P04 / Agency Policymaking: Dynamics and Contributions to National Public Policies

Topic : POLICY FORMULATION, ADMINISTRATION AND POLICYMAKERS

Chair : Ebinezer Florano (University of the Philippines Diliman)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Much of the discussions, literature, and studies on public policymaking focus on the role of legislative bodies and policy implementation in the executive branch of the government. More often than not, the role of public agencies or the bureaucracy in public policymaking is glossed over. Yet, the scant literature about them points out their importance in the formulation of public policies. As policy implementors, and the ones involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the relevant programs or projects, the bureaucracy is in the position to speak clearly about the need to correct the implementation of the existing public policies, amend/modify or altogether, terminate them. A handful of studies have already raised issues about agencification (Bach, Niklasson and Painter, 2012), policy autonomy or independence from politicians (Berry and Gersen, 2017; Selin, 2015; Rose-Ackerman and Perroud, 2013; Bach, Niklasson and Painter, 2012), judicial/statutory interpretation or adjudication (Phillips, 2021; Stack, 2009; De Mesquita and Stephenson, 2007; Koch, 2005; Magillt, 2004), delegation to the bureaucracy of the regulatory policymaking function of the legislature (Wiseman, 2009; De Mesquita and Stephenson, 2007), public participation or mass public engagement (Judge-Lord, 2021; Mendelson, 2007), legislative oversight (Clinton et al., 2014; Feinstein, 2017), executive turnover's influence on policy implementation (Bertelli and Lewis, 2013), multiple agency policymaking (Bils, 2020), etc. In spite of these, there is still a need to conduct more studies on the dynamics of internal policymaking in government bureaucracies and their contributions to (national) public policymaking. For this purpose, the following questions have to be satisfactorily answered: What is the role of agencies in public policymaking? What factors affect their participation in public policymaking? Are there areas for autonomous public policymaking reserved for agencies? Do they produce better policies that lead to effective public service? What factors could this be attributed to? What is the state of internal policymaking in agencies? Or, how well-developed is the internal policymaking in agencies? What are the dynamics involved?

References

Bach, T., Niklasson, B. and Painter, M. (2012) The role of agencies in policy-making. Policy and Society. [online]. 31 (3), Policy and Society Associates Ltd Partnership, pp.183–193. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2012.07.001.

Berry, C.R. and Gersen, J.E. (2017) Agency design and political control. The Yale Law Journal. [online]. 126 (4), pp.1002–1049. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/44863339.

Bertelli, A.M. and Lewis, D.E. (2013) Policy influence, agency-specific expertise, and exit in the federal service. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. [online]. 23 (2), pp.223–245. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24484815.

Bils, P. (2020) Policymaking with multiple agencies. American Journal of Political Science. [online]. 64 (3), pp.634–648. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/45295338.

Clinton, J.D., Lewis, D.E. and Selin, J.L. (2014) Influencing the bureaucracy: The irony of congressional oversight. American Journal of Political Science. [online]. 58 (2), pp.387–401. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24363492.

Feinstein, B.D. (2017) Designing executive agencies for congressional influence. Administrative Law Review. [online]. Spring (2), pp.259–289. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/44648616.

Judge-Lord, D. (2021) Public pressure campaigns and bureaucratic policymaking The University of Wisconsin-Madison. Koch, C.H. (2005) Policymaking by the administrative judiciary. Faculty Publications. [online]. 1278. Available from: https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/facpubs/1278.

Magillt, M.E. (2004) Agency choice of policymaking form. The University of Chicago Law Review. [online]. 71 (4), pp.1383–1447. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1600528.

Mendelson, N.A. (2007) Regulatory beneficiaries and informal agency policymaking. Cornell Law Review. [online]. 397, pp.397–452. Available from: http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/clr/vol92/iss3/1.

(Note: Not all references could not be included due to space limitations.)

Format of the panel: Hybrid (onsite & online)

CALL FOR PAPERS

Agency Policymaking: Dynamics and Contributions to National Public Policies

The panel is calling for theoretical and empirical papers that tackle the nature of agency policymaking, the dynamics of agency internal policy development, and their contributions to the formulation of (national) public policies. The papers should be able to answer one or more of the following questions:

1. What is the role of agencies in public policymaking?

2. What factors affect their participation in public policymaking?

3. Are there areas for autonomous public policymaking reserved for agencies?

4. Do agencies produce better policies that lead to effective public service? What factors could this be attributed to?

5. What is the state of internal policymaking in agencies? Or, how well-developed is the internal policymaking in agencies? What are the dynamics involved?

“Agency” as utilized in this call, generally refers to executive government agencies at the national level, e.g., ministry/department, bureau, etc.

P04 / Agency Policymaking: Dynamics and Contributions to National Public Policies

Chair : Ebinezer Florano (University of the Philippines Diliman)

Session 1Policy Development Processes at the National Government Level

Wednesday, June 28th 08:00 to 10:00 (KHE332)

Discussants

Juan Carlos Triviño Salazar (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Abraham Manalo (University of the Philippines Diliman)

The road better taken – A comparison of the policy formulation route taken by select ASEAN countries on their domestic adoption and regulation of modern agricultural biotechnology

Abraham Manalo (University of the Philippines Diliman)

The global adoption of modern biotechnology in agriculture, particularly in plants and plant products, has been quite impressive. From the 1.7 million hectares reported when biotech crops were first commercially grown in 1996, latest figures from the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA 2020) reveal that 23 years later, about 190.4 million hectares of farmland have been devoted to biotech crops in 2019, spread across 29 countries and planted by approximately 17 million farmers from both developing and developed countries. In spite of its widespread commercial planting and direct use for human food or animal feed, different countries have set in place different policies and regulations that can either facilitate or stifle their adoption of this technology to agriculture and the domestic economy at large. One of the essential elements that differentiates these issuances is the source of the basic policy formulation – as a law enacted by the national legislature or as a policy directive emanating from a regulatory agency of the executive branch. There are historical, legal, institutional, and political reasons behind the policy-formulation route taken by a particular country, and this will be the main focus of this study, as it surveys and compares the basic policies on biotech regulation in the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam. The lead policymaking bodies will be identified and the role they played will be substantially discussed. This paper will also examine the policy implication of taking such route, how it may have affected the adoption and use of the technology in agriculture and commerce. It will strive to answer an important and timely question: on highly technical matters such as in modern agricultural biotechnology, which policymaking and regulatory-formulating route leads to more effective public service? Which route better serves the people that are the intended beneficiaries of these new interventions? Aside from documentary analysis of pertinent laws, policies, regulations, and similar issuances on modern biotechnology from the five case countries mentioned above, the author intends to conduct in-depth interviews with key informants from these countries to be able to answer the research problems that have been put forward.

Does the Background of the Regulator Matter? Representative Bureaucracy, Critical Mass and Cultural Capture in Regulatory Bodies

Juan Carlos Triviño Salazar (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Ixchel Pérez-Durán (Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona)

Yannis Papadopoulos (University of Lausanne)

Regulatory bodies (RAs) have been conceived as expert bodies able to enhance the credible commitment problem of policies due to their technical capacities and knowledge (Majone, 1994). In contrast to other political organizations, it might be argued that RAs do not need to fulfill social representation. However, previous studies (Jasanoff, 2011; Krick, 2018; Pérez-Durán and Bravo-Laguna, 2019) have emphasized that

expert bodies and their members also need to meet some requirements related to: (i) the reliability of their knowledge and competence; and (ii) the credibility of their independence -as opposing to bias- in their background and professional trajectories. For this reason, our purpose is to examine representation in RAs and its potential effects on the risks of cultural capture and the lack of critical mass and plurality of voices in their regulatory process. To this end, we propose answering the following questions: To what extent do regulatory bodies have representative bureaucracy in regulatory domains? To what extent does such representative bureaucracy affect the risk of cultural capture in regulatory domains? We respond to the questions by examining an original biographical dataset developed in the H2020 TiGRE (Trust in Governance and Regulation in Europe) with 1070 profiles covering members of national (Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Israel, Spain, Switzerland) and EU agencies in three policy sectors, finance, data protection and food safety. In particular, we focused on examining: agency heads, members of management boards (or similar bodies); members of stakeholder bodies/advisory boards (or similar bodies), and top high-ranking officials (i.e. directors and sub-directors). Through our study, we seek to provide insights about the extent to which diversity is present in regulatory bodies; the extent to which critical mass is needed in expert bodies and regulatory domains; and finally, to contribute to the debate of democratization in expert bodies. All in all, our results contribute to critiques that signal the potential (lack of) representation within these bodies and the dangers of a cultural capture in regulatory policies.

Our paper is strongly connected to the theme of IPPA's panel on "Agency Policymaking: Dynamics and Contributions to National Public Policies" as it precisely looks for answers to the questions: What is the state of internal policymaking in agencies? how well-developed is the internal policymaking in agencies? What are the dynamics involved? These questions are strongly connected to organizational dynamics linked to the governance of these public bodies.

Agency Policy Development Processes in the Philippines: Roles, Processes, and Patterns

Ebinezer Florano (University of the Philippines Diliman)

Eunice Teodoro (University of the Philippines Diliman)

Theoretically speaking, government agencies are considered direct and official participants in policymaking at the national level. In the policy development process, they are expected to be actively involved in the development of public policies and their implementation. In the Philippines, while many studies had been conducted on public policies enacted by the national legislature, still, not much is known about the internal processes of policymaking of government and their roles in national public policy development. Therefore, this exploratory study seeks to discern the roles of and patterns in the policymaking of national government agencies. Specifically, it aims to answer the following panel questions: What is the role of agencies in public policymaking? What is the state of internal policymaking in them? How well-developed is the internal policymaking in these agencies? What are the dynamics involved? For this purpose, the policy development processes of seven government agencies were investigated by the researchers using the institutionalist approach. The seven agencies consist of a science high school system, a bureau, a law enforcement agency, a public enterprise, a presidential commission, and two departments representing the education, finance, peace and order, water resources, urban poor, social welfare, and migrant labor sectors, respectively, Interviews or focus group discussion were conducted among key informants and relevant documents were studied. In a nutshell, the major findings from these seven case studies are: that while many of these agencies have developed manuals or flow process charts for policymaking, the processes are incomplete because most of them end at either the approval of the policy or their dissemination; most of the policies are limited to internal policies, and their processes in contributing to public policies at the national level are not clear; and, the stakeholders or their "publics," in some of these agencies, are not involved in the policymaking processes. The implication of these findings is that if these trends among the seven agencies are the norms in the national bureaucracy of the country, the practice of Public Policy could only be halfway ingrained in the Philippine administrative system.

P04 / Agency Policymaking: Dynamics and Contributions to National Public Policies

Chair : Ebinezer Florano (University of the Philippines Diliman)

Session 2POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES AT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEVEL

Wednesday, June 28th 10:20 to 12:20 (KHE332)

Discussants

Masao Kikuchi (Meiji University)

Joan Ruiz (Isabela State University)

Making Civil Society Integral to Local Public Finance

Joan Ruiz (Isabela State University)

Section 23 of Article II of the 1987 Philippine Constitution states that the participation of non-governmental, community-based, and other sectoral organizations shall be encouraged by the State. Likewise, Section 67 of Republic Act No. 10964 (General Appropriations Act of 2018) allows national government agencies to partner with civil society organizations (CSOs) in implementing specific programs and projects.

This paper examines the role of CSOs in local public finance in the Philippines. It specifically covers the local government unit of Echague, Isabela, a first-class municipality located in southern Isabela Province. Eighteen accredited CSOs for 2019-2022 were noted in Echague, Isabela, which is a manifestation of the CSOs' commitment to formalize their engagement with the LGU.

This is a project that was funded by the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) through its Technical Assistance Program for Local Resource Institutes to empower the CSOs. Specifically, it aims to identify the accredited CSOs, determine their level of engagement in public procurement, and capacitate CSOs to sustain their participation in local public finance.

Civil society organizations were found to be effective in enabling services, According to the accredited CSOs, their participation in government processes is vital for providing check and balance and exacting accountability. They believed that active CSO participation is an indicator of healthy participatory governance. However, they face key challenges in their recognition and procurement expertise.

Keywords: Civil Society Organizations; Local Government Units; Local Public Finance; Philippines

Resident-government relations and residents' trust in local government in the Philippines

KENICHI NISHIMURA (Osaka University)

Masao Kikuchi (Meiji University)

This paper explores what improves residents' trust in local government, focusing on the Philippines as a case. Trust in government affects government performance. Fujii (2006), who examined the relationship between public works projects by Japan's central government and government trust, points out that "ensuring transparency" and the attitude of "carrying out public works for a good cause" increase residents' trust in government and make it easier to implement public works projects. Murayama et al. (2021) also found that prefectures in Japan with stronger ties among residents and higher government trust had lower mortality rates from new coronavirus infection, based on a survey conducted between August and September 2020.

What influences trust in government? Oyama (2010) distinguished between factors that define trust in government that relate to characteristics on the government side and those that relate to characteristics on

the citizen side, and examined which factor defines trust in government. He found that although the most significant factor defining government trust is government performance, the most important factor on the citizen side is political participation. Chida and Arai (2011) point out that if individuals frequently use local government services and facilities and frequently attend government-sponsored events, they are likely to strongly trust the local government. Furthermore, they believe that trust would be further increased if citizens could participate in some way in local government planning. They also point out that, in the case of local governments, the dissemination of information by the government itself affects residents' trust in the government. OECD, which conducted a project to measure the drivers of trust in democratic government, notes that South Korea, one of East Asia's democracies, needs to better listen to and engage its citizens in order to increase government trust (OECD/KDI 2018).

Given the above points, we use statistical analysis to identify what drives government trust in the Philippines. For this purpose, we use the results of our 2019 public opinion survey on the local governance. The analysis will test how residents' relationship with local government, information dissemination by local government, and residents' political opinions affect their trust in local government.

References

1. Chida, Ryoukichi and Arai, Kazuhiro (2011), “Determinants of Trust in Local Government: Comparison with Central Government (Chihouseifu ni taisuru Shinrai no Ketteiyouin)”, Hitotsubashi economics; Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 950129.

2. Fujii, Satoshi (2006), “Public Trust in Government: Building Trust through Public Works for a Good Cause (Seifu ni taisuru Kokumin no Shinrai)”, Proceedings of JSCE; 807/IV-70, pp.29-41.

3. Murayama H, Nakamoto I, Tabuchi T. (2021). “Social Capital and COVID-19 Deaths: An Ecological Analysis in Japan”. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health; 18(20): 10982.

4. OECD/KDI (2018), Understanding the Drivers of Trust in Government Institutions in Korea, Building Trust in Public Institutions, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264308992-en.

5. Oyana, Kousuke (2010), “Factors on the Government and Citizen Sides of Administrative Trust: Focusing on Data from the World Values Survey 2005 (Gyoseishinrai no Seifugawa to Shimingawa no Youin)”, The Annuals of Japanese Political Science Association; Vol. 61, No.1, pp. 31-48.

The Legislation and Policymaking in the Local Government Units (LGUs) in the Philippines: The Science and Participatory Challenge

Geraldo Petilla (University of the City of Manila)

The legislation and policymaking process in the Philippines, particularly in local government units (LGUs), is a conundrum. The prevailing practice raises questions about its crafting and the level of difficulty in creating accurate, fair, objective, and impactful policies. These are considered essential characteristics of all policies, as they are expected to secure and promote the welfare of constituents. The basis and substance of local legislations and policies adopted and implemented have long eluded public scrutiny.

As representatives of the people, local legislators and policymakers are accountable for satisfactorily addressing questions about the construction of statutes and policies. This includes evidence provided to support and validate the legislation, the sources used to inform the legislation (e.g. sectors, specialists, scientists, and ordinary people), and whether the legislation was informed by testing, study, application, and review. Effective governance requires considering both the scientific and participatory aspects of the legislative and policymaking process, leading to evidence-based decision making.

This paper argues for the significance of science (both substance and process) and participatory aspects in local legislation and policymaking, which are integral to the principles of Good Governance, particularly accountability and participation. The role of science in providing a deeper understanding of accountability in public service and building trust and confidence among the public is emphasized. The participatory process highlights the importance of incorporating a human element in science. This study aims to assess the level of utilization of evidence, public consultations, and involvement of specialists, researchers, and scientists in local legislation and policymaking in the Philippines. It also examines the resources available for developing data and knowledge capacity, evaluating the impact of legislation and policies, and investigating the correlation between evidence in legislation and policies and the public's level of trust and confidence.

Given the realities and limitations of local government units (LGUs), the paper argues that the growth of science and participatory policymaking are crucial to addressing challenges and advancing governance.

Keywords: science, evidence- based, participatory

Barangay Policymaking Processes: Public Policies at the Frontline

Ebinezer Florano (University of the Philippines Diliman)

Barangay (literally “village” in English) is the basic politico-administrative unit in the Philippines that is at the frontline of public service for its residents ranging between a hundred to tens of thousands. According to the 1991 Local Government Code, barangays serve as the primary planning and implementing units of government policies, plans, programs, projects, and activities in the community. It is in the barangays that residents are able to articulate their issues, problems, and concerns. Most of the relevant literature about it delves on legislating barangay ordinances or resolutions, which is only halfway through the entire policymaking process. Furthermore, there is a question on the “policymaking space” of barangays because their policymaking authority is already limited given that there are too many of them handed down by national government agencies and local government units (provincial, city/municipal) for implementation. In addition, some of the studies do not dwell on the dynamics of policymaking involving the residents. Therefore, there is a need to conduct a deeper institutional study on the practices of barangay policy development processes. This paper aims to investigate how policymaking is officially conducted in barangays with a special focus on the participation of the residents. For this purpose, four barangays located in four cities (Pasig, Quezon City, Makati, and Tagum) were investigated. They were chosen based on the reported “best practices” in their policymaking. The researchers interviewed key informants mostly barangay officials, conducted focus group discussions with them together with the residents, examined the contents of their ordinances and resolutions, and poured over their manuals and relevant documents. The major finding of the study is that “policymaking” and “policy analysis” are still foreign concepts among the barangay officials. Being at the frontline of public service, their policymaking processes are strong in the participation of their residents but they are unequipped with the technicalities of policy analysis, implementation, and assessment (i.e., monitoring and evaluation). Still, there are nuggets of wisdom that could be learned from their experiences in local policy development in their own ways.

Entrepreneurial Orientation as a Personnel Development Policy in Public Universities

Alessandro Silva Junior (Federal University of Viçosa)

Magnus Emmendoerfer (Universidade Federal de Viçosa - UFV / UNESCO CHAIR CEPPBRASIL)

Josiel Valadares (Universidade Federal de Viçosa)

Tamiris Resende (Prefeitura Municipal de Belo Horizonte)

Contextualization: In the complex scenario coming from globalization, public universities have been undergoing transformation caused by new social demands and the inclusion of new technologies, demanding the ability to debate and implement entrepreneurial actions (Cai & Etzkowitz, 2020). Thus, entrepreneurial orientation (EO) emerges as an important strategic construct to stimulate entrepreneurship in public organizations through new processes, practices, and activities aimed at organizational development (Diefenbach, 2011; Emmendoerfer, 2019). Within public universities, it is believed that these practices can be important personnel development policies, stimulating an academic culture that leads them to act in an innovative, proactive, competitive way and to take risks since they seek external financial resources and application of scientific knowledge, aiming at a promising posture for the future (Ruiz, 2018).

Research problem: What is the evidence in the international literature of personnel development policies based on Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) in public universities? This article aimed to analyze in the international literature evidence of theoretical and empirical studies that demonstrate the application and results of the EO as a policy of personnel development in public universities.

Methodology: Considering the proposed objective, this is a bibliographic research of exploratory-descriptive level. A systematic literature review will be conducted in Scopus and Web of Science international databases. As search strings will be used "entrepreneurial orientation" AND "universities"; "public universities" AND "entrepreneurship"; "entrepreneurial orientation" AND "public universities." A priori exclusion criteria will not be adopted to allow a complete view of the phenomenon. The PRISMA method (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses) will be used as a strategy of systematization and discussion of the results alongside the content analysis technique. One proposition to be verified from data analysis is the appropriation of The EO centered on graduate students.

Panel Applicability: The UNESCO Chair on Creative Economy and Public Policies: governing through alternative economic models and creative policy solutions aims to discuss possibilities and actions to stimulate creativity and governance. In this sense, it is believed that the article can contribute to the discussion of stimulating creativity and innovation of public servants, as well as in the change in educational and governance policies of public universities, stimulating local and regional cooperation by inserting

universities as a protagonist for sustainable development.

References

Cai, Y., & Etzkowitz, H. (2020). Theorizing the Triple Helix model: Past, present, and future. Triple Helix, 7(2/3), 189-226.

Diefenbach, F. E. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation in the public sector. (Doctoral dissertation). University of St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland.

Emmendoerfer, M. L. (2019). Inovação e empreendedorismo no setor público. Brasília: Enap.

Ruiz, S. M. A. (2018). Universidade empreendedora: proposição de um modelo para as instituições de ensino superior públicas brasileiras. Tese (Doutorado em Administração), Universidade Nove de Julho – UNINOVE, São Paulo, SP, Brasil.