W06 / Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality

Topic : Policy Process, Policy Making

Chair : Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Second Chair : Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

CALL FOR PAPERS

The workshop is interested in interrogating multiple questions related to how the policy sciences literature can aid the 3rd generation of Policy Advisory System research and advance its capacity to understand and manage policy advice dynamics and the quality of policy advice.

Mindful of the fact that these dimensions are interconnected and interrelated and that they overlap, influence, multiple other characteristics of policy advice content and structure, the Chairs are interested in papers which address any of a broad range of questions related to 3rd generation PAS research, including topics such as:

- What theories and/or frameworks can be utilized to better address the study of PAS dynamics and policy advice quality?

- What parameters can be applied to defining the nature of ‘high quality’ versus ‘low quality’ policy advice?

- Do PAS operate in different ways under conditions of emergency policy-making and what are the effects of these decision environments on both the dynamics of the PAS and the quality of the advice?

- What are the roles of the actors involved in the PAS in the production of low- and high-quality advice, in particular within PAS that exhibit less than desirable dynamics: i.e., corruption, toadyism or high levels of disengagement?

- How can we best measure the differences in policy dynamics and quality between different types of political systems (i.e., authoritarian regimes vs. democracies) and between different jurisdictional levels (i.e., local vs. national)?

ABSTRACT

Over the past decades, policy advice has been at the core of a growing literature that has both increased it reach in terms of policy areas and jurisdictions being analyzed, and has expanded its analytical capacity by progressively adding to its original framework based on 1st generation simple models of the communities of policy advice suppliers, brokers and consumers. 2nd generation research has added more layers of complexity, is more aware of the role of interactions between actors and ideas in the PAS and of the nature of the institutional and locational dimensions of advice systems.

To advance the progression of the policy sciences literature on the topic of the Policy Advisory System, this IWPP4 workshop is interested in exploring further the complexity and multi-layered nature of the PAS by exploring the two 3rd generation dimensions that are increasingly becoming relevant to this subfield: the dynamics of Policy Advisory Systems and policy advice quality.

These two dimensions are critical in helping scholars to further refine the empirical analytical and predictive capabilities of the PAS literature, at the same time they present interesting theoretical challenges such as how to categorize some of their elements (what represents ‘good’ policy advice?), how to choose appropriate and effective theoretical or analytical frameworks within which to ground 3rd Generation research, what methods to use to study the relationship between PAS actors and its dynamics, and others.

The workshop is interested in a wide range of papers including, but not limited, to theoretical contributions, comparative analyses exploring how PAS dynamics and policy advice quality are impacted/affect different regimes and jurisdictional levels, the role policy actors play in the quality of policy advice and case studies exploring these areas.

W06 / Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality

Chair : Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Second Chair : Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Session 1PAS and the Dynamics of Expertise (1): What is the Problem with PAS Dynamics?

Wednesday, June 26th 10:15 to 12:00 (AULA 24)

Introduction/ Tour de Table

Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Intro

W06 / Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality

Chair : Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Second Chair : Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Session 2Structural Aspects of PAS Quality

Wednesday, June 26th 14:00 to 17:15 (AULA 24)

Discussants

Maria Tullia Galanti (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Johanna Hornung (University of Lausanne)

Promoting Engagement in Community Development Through Policy-Setting: The Scottish Policy Landscape

Giuliana Longworth (Instituto de Investigación San Joan de Déu (IRSJD))

Maria Giné-Garriga (Blanquerna - Universitat Ramon Llull (Barcelona, Spain))

This comprehensive review aims to explore the potential role of policies in promoting engagement in community development, by exploring Scotland's good practice community engagement standards which were commissioned by the Scottish Government back in 2003. To respond to this aim, it systematically identified policies launched by the Scottish Government that included an element of engagement as part of their intention. By applying principles adopted in systematic reviews, through double and blinded peer-reviewing, the review identified 37 policies and the objectives. For each policy, it described, among other things, the type of engagement and concepts put forward by the policy. It described each policy's aims and objectives and classified policies according to the IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum. The number of policies demonstrated a strong interest and intention of the Scottish Government towards the subject matter. The study also further reported on implementation barriers and facilitators faced by practitioners when aiming to implement these policies by conducting 12 semi-structured interviews with community anchor organisations, non-governmental organisations and city councils. Implementation barriers identified included resource concerns, and lack of capacity-building instruments and clarity around linkages between policies. By bringing together perspectives from both the policy review and stakeholders' insights, the study aspires to provide a comprehensive narrative on the landscape of policies promoting engagement in community development and hopes to represent a case for replication of similar policies in different locations, avoiding common pitfalls and achieving more successful outcomes.

The study fits within the workshop "Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality" as it considers new ways of policy advisory dynamics including representatives of the target population and relevant stakeholders in policy design and/or decision making. Increasingly different actors are being considered an important part of such dynamics and a way to increase their effectiveness. Scotland, in this respect, represents an interest scenario in which governmental efforts exist towards this engagement and inclusion. Useful examples within the manuscript include cases in which policies encourage and regulate the co-design of public services, community empowerment and policy initiatives such as participatory budgeting and citizen's councils. The manuscript will provide a rich example in terms of existing policies, in the context of Scotland, that are relevant to new policy advisory dynamics, provide a way for categorizing them and report on barriers and facilitators on the ground implementation of such policies.

(Virtual) When the nature of policy issues matters: the Policy Advisory Systems in the EU Green Taxonomy

Edoardo Esposto (Sapienza Università di Roma)

Tiziana Nupieri (Sapienza Università di Roma)

The second wave of research on the dynamics of Policy Advisory Systems (PAS) has identified two major development trajectories, the externalisation and the politicisation of PAS (Craft & Howlett 2013), shared by OECD member countries with different politico-institutional traditions (Howlett 2019). These two trends induced scholars to rethink the received knowledge about the insider-outsider and technical-political divides in policy advice, leading to the description of more nuanced, hybrid PAS configurations (Veit *et al*. 2017; Galanti & Lippi 2023).

The long-term structural change of PAS has been the central focus of this research agenda (Craft & Halligan 2017), but a research gap exists in the formalization of a model for analysing the diachronic change in the ordinary functioning of policy advice networks. The paper aims to contribute to this research objective by expanding on Craft & Wilder (2015) study on the compatibility between advisory networks and policy subsystems, focusing on the role of salience, complexity and temporality of an issue in shaping the configuration of advisory networks. We hypothesise that the change in the perception of the complexity and the salience of the issue at stake, under different temporal constraints, influences the relationship that prevails between advisory networks and decision makers, as well as the quality of the advice generated.

We will test our hypothesis by analysing a case study selected among the vast PAS supporting the policymaking of the European Commission (EC) (Gornitzka & Sverdrup 2008; Metz 2013, 2015). We chose the case of the advisory networks involved in the definition of the *EU Green Taxonomy*, i.e. the classification of economic activities that underpins the new EU regulation of public and private sustainable investments. An expert advisory board, the Platform on Sustainable Finance (PSF), was formed by the EC in 2020, bringing together participants from public financial institutions, private financial and non-financial sectors, lobbying groups, NGOs, and research centres. The Taxonomy gained some notoriety in 2021 when the EC – refusing to act on the advice of the PSF – decided to include gas and nuclear energy among the sustainable investments in its *Complementary Climate Delegated Act*. To legitimise its decision, the EC relied on the advice of its in-house research group, the Joint Research Centre, which starkly opposed the conclusions reached by the PSF. As a result, in 2022 the PSF emended its previous determination in its *Response to Complementary Delegated Act* .

Analysing the case study through the lens of our model will help explain both the diachronic evolution of this advisory network from collaborative to contested and the “reactive management” (Marciano & Craft 2023) of the PAS by the EC. Furthermore, it will help shed light on the behavioural change of the PSF, and on the consequences of its “loyal alignment” (Migone & Howlett 2023) on the quality of the advice it provided.

(Virtual) The Impact of multiplicity of Policy Advisory Systems on the quality of Advice in Kenya

Joseph Obosi (University of Nairobi)

As a grouping/entity of experts operating as either internal or external advisors to the government or other organizations, a Policy Advisory System (PAS) includes specific sets of policy advisory actors working in government, and the works of external actors, for example, think tanks or lobbyists (Nelson and Yackee 2012) and groups such as partisan political advisors, scientific, technical and legal experts, and many others (Craft and Howlett 2013). Over time, PAS has multiplied in terms of sources and nature of expert advice, external or internal, technocratic or professional and more often than not triggered competition amongst the various actors. The multiplicity of PAS has seen asymmetrical shifts in terms of the locus of PASs, from insourcing PASs (with career civil servants or appointed official advisors) to outsourcing PASs (externally recruited professional policy experts for internal policy advisory committees or for ad hoc policy advice committees) and then to citizen sourcing PASs relying on policy ideation, discussion, and feedback by ordinary citizens, not professional policy experts (Moon, Lee, and Park 2023) including media pundits, consultancy and knowledge companies, free-floating and independent institutes, and for-profit enterprises all contesting the roles. Actors and advisors often ignored in the past as unreliable or uninformed such as bloggers, podcasters, influencers, and other media figures, then emerged in many countries as key sources of policy advice (Capano et al. 2023) thereby resulting in a kind of vicious circle of the increased trivialization of expertise and the elevation of often emotionally based opinion in its place.

The competition has ranged from that of Technocratic/bureaucratic version of expert legitimacy, to bounded rationality, partisanship, and conflicts in ideas and values (Haas 2011) to the epistemic authority of experts

and needs to meet extrinsic criteria of legitimacy in specific contexts where different ideas, problems, and values interact with each other (Capano et al. 2023).

In many countries, during the third wave, some PAS have engaged in continuous bargaining arrangements coupled with a number of strategies such as shirking, sabotage, and acquiescing with the decision makers, both the political class and the government technocrats for survival within the policy advisory System (Koga et al. 2023) factors with serious bearing on the quality of advice received. In response, some governments have optimized PAS configuration and operation for through privileging or marginalizing particular sets of advisers including public servants, private sector consultants, various specialized advisory bodies, or via structural and procedural changes that alter how these systems of advice operate (Marciano and Craft 2023) thereby attracting unhealthy competition among PAS in given jurisdictions.

Although neo-liberal scholars have argued that competition within and across the policy advisory systems have led to more efficient and cost-cutting (Obosi 2023), this paper argues that uncontrolled multiplicity of PAS within the same arena through unhealthy competition and infractions can compromise the quality of advice to the clients. We use the challenges experienced in the implementation of Competency Based Education System and Conflicts in the regulation of Engineering and Legal Education Curricula, and collapse of University research institutes in Kenya to demonstrate our case.

W06 / Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality

Chair : Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Second Chair : Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Session 3Behavioural Aspects of PAS Quality

Thursday, June 27th 09:00 to 12:15 (AULA 24)

Discussants

Christopher Walker (Griffith University)

Giuliana Longworth (Instituto de Investigación San Joan de Déu (IRSJD))

(Virtual) How to Induce Honesty in the Public Sector: An Experiment on Honesty Patterns in U.S. Civil Servants

Junyi Huang (LKY School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore)

Ching Leong (National University of Singapore)

Swee Kiat Tay (LKY School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore)

Everyday life is premised on honesty, a paramount virtue that supports the foundation of societal trust and relationships (Iyer, 2010). Studies show that honesty behaviors differ across different genders (Grosch & Rau, 2017), different careers (Cohn, Fehr & Maréchal, 2014), and even in different countries (Gächter & Schulz, 2016) and continents (Hugh-Jones, 2016).

Honesty is perhaps even more crucial for civil servants. They often serve as the intermediary between governments and their citizens, shaping mutual impressions during interactions. For the citizens, civil servants represent the quality of governance, the level of corruption, and the stabilization of society (Sulitzeanu-Kenan, Tepe & Yair, 2022). In turn, corruption and dishonesty among civil servants have been found to damage society by increasing economic inequality (Gupta et al., 2002), loss of trust in the government (Anderson and Tverdova, 2003), and worsening the working conditions of workers (Fisman & Wang, 2015). On the other hand, for governments, civil servants relay information on the honesty levels of the populace, which then shapes the type of public policy that is deemed most appropriate for implementation.

Few studies have focused on civil servants' honesty specifically. Some research suggests that public servants are more honest than private workers in some countries (Tsuruta et al., 2021), but others point to a lack of differences at a global scale (Sulitzeanu-Kenan, Tepe & Yair, 2022). This study aims to achieve the dual role of an exploratory study into the study of honesty levels for this intermediary group, as well as a replication of an earlier study that focused primarily on the general population – do civil servants behave more honestly than the general population?

A recent study by Leong et al. (2023) showed that US citizens (i) have a modest but significant amount of dishonesty and (ii) people could be induced to act honestly. In a replication of this study, a three-arm randomized control trial with a sample of 3,000 civil servants in the USA will be conducted, where subjects perform a dice roll task and report the results. The higher the reported value, the more rewards they will get. In two conditions ("private lottery" and "private cash"), the roll is observed only by the subject. In the third condition ("public cash"), subjects can opt to have their roll observed by the experimenter. On aggregate, an average value of 3.5 would be obtained if everyone reports truthfully. This study's results will be compared with Leong et al. (2023) to examine: a) whether civil servants differed in their behaviors (of reporting honestly) as compared to the general public; and b) whether the choice to opt to be monitored would induce honest behaviors as it did for the general public. This study aims to not only shed light on the patterns of

dishonesty in U.S. civil servants, but also serve to separate and isolate civil servants as a group worthy of consideration in its own right.

(Virtual) Policy Advisory System (PAS) actors or policy entrepreneurs? An analysis of PAS actors and policy advice quality in anticorruption policymaking processes: evidence from subnational governments in Kenya.

Justa Mwangi (University of Sussex)

This paper explores the dynamics of PAS actors and policy advice quality within anticorruption policymaking processes in Kiambu and Nairobi City counties, which are two devolved systems of government in Kenya. The primary research question sought to determine how the state, business and civil society, as critical PAS actors, influence policy advice quality within these two counties' anticorruption policymaking processes. The PAS actors selected for this study were of particular interest as they frequently exhibited less than desirable behaviors. The state actors, for example, were mentioned in corruption scandals, and business actors were linked to sycophancy (and toadyism) as they sought to curry favor from state actors, while the civil society exhibited signs of disengagement, due to frustrations from state and business actors within the anticorruption policymaking process. The study looked at policy advice as a service whose quality could be interrogated through the SERVQUAL model of reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy and responsiveness. In gauging the reliability of policy advice, the author interrogated the ability of the PAS actors to deliver advice that was accurate and dependable. In assurance, the author delved into the knowledge and ability of PAS actors to inspire confidence and trust among their advisees, and in tangibles, the study looked at the availability of tools, personnel, information and equipment necessary for producing quality policy advice. In empathy, the packaging of policy advice and its customization was the focus, while in responsiveness, the study looked at the PAS actors' willingness to support the advisees by providing prompt advice.

The paper is framed within John Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) and is based on an empirical study that used a qualitative interpretative and phenomenological research design. Two focus group discussions involving nine key stakeholders drawn from women, youth, non-governmental organizations, politicians, persons living with disability, business, professionals, religious groups and minorities were held in each county and 63 respondents from ten strategic functions drawn from information communications technology, public participation, communications, payroll, human resources, revenue, finance, authority to incur expenditure, supply chain and subcounty administration in each county, were interviewed. The results demonstrate the extent to which MSF and the SERVQUAL model may be deemed applicable in the analysis of PAS actors and policy advice quality within subnational governments in a low-income country, like Kenya.

The paper seeks to explore the applicability of MSF in PAS and to expand the analytical capacity of MSF by providing a theoretical framework within which to ground third generation policy advice research. It addresses the main research problem of inadequate data from the global south, and the lack of measurements for policy advice quality, and contributes conceptual tools that deepen our understanding by presenting SERVQUAL as a useful model for consideration. The study presents MSF as a suitable framework due to its ability to capture complex, fluid and unpredictable interactions within policymaking processes. The paper also contributes to comparative analysis and to the literature on PAS and policy advice quality in general.

(Virtual) The institutionalization of China's national expert and advisory committees' role in scientific and democratic policymaking

Wei Li (Huazhong University of Science and Technology)

One major initiative of Xi Jinping administration is to modernize the national governance system and capacity, and promote scientific, democratic and law-abiding policymaking. Experts' advisory roles in policy processes have been highlighted as being essential to effectively implement this initiative. One institutional venue for non-governmental experts in China to advise top policymakers is the national expert and advisory committees. This chapter investigates the degree of institutionalization of China's 122 national expert and advisory committees (NAEs). By coding the public documents and press releases published by the NAEs, we identify the types of advisory roles provided by the official rules and how these roles are regulated by the official rules. The paper will then relate NAEs' roles to the changing pattern of state-intellectual relations and evolving features of policy advisory system under Xi Jinping administration. Finally, we will discuss the theoretical implication of the findings to comparative literature of policy advisory system.

W06 / Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality

Chair : Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Second Chair : Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Session 5Multi-Level Aspects of PAS Quality

Friday, June 28th 09:00 to 12:15 (AULA 24)

Discussants

Joseph Obosi (University of Nairobi)

Wei Li (Huazhong University of Science and Technology)

Who are the SDG experts? Discovering sustainability advisors in a multilevel perspective

Maria Tullia Galanti (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Giulia Vicentini (University of Naples Parthenope)

Andrea Lippi (Department of Political and Social Sciences, University of Florence)

Edoardo Bressanelli (Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna)

The UN's Sustainable Development Agenda is a framework for measuring, designing and implementing integrated policies through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that tackle wicked issues while offering the possibility to shape and define tailored policies at the local level (Clement et al. 2023). In making the SDGs local, multiple actors frame problems and develop solutions that resonate with local resources and governance settings. Sustainability can route at the local level in multiple ways, also considering the knowledge regime that activates experts, the features of the Policy Advisory System across national and subnational levels that connect experts with policy designers and public administration, and the characteristics of the local institutional setting and leadership. The multi- sectoral and integrated perspective of the SDGs offers the opportunity to see whether sustainability is predominately framed as a matter of economic, environmental or social capacity, and thus to understand better how sustainability turns into possibly different epistemic infrastructures (Bandola Gill et al. 2022). What is the role of knowledge in shaping the localization of the SDGs? How can sustainability experts be identified internationally, domestically and locally? What is their socio-graphical, professional, and relational profile? How are they certified or recognized as experts in sustainability? How do public institutions organize their advice? What kind of output do they deliver? These explorative questions are aimed at the creation of a dataset of sustainability experts, thought as a first empirical survey of experts active in local sustainability, and to serve as a guide for comparative case studies on the role of expert advice in localizing the SDGs in the context of the European Union. Several semi-structured interviews will guide the construction of the dataset of the SDGs experts focused on the SDG communities of the countries selected for the study – Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Belgium. In particular, we will interview academics and professionals active in the field of sustainability and policy designers and policymakers involved in the SDG agenda at European, national and local levels, to understand how experts can be identified at multiple levels, how experts access policymaking, and how policymakers design the localization of the SGDs by selecting and organizing the work of the experts.

Bandola-Gill, J., Grek, S., &Tichenor, M. (2022). Governing the Sustainable Development Goals: Quantification in Global Public Policy. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Clement, J., Ruysschaert, B., &Crutzen, N. (2023). Smart city strategies–A driver for the localization of the sustainable development goals?.Ecological Economics, 213, 107941.

Policy Advisory Systems and Crises in Multilevel Governance

Johanna Hornung (University of Lausanne)
Philipp Trein (University of Lausanne)

Policy advisory systems come in different shapes. Existing typologies distinguish them according to the location of policy advice (Halligan, 1993; Veselý, 2013) or the degree of politicization (Kuhlmann, Franzke, & Dumas, 2022). Scholars have pointed out that a common trend across policy advisory systems is the blurring of lines between inside and outside as well as technical and political advice (Craft & Howlett, 2013), which results in research focusing on the content instead of the location of policy advice (Craft & Howlett, 2012). Additionally, the focus on science-policy interactions has benefited from an actor-centered perspective that ascribes different roles, such as boundary spanners, or brokers, to scientists or policy actors (Bortz, 2023; Hoppe, 2010; Marciano, 2023).

The multitude of typologies has opened two research gaps that this article aims to fill: Firstly, while selected works acknowledge that there are multiple levels of government with distinct policy advisory structures (Howlett, 2009), both theoretical and empirical work on policy advisory systems in multi-level governance systems with a substantial autonomy of subnational levels is missing. Secondly, the question how policy advisory systems in multilevel governance structures function in times of crises has been underexplored, with few examples (Sager, Mavrot, & Hornung, 2022; Schlaufer, Hirschi, Mavrot, Hornung, & Sager, 2022). These research gaps are important because many current policy problems, such as climate change and public sector digitization, span across various levels of government requiring policy advice to include this issue. Furthermore, ongoing creeping and acute crises around environmental policy, energy policy, and public health require a coordinated production and utilization of scientific knowledge and advice across different levels.

This article examines the following research questions: How do we incorporate multilevel governance into existing typologies of policy advisory systems? How does multilevel governance affect policy advice in times of crises? Answering these questions, this article conducts a scoping review of major typologies of policy advisory systems. Based on this review, we contribute to the literature by developing a typology that incorporates institutional and actor-driven dynamics and classifies policy advisory systems in multilevel governance structures under the impression of crises. We illustrate this typology with empirical evidence on policy advice during the COVID-19 pandemic in diverse multilevel settings, such as the EU, Germany, Switzerland, and the UK.

Bortz, M. (2023). Advice that Resonates: Explaining the Variability in Consultants' Policy Influence. Policy Sciences, 56(2), 211-232. doi:10.1007/s11077-023-09506-5
Craft, J., & Howlett, M. (2012). Policy formulation, governance shifts and policy influence: location and content in policy advisory systems. Journal of Public Policy, 32(2), 79-98. doi:10.1017/s0143814x12000049
Craft, J., & Howlett, M. (2013). The dual dynamics of policy advisory systems: The impact of externalization and politicization on policy advice. Policy and Society, 32(3), 187-197. doi:10.1016/j.polsoc.2013.07.001
Halligan, J. (1993). Policy Advice and the Public Service. In B. G. Peters & D. J. Savoie (Eds.), Governance in a Changing Environment (pp. 138-172). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Hoppe, R. (2010). From "knowledge use" towards "boundary work": sketch of an emerging new agenda for inquiry into science-policy interaction. In R. J. in 't Veld (Ed.), Knowledge Democracy (pp. 169-186). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
Howlett, M. (2009). Policy Advice in Multi-Level Governance Systems: Sub-National Policy Analysts and Analysis. International Review of Public Administration, 13(3), 1-16. doi:10.1080/12294659.2009.10805127
Kuhlmann, S., Franzke, J., & Dumas, B. P. (2022). Technocratic Decision-Making in Times of Crisis? The Use of Data for Scientific Policy Advice in Germany's COVID-19 Management. Public Organization Review, 22(2), 269-289. doi:10.1007/s11115-022-00635-8
Marciano, R. (2023). More Than Just Experts for Hire: A Conceptualization of the Roles of Consultants in Public Policy Formulation. Policy Studies Journal, n/a(n/a). doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12495
Sager, F., Mavrot, C., & Hornung, J. (2022). Wissenschaftliche Politikberatungssysteme in der Covid-19-Krise: Die Schweiz im Vergleich mit Deutschland, Italien, Frankreich und Grossbritannien. Schweizerischen Bundeskanzlei, Sektion Strategische Füh- rungsunterstützung, https://www.bk.admin.ch/dam/bk/de/dokumente/strategische-fuehrungsunterstuetzung/Krisenmanagement/F._Sag
Schlaufer, C., Hirschi, C., Mavrot, C., Hornung, J., & Sager, F. (2022). Wissenschaftliche Politikberatung in Krisenzeiten in der Schweiz: eine vergleichende Analyse. DVPW Arbeitskreis Politik, Wissenschaft und Technik. Jahrestagung 4. März 2022.
Veselý, A. (2013). Externalization of policy advice: Theory, methodology and evidence. Policy and Society, 32(3), 199-209. doi:10.1016/j.polsoc.2013.07.002

W06 / Towards a Third Wave of Policy Advice and Policy Advisory System (PAS) Thinking: Re-envisioning Policy Advisory Dynamics and Quality

Chair : Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Second Chair : Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Session 6Better Managing PAS (2): Managing/Improving PAS Dynamics (2)

Friday, June 28th 14:00 to 16:00 (AULA 24)

Discussants

Giovanni Esposito (Université Libre de Bruxelles)

Justa Mwangi (University of Sussex)

(Virtual) Hirschman 2.0 or What Makes for a Good Policy Advice System? A Theory of Policy Advice System Quality

Andrea Migone (Simon Fraser University)

Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University)

Not everyone’s ideas count equally in terms of influencing and informing policy design and instrument choices. As the literature on policy advice has shown, policy advice arises from many different actors interacting with each other often over relatively long timeframes. Actors within these ‘policy advisory systems’ interact within the confines of a set of political and economic institutions and governing norms and each brings with it different interests, ideas and resources. Studying who these actors are, how they act and how this affects the overall nature of the advice system is a critical aspect of current public policy research but not all of these elements have been equally well conceptualized or studied, especially concerns around the quality of policy advice emerging from these systems. In this article, the general nature of policy advisory systems is set out, their major components described and a model of individual and organizational behavior within them outlined based on a modification of the Exit, Voice, Loyalty rubric of Albert Hirschman. The paper shows how aggregated individual organizational behaviour along the lines suggested by Hirschman can over time result in very different kinds of advice being provided by an advisory system, with predictable consequences for its nature and quality.

Dynamic Policy Advisory Systems and the 5 D Approach: Structuring responsive practice to guide the provision of quality policy advice.

Christopher Walker (Griffith University)

Sally Washington

Actors central to the provision of policy advice are embedded in the technical, political and organisational dimensions of the agencies and sectors in which they work (Migone and Howlett, 2023, p. 5). How organisational processes, and relations with other actors in the policy advisory system, are organised affects the quality of policy advice and subsequent action giving effect to policy determinations. This paper explores the operational dynamics of policy advisory systems to present a model of practice to guide the production of quality policy advice that supports effective government decision making.

This paper draws on practical experience and engagement with agencies and practitioners involved in developing policy advice. Our model defines five key decision stages that shape the delivery of quality policy advice. This involves understanding issues of Demand, being open to Discovery, applying diverse approaches to policy Design, identifying critical Decision points, and finally, shaping advice to ensure effective Delivery.

Our model situates the provision of quality policy advice as part of the ‘policy infrastructure’. While aware of structural context it aims to move beyond agencies, departments and units and define a strategic process for the organisation of policy work and analysis that shapes quality policy advice. It recognises the dynamic nature of action within policy fields, as well as the embedded (often inaccurate) assumptions that policy work and advisory activity follows a rational deductive and analytical process. Despite the growth in contestable policy advice, we focus on the action of civil servants who continue to provide the bulk of advice to government decision makers. Our aim is to develop a ‘repeatable, scalable’ model for supporting policy practitioners in their day-to-day work.

Aligned to the workshop our research questions explore what parameters can be applied to define the nature of quality in policy advisory practice. We focus on the role of actors involved in PAS and how their actions might be guided to shape the production of quality policy advice. Our primary research question concerns the utility for policy practitioners of process models to guide action. Specifically, our research asks;

· How might an inquiry driven model of advisory practice contribute to quality policy advice?

· Do policy practitioners find the 5 D model useful for structuring action and supporting the development and provision of quality policy advice?

The applied nature of our inquiry dictates that our methodology involves interaction with practitioners and agencies. The process required inductive field work involving discussions and presentations of our proposed model with public sector agencies and senior practitioners from across Australia and New Zealand throughout 2022 and 2023. Feedback from these interactions contributed to refinements of the model. Further presentations, a workshop and survey of senior practitioners are planned for 2024 to conclude the data collection and model refinement process. We see participating and presentation of our work at the IPPA workshop as a critical point of theoretical review for our model and its place within the broader context of the PAS literature.

The authors will attend the workshop and present in person.