dynamic and proactive spirit of the cross-cutting programme. The first step of this revival is to develop a “transition arena”. In the transition arena “change agents” from various backgrounds are brought together to discuss problems and solutions. The goal is to form a joint definition of the problem. The participants in the transition arena, both public actors (e.g. government agencies) and private actors, such as interest groups, proactive companies and non-profit organisations, are considered to be key players within their own networks. To learn about different innovative solutions and niches, field experiments are conducted. Successful experiments and niches are then selected and supported by governmental interventions and policies in order to substitute existing practices by these innovations.</p>
<p><b>2.3. Impacts and effects</b></p>	
	<p>The FiA as a government-wide cross-cutting policy programme made it possible, to a certain extent, to direct efforts of the administration and stakeholders towards common goals and to frame the coalition agreement into a broader policy programme with a longer time horizon. However, the implementation of this programme faced several challenges.</p> <p>On the level of the ambitions of the plan, as stated before, the administrative translation phase and the merger of the FiA programme into the coalition agreement caused a few side effects that temporarily weakened the ambitions of FiA. Additionally, the emphasis shifted partially to a short-term perspective (the coalition agreement term) and, in several cases, the suggested projects referred to on-going policies rather than the introduction of new, innovative policies. The administrative translation of FiA also led to a temporary weakening of the involvement of social partners and stakeholders. During the transversal phase these side-effects were to a substantial degree corrected with a new emphasis on long-term and fundamental change projects and intensified external stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>The reframing and re-clustering of goals and themes happened a lot during the programme implementation and transversal phase. The layering of structures and levels of objectives can create complexity, in terms of transparency and confusion, which might affect the impact and effects of the programme.</p> <p>There seems to be a need for some coordination functions with a more explicit decision-making mandate; implementing a programme without formal authority-based coordination tools is a tough challenge.</p> <p>Concerning the planning: there are no intermediate deadlines, only yearly monitoring reports. Consequently, there are no mid-term adjustments on the actions. The monitoring tool plays an important role as a</p>

	<p>communication and coordination tool, which makes both public and transparent how projects are progressing. In addition, the tool provides an incentive to implement and monitor the on-going projects well, since others can “benchmark” the result of each entity.</p> <p>Regarding the cultural dimension we can say that initiatives like the interdepartmental working group are trust building tools. Moreover, the interdepartmental working group plays a major role in mutual openness and transparency and the harmonisation of planning methods and structures. Cross-policy plans are successful when people feel shared ownership and responsibility for their implementation.</p>
<p><b>2.4. Lessons learned and policy recommendations</b></p>	
	<p>From the FiA coordinating practice, several constraining and enabling factors appear important. Based on the coordination literature, we only refer here to the most important ones and provide some explanatory notes where needed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Continuous political support, not only by the Minister-President but also by other ministers (and across related political parties). Safeguard broad political support in order to foster the continuity of government-wide cross-cutting policy programmes by future cabinets.</li> <li>2) Ownership of (senior) civil servants: the senior civil servants were only involved late in the process, mainly in the administrative translation phase, which causes some problems in terms of ownership.</li> <li>3) An administrative culture oriented towards coordination and collaboration, which was to a certain extent insufficiently present since the large reform of 2006.</li> <li>4) Sufficient and clear internal and external communication.</li> <li>5) The quest for some degree of authority and incentives as coordination instruments, as information-sharing, mutual consultation and persuasion are in themselves insufficient for the governance of such complex government-wide programmes, despite the subsequent administrative translation into vertical, sector-based policy measures and activities (through ministerial policy briefs and organisational performance contracts), and despite the coupling of FiA with the coalition agreement.</li> <li>6) The need for meta-coordination capacity in complex multi-layered cross-cutting policy programmes and the need to keep governance structures as simple as possible.</li> <li>7) The clear tension between politically externally driven cross-cutting policy programmes that focus on fundamental change and far-reaching intersectoral collaboration on the one hand and the need for</li> </ol>

	implementation through a politico-administrative apparatus that is based on a strong single-organisation and single-sector logic and accountability mechanisms on the other hand.
<b>2.5. Further information</b>	
Data and references	<p>The research techniques consisted mainly of semi-structured expert interviews, a content analysis and an additional document analysis. This empirical description is part of a broader project where the overlap between government-wide plans (and its meta-governance) was under study. We chose to select respondents represented in different working groups of different government-wide plans. That way we could study within the plans how the official coordination is regulated and arranged, and how the alignment between the plans, in which the respondent is involved, occurred.</p> <p>In addition, we conducted a content analysis. The content analysis focused on Flanders in Action/the coalition agreement, Pact 2020, Flemish Strategy for Sustainable Development, Flemish EU Reform Programme 2020 and Flemish Action Plan for Poverty Reduction. The purpose of the content analysis was to get an idea of the extent to which the different plans refer to each other in order to study the link between the different policies.</p> <p><u>References on Belgium as a federal state and Flanders as a region:</u></p> <p>Brans, M. and A. Hondeghem. 2005. "Competency Frameworks in The Belgian Governments: Causes, Construction and Contents." <i>Public Administration</i> 83, 823-837. Available at <a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0033-3298.2005.00478.x/full">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0033-3298.2005.00478.x/full</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p>Ministry of the Flemish Region. 2001. <i>Beter bestuur Een visie op een transparant organisatiemodel voor de Vlaamse administratie</i>. Available at <a href="http://www2.vlaanderen.be/bbb/documenten/algemeen/rapport_bc-synthese.pdf">http://www2.vlaanderen.be/bbb/documenten/algemeen/rapport_bc-synthese.pdf</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p>OESO/OECD. 2007. <i>OECD Reviews of Human Resource Management in Government. Belgium. Brussels Capital Region, Federal Government, Flemish Government, French Community, Walloon Region</i>. Advance Copy, October 2007. Available at <a href="http://www.oecd.org/gov/publicemploymentandmanagement/39375676.pdf">http://www.oecd.org/gov/publicemploymentandmanagement/39375676.pdf</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p>SERV. 2009. <i>Advies Over de tussentijdse conclusies van de Commissie Effectieve en Efficiënte Overheid</i>. Brussel: SERV. Available at <a href="http://ikdoe.vlaandereninactie.be/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Advies-SERV-over-het-ontwerp-Meerjarenprogramma-Slagkrachtige-Overheid.pdf">http://ikdoe.vlaandereninactie.be/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Advies-SERV-over-het-ontwerp-Meerjarenprogramma-Slagkrachtige-Overheid.pdf</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p>

	<p>Spanhove, J. and K. Verhoest. 2008. <i>Deugdelijk bestuur in de Vlaamse overheid anno 2008, een kwalitatieve analyse van nieuwe government governance mechanismen in BBB</i>. Leuven: Steunpunt bestuurlijke organisatie Vlaanderen. Available at <a href="http://steunpuntbov.be/rapport/s2A0305001_spanhove_GovGov.pdf">http://steunpuntbov.be/rapport/s2A0305001_spanhove GovGov.pdf</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p>Spanhove, J. and K. Verhoest. 2007. <i>Analyzing Government Governance at different levels, developing a normative and analytical framework bases on principles, processes, instruments and cycles</i>. Leuven: EGPA, Instituut voor de Overheid. Available at <a href="https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/.../paper_preconference_egpa.doc">https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/.../paper_preconference_egpa.doc</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p><u>References on Flanders in Action:</u></p> <p>Bussels, M. and K. Bachus. 2012. "Beleidsafstemming en duurzame ontwikkeling: casestudies over de VSDO II en ViA." Working Paper 34. Leuven: HIVA. Available at <a href="http://www.steunpuntdo.be/papers/Working%20Paper%2034_Bussels.pdf">http://www.steunpuntdo.be/papers/Working%20Paper%2034_Bussels.pdf</a> (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p>Spanhove, J. and A. Delarue. 2011. <i>An Horizontal View on a Flemish Public Sector Reform: "Flanders in Action – Decisive Governance"</i>. 7<sup>th</sup> Transatlantic Dialogue on Strategic Management of Public Organizations. Newark, New Jersey: Rutgers University. Available at <a href="http://www.7tad.org/documents/WG4/Spanhove-Delarue.pdf">http://www.7tad.org/documents/WG4/Spanhove-Delarue.pdf</a>. (last accessed 16 November 2012).</p> <p>Vlanders in Action website. Available at <a href="http://vlaandereninactie.be/nieuws/vlaamse-regering-bekrachtigt-opvolgingsinstrument-vlaanderen-in-actie/">http://vlaandereninactie.be/nieuws/vlaamse-regering-bekrachtigt-opvolgingsinstrument-vlaanderen-in-actie/</a></p>
Contact	<p><b>Prof. Dr. Koen Verhoest</b> University of Antwerpen <a href="mailto:koen.verhoest@ua.ac.be">koen.verhoest@ua.ac.be</a></p> <p><b>Astrid Molenveld</b>, PhD candidate University of Leuven <a href="mailto:astrid.molenveld@soc.kuleuven.be">astrid.molenveld@soc.kuleuven.be</a></p> <p><b>Dorien Buttiens</b>, Researcher University of Leuven <a href="mailto:dorien.buttiens@soc.kuleuven.be">dorien.buttiens@soc.kuleuven.be</a></p>