

International Conference on Public Policy
Panel: Public Policy Innovation for the 21st century: Lessons for the Developing World

PUBLIC SERVICE INNOVATIONS IN KAZAKHSTAN
(Draft Paper, please Do Not quote)

Saltanat Janenova, PhD in Social Policy

Instructor, Graduate School of Public Policy, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan

E-mail: saltanat.janenova@nu.edu.kz

PUBLIC SERVICE INNOVATIONS IN KAZAKHSTAN

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses the implementation of the New Public Management ideas in Kazakhstan using the cases of public service innovation: One Stop Shops and e-government policies. In particular, the paper describes a transitional context of the country in which public service innovation policies have been implemented, illustrates developments in service modernisation and identifies some of the key challenges faced by the Kazakhstani government in introducing service innovations.

The public service innovation policies through One Stop Shops and e-government are an attempt of the Kazakhstani government to improve quality of public services and reduce corruption. Some progress in improving accessibility and quality of public services has been noted. However, as this paper argues, implementation of the NPM ideas has been limited and constrained by the institutional framework and culture prevailing in the Kazakhstani bureaucracy. The main conclusion is that the governments of transition countries need to critically analyse the pros and cons of the new innovation policies and reflect on their cultures before making further steps to adopt Western managerial initiatives.

Key words: New Public Management, innovations, e-government, One Stop Shop, Kazakhstan

1. Introduction

Following the paths of developed countries and under pressure imposed by the international donor agencies, many developing countries have been trying to reshape their administrative systems along the logic of New Public Management (NPM). Kazakhstan has not been immune to the international trends of NPM and has adopted a managerial agenda as a key priority in the current administrative reform (Janenova, 2010). Moving away from a command and control mode of government to integrated governance through multiple stakeholders is an emerging policy paradigm in Kazakhstan. This paper analyses the implementation of the public service innovation policies such as One Stop Shop and e-government in the post-Soviet Central Asian state of Kazakhstan.

Kazakhstan is emerging as the most dynamic economic and political actor in Central Asia (Dave, 2007). It has rich natural resources, particularly oil and gas reserves, which are being exploited through massive foreign investment. Over the past decade, the country has made impressive policy strides, progressed towards developing a rules-driven fiscal framework, strengthened public management and the business climate, and allocated resources for improved social services and critical infrastructure to sustain growth (World Bank, 2012).

Kazakhstan is under growing pressure by the international community to engage in political reforms which include a modernization agenda to improve quality of public services (Knox, 2008). In recent years Kazakhstan has made efforts to modernize the public sector, including technology-based reform of administrative governance systems. A parallel effort has been a focus on the use of information and communication technologies for provision of services and inclusion.

In 2004 the government of Kazakhstan launched two ambitious programs aimed at modernising and improving public services through single-window arrangements: One Stop Shops (further

referred to as the “OSS”) (Public Service Centers) - innovative organisations which provide services of different government bodies through one location (Janenova, 2010) and e-government (World Bank, 2006).

The OSS represent a counter service, in a modern and well-designed space which is available for citizens, which tries, in a more business-like atmosphere, to process customers’ requests for official documents, payment of registration fees and similar services. The OSS “have proved to be highly popular with citizens more used to being shunted from one public body to another by poorly motivated civil servants lacking in customer orientation” (Knox, 2008: 489). During the period of this research project, December 2006 – December 2014, the OSS provided access starting from 25 services of three stakeholders: Ministry of Justice (MJ) of the Republic of Kazakhstan, a coordinator of reform (e.g. obtaining passports, birth/death/marriage certificates, registration of businesses); Agency for Land Resource Management (ALRM) (registration of land ownership and rent), and Ministry of Defence (MD) (registration of military servants in reserve) and gradually increasing up to over 200 services of various government bodies.

The e-government program has been in place in Kazakhstan since 2004 to provide citizens with fast and reliable access to public services on-line (Bhuiyan, 2010). The promises of e-government such as faster access government services, lower costs for administrative services, greater public access to budgets and documents, and increase in transparency and accountability of government actions (Basu, 2004; Kubicek and Martin, 2003) have captured the imagination of policy makers in many developed and developing countries including Kazakhstan. To achieve level of efficiency and flexibility of a developed country for a transitional country such as Kazakhstan, which inherited Soviet bureaucratic and administrative machinery, has been far more difficult (Amagoh and Bhuiyan, 2010).

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the implementation of public service innovation policies in a transitional context using the cases of the OSS and e-government from the NPM perspective. The paper is structured as follows. In this paper two main research questions are addressed:

1. What characterises public service innovations such as the OSS and e-government in a transitional context such as Kazakhstan?
2. What has constrained public service innovations in Kazakhstan?

The first question is addressed by giving a brief overview of the public service modernisation in transition countries followed by the empirical data from Kazakhstan, which increases its complexity. The second question is answered in the discussion by analysing the underlying reasons for the behaviour and actions of policymakers in shaping the country-specific policy framework. I will conclude with some reflections on the implications and effects of the NPM on public service innovations and changes. The empirical data were collected from interviews, participant observation and documentary analysis.

2. The Challenges of Managerial Reforms for Transitional Countries

While the adoption of NPM practices seems to have been beneficial in some cases, the previous research shows that there are both potential for and real limitations to applying such elements in transition countries. The limited experience of NPM in such states suggests that there are institutional and cultural problems, whose persistence constrains implementation. It is argued that country-specific contexts influence the dynamics of NPM reforms, as policy implementation is firmly embedded in the societal, political and economic circumstances of a particular point in time. The proponents of NPM see managerial reforms as providing a future for smaller, fast-moving service delivery organisations that would be kept lean by the pressures of competition and that would need to be user-responsive and outcome-oriented in order to survive. By contrast, the critics of NPM note concerns about the potential destabilising effects of NPM, particularly for transition countries, such as increasing social inequality, corruption and unmanageable change processes that could damage public service provision.

The central objective of change was the improvement in the ways in which government is managed and services delivered, with emphasis on efficiency, economy and effectiveness. Public services were provider-dominated, especially in the case of professionalised provision, where powerful, autonomous professions defended vested interests and could not be held to account (Pollitt, 1993). A new model emerged with different titles, such as “new public management” (Hood, 1991), “market-based public administration” (Lan and Rosenbloom, 1992), “managerialism” (Pollitt, 1993), “reinventing government” (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992) and the “post-bureaucratic” model (Barzelay, 1992). Whatever the title is, they provide similar premises, although there are significant country-specific variations and NPM’s overall suitability for different regimes still remains uncertain.

The literature on public management reforms also points to the development and availability of information and communication technologies as providing the necessary tools and structures to make workable managerial reforms in the public sector (Greer, 1994). NPM reforms have also been “globalised” by change agents (international consultants and international financial institutions) which have contributed to the “importation” of new management techniques from the business sector to the public sector (Greer, 1994).

Hence, a combination of factors coincided to produce an irresistible pressure for management reforms in the public services in developed and developing countries. In contrast to rigid, rule-bound, slow moving bureaucracies, NPM was presented as providing a future for smaller, fast-moving service delivery organisations that would be kept lean by the pressures of competition and that would need to be user-responsive and outcome-oriented in order to survive. These organisations would be expected to develop flatter internal structures and devolve operational authority to front-line managers. Professional dominance would be minimised to allow for the substitution of more cost-effective mixes of staff. The rationale is the shift of power from providers to users of public services, which is argued to produce benefits in flexibility, quality and cost effectiveness (Osbourne and Gaebler, 1992).

Reformers face a number of challenges in repositioning public service recipients as customers. The limited experience of NPM in transition states suggests that there are *institutional constraints* with implications for the capacity of central agencies to manage the process. Questions are raised whether the new model has sufficient conceptual coherence to provide an alternative to public administration as either a theoretical construct for academic research or an approach to the management of public services (McLaughlin, Osborne and Ferlie, 2002). Doubts are raised regarding its universal applicability for both public service and civil society failures (McCourt and Minogue, 2002). Particularly, the applicability of the new model in the developing

world has faced many problems, as many developing countries do not fulfil some preconditions for its effective implementation (Larbi, 1999). There are also *socio-cultural constraints* in reforming the administrative system along the NPM model. NPM initiatives are difficult to implement where there are social and cultural inertia (Zafarullah and Huque, 2001; Ray, 1999). State-civil society relations also remain problematic. Civil society has not been able to put sufficient pressure on the state apparatus to implement reforms (Sozen and Shaw, 2002).

Hence, the dynamic managerial model of social and economic development, which encourages building-up a customer-orientated, transparent, quality-driven and accountable government, has posed a fundamental challenge for a traditional model of administration in Kazakhstan which is characterised as inefficient, costly, corrupt and a patronage-based system (Cummings, 2005; Emrich-Bakenova, 2009; Perlman and Gleason, 2007; Schatz, 2004).

Concepts of e-government and service integration

There are many definitions of e-government which range from the provision of efficient, convenient and transparent services by government departments and agencies to citizens and businesses (Tandon, 2005) to “the use of information and communication technologies and particularly the Internet, as a tool to achieve better government” (OECD, 2003) to “the use of technology to enhance the access to and delivery of government services to benefit citizens, business partners and employees” (Deloitte and Touche Consulting, 2000). While early conceptions of e-government have largely focused on electronic service delivery as the key feature of the phenomenon, a close examination suggests a more complex set of circumstances.

E-government is more than a technological phenomenon. It is transformative in nature affecting the management of human, technological, and organisational resources and processes (Grant and Chau, 2006). The transformation agenda focuses on the need for governments to more effectively manage inputs, processes, and outputs of public administration organisation, and covers broad classes of institutional reform (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Rais Abdul Karim, 1999) such as increased efficiencies in government operations; decentralisation of services and administration; increased accountability and improved resource management. Changes and transformational efforts are often a reflection of the unique political, social and economic needs and capacities of the hosting nation or government administration (Grant and Chau, 2006: 77).

Service integration is framing policy debate around public service innovations. Expressed variously as partnerships, joined-up-government or holistic services, integration strategies aim to alter the interface between the diversity of public services, addressing issues of access, equity, efficiency and effectiveness. This paper interrogates the challenges of service integration, focusing upon public service innovations through OSS and e-government policies in the transitional context.

Bardach (1998) and Bloom et.al. (2008) argue that integration is best conceptualised not in structural or organisational terms, but rather that, integration is more richly textured encompassing accountability, the particular nature of services integrated, sets of people, and the strategic framework. Bardach (1998) highlights that integration is a learning process, and learning is necessarily situated and a non-linear subject.

Bardach (1998) characterises service integration as shared strategies, coordinating processes, without necessarily pooling resources or establishing new organisational forms. Rather it is based on trust between delivery agents, without emphasis on longer-term radical service remodelling.

Hudson (2002: 6) argues that structural integration evidently does not guarantee well-coordinated practice on the ground. Perri et al. (2002) counter-poses holism to fragmented services, defining integration as shared goals in relation to shared problems, rather than particular organisational forms or coordination mechanisms. Sullivan and Skelcher (2002) stress organisational collaboration as opposed to organisational mergers. Little wonder that the practice of service integration is so little evaluated when the basic terms remain contested (Bell et al., 2008).

The literature suggests that service integration is particularly challenging for post-communist hierarchical centralised bureaucracies due to the lack of relational trust between government institutions. Having trained and practiced separately, public service integration brings professionals together, perhaps for the first time, often with a heritage of distrust (Glen and Reeves, 2003). As integration formalises joint decision taking, professionals are challenged to renegotiate roles, identities and norms patterned over time in vertical structures. Sennett (2000) emphasises the importance of allowing time for discourse and identity renegotiations in service environment.

Although there are many studies on the OSS and e-government in developed and developing countries, the current scholarship on public service innovations in post-Soviet countries is still not satisfactory. This paper aims to reduce this gap and make a contribution to the scholarship focused on public service innovations in transitional and post-Soviet countries.

It is largely accepted as a fact that national cultures affect the structures and performance of public administration. As Lachman, Nedd and Hinings (1994: 52) state, “Imported practices may fail, or be ineffectively implemented, if they are inconsistent with the core values of local settings”. Explanation of the relations between contextual factors and a new policy will help me to lead a discussion on why service innovation policies have taken a country-specific form in Kazakhstan, what challenges have constrained service innovation and how the government of Kazakhstan has addressed these challenges.

Understanding the operation and impact of the public service innovations in Kazakhstan is of great importance. The responses to service quality improvement are indicative of the broader trends of how the Kazakhstani government responds to the needs of its citizens’ and pressure from the international community, which it is very keen to become part of. This paper is particularly beneficial for academics and practitioners from other transitional and post-Soviet countries which share many of the challenges and problems encountered during implementation of the public service innovation policies.

2. Methodological approach

One Stop Shop policy

Four single-window centres in Almaty, a former capital, and Astana, a new capital of Kazakhstan, were selected as in-depth case studies. Each OSS has a manager who is appointed by the AIC, three deputy managers, supervisor of customer service and 40-60 front-line employees. In addition to the case studies to strengthen the external and internal validity of my data, 10 single-window centres at the regional level were examined to capture the general patterns of change processes.

Case organisations are located in densely populated districts with easy access by public transport and limited parking space. The office buildings are visible from a distance because of their bright blue colour amongst the surrounding grey apartment buildings. The colour blue symbolising “freedom” for Kazakhs (the colour of sky), with yellow stripes symbolising “prosperity”

(associated with “wheat”, “welfare”) is the corporate colour of the single-window centres, following the example of the Kazakhstani official flag. The workplace is split into five sections: waiting area for clients, front-line service area, back-office section (where chancellery and IT services are located), management office and open space for support services (banking, photo, notary and copying services). The opening times of the single-window centre (from 9 am till 8 pm, Monday to Saturday, without a lunch break) are more convenient than the working hours of the government departments (normally from 9 am till 6 pm, Monday to Friday, with a two-hour lunch break). In fact, the civil servants at the government departments also continue to work until very late (around 8 pm) exceeding official working hours; however, they do not interact with customers during this time. Within this environment, the single-window organisations serve around 1,000-1,200 clients on a daily basis. The public services provided through OSS vary from registration of legal documents, starting up a new business, application for social benefits (e.g. public housing, public nursery).

The research questions required detailed, empirical data, best collected through in-depth exploration of the issues with the selected participants. A number of primary sources were used to generate data for this paper. Participant observation of the daily work practices within the case organisations provided first-hand insight into the challenges, tensions and contradictions of the front-line customer service. In addition to the examination of the work practices in the case organisations, interviews with 10 managers of the single-window centres from different regions, 10 senior managers from the coordinating authority, and 25 front-line employees were conducted and analysed. The rich empirical data, combined with extensive secondary data in the form of policy documents, survey reports and mass media publications, provided an opportunity to grasp a broad overview of the policy implementation from the views of those who have introduced legislative changes and those who implemented policies in practice.

Anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed to the research participants. Respondents were given a brief description of the research goals at the beginning of the interview and could refrain from answering questions. Semi-structured interviews, lasting for about an hour, were conducted in Russian, recorded and often followed up with telephone calls. Data collection also included relevant legislation and organisational texts such as standards and regulations. All this data was integrated and analysed in order to explore, in an inductive and contextual manner, the values and norms of managerial culture, and the processes of service integration versus interpretation by the managers and front-line employees.

Questions used in the semi-structured interviews included perceptions of the customer service, the challenges faced, and practices of managing service processes, as well as learning new ways of working. Questions were asked in the same way but in an open-ended manner without offering specific options for responses, so as to allow respondents to share their views in their own words. While the interview was structured around these standard questions, open discussions also developed around particular questions. Statements that were thought to indicate the respondents’ views were extracted from the interview texts and categorised in a cross-case basis.

In the following stage of the analysis, the commonalities of each subject’s narrative were interpreted further and compared with patterns identified during observations and in the organisational texts studied. Finally, in the contextualisation stage, the patterns that were noted were applied back to the subjects’ narratives to reveal how the meaning of customer service management and learning changes from participant to participant. The process of inductive categorisation showed that similar patterns were evident in both case organisations, as well as OSS across regions.

E-government policy

The analysis of the e-government policy is primarily based on the use of the secondary sources: legislation and official reports; academic journal and newspaper articles; reports published by the international organisations; and examination of the content of e-government portal of Kazakhstan throughout 2004-2014. Secondly, an important source of data was semi-structured interviews with government officials who shared their experiences on building e-government system and integrating public services, learning new work practices, changing their roles and tasks.

25 government officials at senior and mid-level positions from central-level government bodies (such as the Ministry of Transport and Communications, Tax Committee, Ministry of Justice, Civil Service Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan) as well as 5 experts from the Joint Stock Company “National Informational Technologies” were interviewed during 2012-2014. Semi-structured interviews were recorded, anonymity and confidentiality was guaranteed to the participants. The author of the paper has worked in the Kazakhstani civil service for 10 years which proved to be helpful in arranging access to the participants.

Primary and secondary sources have been employed in this research and strengthened through triangulation. Bell (1999) sees triangulation as a multi-method approach that involves the study of a phenomenon through cross-checking individual accounts and data from a number of sources. This allows the researcher to produce a balanced account by comparing and contrasting evidence from the data generated.

4. Implementation of the public service innovations

There is a number of features about Kazakhstan that make it both an interesting and important location for the research. Kazakhstan is emerging as the most dynamic economic and political actor in Central Asia (Dave, 2007). It is the second largest country of the former Soviet Union, after the Russian Federation, and has rich natural resources, particularly oil and gas reserves, which are being exploited through massive foreign investment. Despite remarkable economic transformation under the leadership of President Nursultan Nazarbayev, in 2012 the overall poverty rate was estimated to be 10 per cent of the population, exceeding 60 per cent in some oil-rich rural regions (World Bank, 2012). Kazakhstan has the lowest social indicators in the regions of Europe and Central Asia (for example, in terms of access to safe drinking water, incidence of tuberculosis and AIDS), which illustrate the poor quality of socially significant public services, such as health and social care. One of the significant challenges for Kazakhstan in improving public service quality at lower cost is its small population size (16 million people) spread over a vast territory which is equal in size to Western Europe (1 million square miles), with nearly half of the citizens, 43 per cent, living in the rural areas.

The political system of the country raises serious concerns among the academic community and is criticised for monopolising political power, clanism and nepotism (Cummings, 2005; Emrich-Bakenova, 2009; Perlman and Gleason, 2007; Schatz, 2004). General public dissatisfaction with the poor quality of public services delivered by the government bodies and public sector organisations (hospitals, schools, traffic police, tax bodies etc.) has resulted in the formulation of a negative image of the government (Jandosova et al. 2002).

The political leadership of Kazakhstan wants the country to become one of the world’s top oil producers and to enter the top 50 competitive economies (Nazarbayev, 2006a). Kazakhstan is under growing pressure by the international community to engage in political reforms, which include a modernisation agenda to improve the quality of public services (Knox, 2008). Hence,

implementation of the public service innovations is particularly challenging for Kazakhstan, compared to developed democracies given the transitional context of the country with its hierarchical, inertial and corrupt public sector.

The OSS and e-government policies were initiated by the President of RK, Nursultan Nazarbayev (Nazarbayev, 2004). Implementation of the OSS policy needs to be considered in relation to the changes that have taken place simultaneously in Kazakhstan within administrative reform. A range of new ideas, driven by the NPM ideology, such as development of performance standards, external audits of government bodies' performance, separation of strategic and operational functions, delegation of more autonomy to the managers, building partnerships between public and business sectors etc. have been initiated by the young, Western educated and ambitious members of government. The assumption was that, "by paying more attention to clients, public service organisations will learn to deliver better results, and that clients will notice the change and experience increased satisfaction" (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000: 116).

At the initial stage of developing OSS and e-government concepts a team of the senior government officials analysed good practices of developed countries such as United Kingdom, United States, Netherlands, South Korea, Singapore etc. The key coordinator of the OSS policy was initially the Ministry of Justice (later the Committee for Control over Public Services Automation and Coordination of Public Service Centers) and for e-government policy - the Agency for Informatisation and Communication. In 2011 the Ministry for Transport and Communications (MTC) became a single coordinator and driver of public service innovation policies and was assigned coordination functions of the OSS and e-government policies. The MTC worked in close cooperation with the Joint Stock Company "National Informational Technologies (<http://www.nitec.kz/>) which provided technological and methodological support in elaboration of the OSS and e-government components. As the spectrum of public services provided through the OSS has increased and the number of the OSS has grown from four pilot to over 800 offices across all levels of the government, a state enterprise "Center for Coordination of the One Stop Shops" was established to coordinate and monitor day-to-day activities of the OSS (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Stages of the OSS and e-government implementation

OSS Policy Implementation Process	E-government Policy Implementation Process
<p>Design of the policy vision and launch of the pilot projects (February 2005–December 2006);</p> <p>the OSS were assigned legal authorities to deliver 25 services and expanded from 30 to 300 offices and new channels of service access were introduced (January 2007–December 2008);</p> <p>new stakeholders joined the OSS project with 32 services and new channels of service access were added (since January 2009);</p> <p>decentralising of power over the OSS from the MJ to the local municipalities (since January 2010);</p> <p>centralising back from the local municipalities to the MJ (in 2011);</p> <p>change of the coordinating authority to the Ministry</p>	<p>Information stage - basic components of e-government infrastructure were developed such as the e-government portal, informational services; training was provided to improve computer literacy and promote Internet use among the citizens and reduce the digital divide (2004-2006);</p> <p>Interactive stage – e-government infrastructure was further developed: a "payment gateway" providing a linkage with the banking system, national identification system, establishment of cross-agency information systems, provision of mainly informational and interaction services (2007-2009);</p> <p>Transactional stage - expansion of the e-government services (of transactional nature) and comprehensive ICT-enabled re-engineering of government administrative procedures; development of e-license system and e-</p>

<p>of Transport and Communications (2011) and later to the Agency of Informatisation and Communication;</p> <p>combination of face-to-face and online customer service provision, over 200 services through over 800 single-window centres (2012-2014).</p>	<p>procurement services (2010-2012)</p> <p>Transformation stage – elaboration of integrated e-services; improvement of transactional services, provision of e-health, e-education, e-culture and other services (2012-current stage).</p>
---	---

Source: Author’s representation of the OSS and e-government policies implementation

Official documents and Presidential messages to the people of Kazakhstan reflect the high expectations of the government on the OSS and e-government policies as a panacea from public service failures and corruption.¹ Borrowing ideas from the NPM theory, the Kazakhstani OSS and e-government policies became a huge public campaign, through which the government intended to demonstrate to the international community, as well as to the public, its efforts to achieve a “more responsive and transparent bureaucracy”.

Like many other post-communist countries, at the time of the inauguration of its administrative reform programs, Kazakhstan proclaimed the central principles of professional and accountable government. The reforms were directed at improving the quality of the public administration processes and service provision; improving professional skills and the efficiency of the state apparatus; and fighting corruption (Janenova, 2010; Knox, 2008). An emerging policy paradigm in Kazakhstan is the moving away from a command and control mode of government towards integrated governance through multiple stakeholders. The rhetoric of the reform agenda has largely been adopted from the EU and the World Bank statements.

Heeks (2003) notes that it is important to examine the technological infrastructure of the country given the significant role of information and communication technologies in improving the activities of public sector organisations and their agents. The expected outcome of e-government policy is building joined-up government, which enables information to be gathered and shared across departments, and public services to be re-organised and joined together in an integrative manner. Thus, the technological infrastructure in the country can enable or constrain service integration as a means to overcome distance and assist vulnerable groups in remote locations to get access to the public services.

The main challenges faced by Kazakhstan at the initial stage of introducing public service innovation policies were low computer literacy, limited access to Internet and poor technological infrastructure. In 2004-2006 at the launch of the OSS and e-government policies, digital divide in Kazakhstan was dramatic: the level of computer literacy of the population was 4.3 %; the level of Internet usage was 2.8 %; there was poor technological infrastructure, high cost of the Internet and mobile communication (Decree, 2004).

Despite high scores on the Human Capital Index in the United Nations E-government Survey 2008 (99% of adult literacy and 90% of enrollment), the level exceeding some developed countries, Kazakhstan was ranked 81st out of 192 countries in terms of overall e-government readiness. The state of e-government in Kazakhstan in 2008 was considered to be very close to the lowest score in most of the categories.

¹ The Concept of E-government Program in Kazakhstan for 2005-2007; Program for E-government Development for 2008-2010; Program for Information and Communication Development in Kazakhstan for 2010-2014; Establishment of State Entities – Public Service Centres of the Ministry of Justice of RK; Establishment of Public Service Centres on a Pilot Basis by the Ministry of Justice, Tax Committee and Agency for Land Resource Management.

The significant challenge for Kazakhstan has been the continuing and widening digital divide defined by Fink and Kenny (2003: 2) as a gap in access to ICT, the ability to use ICT, actual use and the impact of use. Following the Program on Reducing Digital Gap in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2007-2009, the government has taken a number of measures to improve computer literacy and popularise Internet usage among the population. These measures included cost reduction for Internet use and computers, expansion of channels of Internet access via dial-up phone technology, mobile phones, free Internet access points introduced at the OSS offices, free training for different target groups of the population, computerisation of 100 percent of public schools, encouragement of sharing practices and knowledge between the government bodies on service delivery.

The government has made large investments into civil service training to bring new knowledge on public service innovations from different parts of the world and adapt these ideas to the local political, societal, technological and economic situation. Many of the variations of this basic idea have been successful in other countries in reducing administrative burdens on businesses and the public, especially on license and permit requirements. However, there was no universal concept of single-window arrangements which were implemented in a vast number of combinations and variations across developed and developing countries.

Traditional departments in Kazakhstan were accustomed to being separated by professional and organisational boundaries, in an environment of mistrust, lack of exchange of information, and in constant battle between the political leaders over power and resources (Janenova, 2010). There was a lack of literature on the managerial reforms available both in Russian and Kazakh languages. Information on public service innovations was transferred through the participants of the study visits, a few international consultants and Internet sources.

The strategic change from the traditional practice was delegation of front-line customer service to the OSS (consultation of customers, application submission) and e-government portal, while other administrative processes on application review and decision-making remained in the traditional departments. A single access point at the OSS and e-government portal enabled clients to apply for a range of public services within one face-to-face or online visit. It allowed customers to save time and costs, and avoid bureaucracy during their application for public services. In the OSS the front-line staff did not make decisions on applications and then the emphasis was on the quick and correct acceptance of applications, and the delivery of documents. From the very beginning of policy implementation, technical functions were assigned to the front-line employees, who played a role of “mediators” between service providers and customers (Janenova, 2008; 2010).

Large investments were put into the pilot OSS and e-government projects, allocating the best human resources in the public sector. The OSS were provided with modern offices, new furniture and computer equipment. The senior and mid-level staff involved in implementation of the OSS and e-government policies were trained and continuously improved their knowledge and skills.

Several important points regarding the impact of the public service innovation policies on the power dimensions between the local stakeholders need to be emphasised. First, in a certain way, the new single-window centers were competing with the traditional departments in terms of better public service delivery. The OSS provided the same services, but their purpose was to provide better quality and transparent services in a more comfortable space and in more accessible ways. The opening times of the OSS (9 am–8 pm, Monday to Saturday without a lunch break) were more convenient than those proposed by the traditional departments (normally 9 am–6 pm, Monday to Friday with a two-hour lunch break). Politeness of the front-line employees presented a striking positive difference compared to the behaviour of the traditional

bureaucrats who were generally perceived as indifferent, rude and unethical among the public (Jandosova et al. 2002).

Second, by being a *single* access point to public services, the OSS were able to reduce personal contacts between civil servants and customers and corrupt opportunities for both sides. The front-line personnel were not able to influence the application review process, as they performed entirely technical functions by accepting and returning documents. The customers, as well as front-line workers, could not know *who* was going to review applications in the back-offices, as documents were distributed among officials on a random basis. This does not mean that government officials could not still seek bribes to influence the results of an application review; however, now they performed corrupt actions with a much higher risk of being caught by the responsible authorities. The new public service innovations encouraged traditional bureaucracy to become more transparent, more accountable and more cost-efficient in delivering better quality public services. Within a short period of time from 2004-2014 the number of the OSS offices has increased to over 800 offices located in all regions and local districts.

Nowadays Kazakhstan has made visible progress in terms of e-government implementation. According to the UN Survey 2014 Kazakhstan has improved its position in the rating by 18 positions compared to 2010 (from the 46th to the 28th position out of 193) or by 53 positions compared to 2008 rating (from the 81st position).

The e-government portal (<http://www.egov.kz>) was introduced in 2006 as a government gateway to provide informational, interactional and transactional public services structured around key topics such as health, education, employment, culture, sport, tourism. The official homepage provides more than 1300 codes, laws, decrees and orders with all legislation integrated into one site (UN, 2012). This portal is tri-lingual: Kazakh, Russian and English, and contains links to the web-sites of the central level government bodies, regional municipalities and national companies. Currently around one and a half million citizens have electronic signature. Today in the country the computer literacy level is 63.2%, and the level of Internet access is 67.6% (UN Survey, 2014). The infrastructure allows the citizens of Kazakhstan to get 570 services online through the e-government portal. In 2014 over 40 million services were provided through the portal and there are about 43 thousand users visit the portal every day. Besides e-government portal, there are other convenient sites such as ePay (<http://www.epay.gov.kz>) and eLicense (<http://www.elicense.kz>) where citizens can get specific services and payments.

Another site, (<http://www.goszakup.gov.kz>), offers participation online in almost all procurement procedures. The main driver behind the improvement in services is the electronic public procurement portal featuring digitization of 59 e-services of state bodies, the e-license database, frequent open public web conferences, often with the with active participation of high-level government officials, and blog platforms in many ministries and agencies (UN, 2012).

Data communication networks have been created and launched in several government bodies, of which the largest are the corporate networks for taxation and customs administration, treasury and pension coverage. Interagency electronic workflow has been introduced in the central government bodies with the use of digital signature.

Applying for Presidential “Bolashak” scholarship, registering a child in a queue for kindergarten, getting the authorisation for driving and utility bills, fines, taxes payment are possible now without leaving the house through the e-government portal. The next stage of the e-government development is mobile government that allows getting online services through the mobile phones.

Also the rapid development of e-government as well as high rates in international ICT rankings has given Kazakhstan the right to hold the Global e-Government Forum 2014. It took place in October 2014 in Astana and brought together leading international experts in ICT and e-government development with support of the UN.²

In terms of the e-participation index Kazakhstan holds 2nd position together with Singapore (rapidly climbing from 98th position in 2008 and 18th position in 2010). The government Blog site where citizens can communicate with the government agencies' executives by posting comments and questions has gained high popularity. The executives (in practice staff on their behalf) respond and post their answers on the blog. The Blog site also contains statistical information on the questions and comments each agency executive has received as well as how many times he/she has responded.

The role of the Kazakhstani government is gradually shifting from a controller of information and services to a service provider. In this context, it is imperative that information and services are promoting user uptake, addressing the needs and concerns of the citizenry, especially the vulnerable. The role of the citizens is also changing from passive receivers of information through web-based services to the active partners who are engaged and supported to interact with the government through ICT-based dissemination of relevant government information.

Kazakhstani public administration system has experienced significant cultural change by transforming from a post-Soviet command system to a new modernised system. There is a growing recognition among the government bodies of the importance of providing relevant and up-to-date information online. Information on spending national and local budgets is now publicly available on the web-site of the Ministry of Finance (<http://www.minfin.kz>). Laws, policies and other documentation of interest to the citizens on education, health, social welfare and other sectors are increasingly being integrated within the overall national portal and on the agency portals.

The review of the OSS and e-government implementation in Kazakhstan during 2004-2014 indicates notable trends. Consistency of government actions in proving better access to the improved quality public services can become a key factor in building trust in the institutions of the government. In the context of Kazakhstan with a vast territory, low density of population and far remote regions, this is particularly important to ensure provision of basic services for different target groups of population using multiple channels of traditional (face-to-face) and technology-based service delivery methods.

5. The Challenges of Public Service Innovations

Kazakhstan as a transitional country is facing multifaceted challenges to the successful implementation of public service innovation policies. Some of them are identified and described below.

Service delivery through single access posed significant challenges for government officials, who were accustomed to working within strict professional and organisational boundaries. In the top-down, hierarchical and inertial public sector, civil servants were encouraged to shift professional organisational boundaries, initiate changes for service improvement and learn to work in close co-operation with a range of stakeholders, including the business sector and non-governmental organisations (Janenova, 2008; 2010). It is useful to remember that each partner in a collaborative undertaking has something at stake and brings in a host of preconceived notions

² <http://www.unpan.org/GeGF/2014>

to the partnership. The stakes may be reputation, but often entail more substantive considerations as resources (people and funds), turf, autonomy, or control (Bardach 1998). Turf battles between politicians had a negative impact on the relationships between the front-office and back-office staff. The political managers, as well as administrative civil servants, were concerned about losing their power, authority and access to illegal payments. The ministers put strong pressure on the government to return their control authorities over service provision, justifying their arguments by the low level of professionalism among front-line employees. The front-office workers were considered by civil servants as “semi-professionals” because they delivered a diversity of services without a university degree in these sectors, as opposed to the “professionals” who were educated and specialised within specific areas such as tax, land or legal services.

Both OSS and e-government policies have been taking a broad “whole of government” and multi-channel approach that presented large and complex challenges. The constraints faced by those involved in public service innovations through the OSS and e-government implementation can be roughly divided into four types: political, operational, technological and cultural.

Political barriers

Promoting public service integration within a hierarchical, centralised context such as Kazakhstan is both beneficial and extremely challenging. It is beneficial as it helps to begin the service integration process in order to reduce bureaucracy and deliver better quality public services. Furthermore, it contributes to developing trust and effective communication between service providers. However, not all service providers were willing to participate in and support service integration, as successful service integration would put their performance under public scrutiny. At the initial stages of policy implementation the Kazakhstani politicians were resistant to join inter-departmental, intergovernmental and inter-sectoral initiatives over which they had less control in regard to decision-making and allocation of resources.

For example, it took around eight years of negotiations to push the Traffic Police management to provide e-service on issuing driving licenses – a service perceived as highly corrupt in the views of the citizens (Jandosova et.al., 2002). The new e-service on issuing driving licenses is now delivered through e-government portal and specialized OSS.

Like the politicians, administrative government officials were also concerned about losing power, status and their source of illegal payments if service integration was successfully implemented. Political battles between the management of the coordinating body and other service providers with respect to the transfer of functions, services and resources have persisted along the entire process of policy implementation.

Operational barriers

The OSS and e-government policies have adopted a multi-channel approach for Kazakhstan. Integrated channel delivery in Kazakhstan involved bringing together online, telephone and face-to-face interaction to provide citizens with good quality services through a combination of channels. Among the benefits of this approach are improved access to the services, particularly for clients from far remote regions, better management of the public service infrastructure on a government-wide basis rather than institutions-based. The integrated channel management strategy of the single-window policy recognised that the drive for cost efficiency must be balanced against the need for fairness and equity in access to services.

Given the poor technological infrastructure and low level of Internet usage in Kazakhstan, it was important, along with further development of e-government, to keep a face-to-face channel for the service users who were unable or unwilling to use other channels. Designing of joined-up services was complicated by differences among the stakeholders in their policies, laws, experiences and methods of working. Fostering service integration required information sharing across professions and organisations, and building new capacities for front-line customer service, which was problematic in a culture of mistrust, lack of tradition to work in partnerships, and lack of customer-orientation.

Technological barriers

Technological factors closely relate to the operational factors adding complexity to the overall situation. A number of researchers highlight the full and perfect power of electronic monitoring, which makes any other form of control unnecessary (Fernie, 1998). However, in the context of Kazakhstan the use of technologies is still limited when it comes to capturing qualitative aspects of customer service. This is particularly important with regard to the public service delivery to the vulnerable groups of population.

Cultural barriers

The vertical and horizontal fragmentation, which is typical of public administration, constitutes one of the key challenges of one-stop government implementation. Public sector initiatives where services cross departmental boundaries present a formidable challenge. Service delivery channels might not be developed based on a shared vision and could have different objectives (Bharosa, et.al. 2010).

The emphasis on the vertical dimension of the government constrains the development of shared values, which are required for a blending of organisational cultures across departmental and jurisdictional boundaries. Not only do Kazakh government officials tend to look vertically rather than horizontally, they are also inclined to support departmental, rather than inter-departmental and inter-governmental, initiatives. International practice suggests that creating a common organisational culture is a lengthy process requiring both the removal of structural and managerial barriers and the development of shared commitment to such overriding values as teamwork and citizen-centred service.

Despite positive developments in modernising public services in Kazakhstan, the OSS and e-government policies have not been implemented to a full extent due to the prevailing culture of the traditional bureaucracy, which favours paternalistic, relations-based habits of thought and practice. Corruption is considered to be a part of public sector culture in Kazakhstan (Cummings, 2005). As Bhuiyan (2010: 40) notes, e-governance “displeases corrupt political executives and bureaucrats, who in turn, create building blocks to the implementation of e-government programs.” The high level of corruption in Kazakhstan is confirmed by the *Corruption Perception Index* (CPI) report published by Transparency International. The CPI report relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by the business people and country analysts among 180 countries, and ranges from 10, as highly clean, and 0, as highly corrupt. Within the last decade 1999-2014 CPI in Kazakhstan has been within the score of 3.0 among highly corrupt countries of the world. The culture of the traditional bureaucracy has presented a significant barrier to successful service integration as it prevented the cultivation of a shared commitment to the values of citizen-centred service, trust, teamwork and public accountability, all the elements of which collided with the relations-based values of the government-centred system (Janenova, 2010).

5. Pros and Cons of the Country-Specific Model

What are the political and social implications of the service integration policy? The new policy in Kazakhstan was driven by the NPM appeal of “better services for less cost”, combined with the political ambitions to reduce corruption in the civil service. The political leadership considered single-window arrangements as a panacea for public service failures and poor performance of the state apparatus. The new policy was also exploited as a demonstration of the government’s dedication to promoting transparency and public accountability for the citizens and, more importantly, international community.

Certain positive achievements in terms of public service provision have been made within a short period of policy implementation:

- information about public services has become more transparent;
- the physical customer service environment has significantly improved;
- public services have become more accessible both through face-to-face interaction and e-government system;
- staff have learned new knowledge and skills to deliver a diversity of services in one place and work across different professions and organisations;
- the consultation mechanism has become more transparent (involvement of international experts, political party and business association).

However, the research evidence shows that the OSS policy has not been implemented to a full extent. Several important points need to be raised in this regard.

The introduction of the single-access service delivery model, where public services were accessible only through OSS, was a successful achievement of the policy at the pilot stage. The single-access model had real potential to reduce the risks of corruption by eliminating direct contact between service providers and customers, improve the quality of services by enabling equal access and social inclusion, and improving the accountability of the public sector by creating reliable monitoring systems of government performance data. However, the single-access model was replaced by the country specific alternative-access model which seemed to suit the interests of the political elite much better compared to the pilot model. The OSS seemed to offer a sort of choice for citizens to choose services at the new public sector organisation or traditional departments. They provided the same services as the traditional authorities, but in a more comfortable space and in more accessible ways. However, service quality has been improved in terms of accessibility and speed of delivery by putting services together in one physical location rather than making changes in the administrative processes in the back-offices. The traditional bureaucrats continued to work without challenging their work practices from the customers’ perspective. Where many countries have introduced more result-oriented management and set up evaluation criteria for performance, the government of Kazakhstan really concentrated its attention on improvement of the front-line service delivery, without considering changes in the back offices.

In the NPM theory evaluation of customer satisfaction is one of the techniques to yield important data and improve quality. While the government declared the customer-orientation principle as a slogan for public service reform, the citizens continued to be ignored in the policymaking process. The OSS services were selected without an evaluation of customers’ needs. The single-window centres introduced standards and regulations as performance measures following NPM ideology. However, performance evaluation could not provide transparent and reliable information, as it contained partial information because of the alternative model, which enabled

the government bodies to avoid OSS when delivering services. The officials continued to have control over statistical data on their performance, with limited access both by the public and central government. Further, the traditional bureaucrats could continue illegal practices as they had direct interactions with clients and were able to influence the results of the application review.

The research findings show that the service integration policy has not been able to change service production processes, mainly because change, to a greater extent, was not desirable for the traditional bureaucracy. Service integration policy has posed fundamental challenges to traditional bureaucracy:

- (1) it competes with the government bodies in the provision of the same services, but produces better quality, in terms of accessibility, speed of delivery and public accountability;
- (2) it has the potential to reduce corruption;
- (3) it can provide reliable and transparent information on the performance data of the stakeholders.

Hence, in the top-down, hierarchical and corrupt system, the service integration policy which promoted transparency, public accountability and social equality, has been constrained by the institutional framework and culture of the traditional bureaucracy.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to analyse the implementation of the public service innovation policies in the transitional context of Kazakhstan, identify challenges faced by the government in service innovations and summarise lessons learnt from the Kazakhstani practice. The research evidence shows that the extent to which NPM ideas were imported was limited and constrained by the institutional framework and culture prevailing in the Kazakhstani bureaucracy.

Implementation of the OSS and e-government policies in Kazakhstan was dynamic; there were several changes in policy and procedures, such as introduction of single-access models of service delivery, integrating of face-to-face service provision with online service delivery. The OSS and e-government policies have changed the traditional pattern of public service delivery in Kazakhstan when services were provided only by the professionals with special education and through face-to-face interaction. The new policies have had significant impact on the entire Kazakhstani public sector by stimulating cooperation across professional and organisational boundaries. New technologies, standards and procedures have introduced new ways of service delivery through single-window arrangements and new ways of interacting among service providers, as well as between service providers and customers.

The public service innovation policies in Kazakhstan were driven both by the global trends for managerial reforms and country-specific political, organisational, technological and cultural factors. The global drivers for integrated service provision in Kazakhstan were diverse. These included globalisation, pressure from the international community, public dissatisfaction with the government, and the opportunities offered by the technologies for shifts in service delivery. A combination of these factors influenced the government's intention to turn to the opportunities presented for joined-up working. The concepts of clear targets, performance indicators and transparency collided with a culture that was strongly influenced by legal control, a patronage system, and bureaucratic administrative procedures.

The OSS and e-government policies still lack customer-orientation, bottom-up approach and consultation with the users. There is a lack of surveys initiated by the government on the views of customers about their choice of public services, channels of delivery and quality of services.

The political leadership pushing the government bodies to integrate services rapidly, sometimes lacks to consider limiting factors like scarce resources, path dependencies, legacy systems and public agencies' time constraints. This may have negative impact on the quality of integrated services as development of trust between service providers requires time.

This paper presents a snapshot not only of the public service innovation policies such as the OSS and e-government policies but of the overall political and administrative situation in Kazakhstan. This research revealed striking similarities in Kazakhstan with other transitional countries in terms of facing both institutional and socio-cultural constraints during implementation of managerial reforms. While lacking knowledge and state capacity, the Kazakhstani government anxiously embraced the OSS and e-government policies as a panacea for public service failures, ineffectiveness and corruption. Kazakhstan has made good progress forward in terms of public service innovations, however, it is still a long way to go to the joined-up government which is clean from corruption and oriented to the customers.

Since the situation in the Kazakhstani political system is rather similar to the situation in other post-Soviet countries, except the Baltic states, the findings of this research might be of particular interest for academics and practitioners who are interested in managerial reforms and policy implementation issues in post-communist and transitional countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amagoh, F., & Bhuiyan, S.H. (2010). Public Sector Reform in Kazakhstan. *Central Asia Business Journal*, 3, 12-20.
- Bardach, E. (1998). *Getting Agencies to Work Together*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Barzelay, M. (1992). *Breaking Through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Basu, S. (2004). E-government and Developing Countries: An Overview. *International Review of Law, Computers and Technology*, 18 (1), 109-132.
- Bell, J. (1999). *Doing Your Research Project: a Guide for First-time Researchers in Education and Social Science*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bell, K., Kinder, T., & Huby, G. (2008). What comes around goes around: on the language and practice of 'integration' in health and social care. *Journal of Integrated Care*, 16, 41-9.
- Bharosa, Nitesh, and others (2010). Guiding Integrated Service Delivery: Synthesizing and Embedding Principles Using Role-Playing Games. Delft University of Technology, Netherlands.
- Bhuiyan, S.H. (2010). E-government in Kazakhstan: Challenges and Its Role to Development. *Public Organization Review*, 10 (1), 31-47.
- Bloom, G., Standing, H., & Lloyd, R. (2008). Markets, Information Asymmetry and Health Care: Towards new social contracts. *Social Science and Medicine*, 66, 2076-87.
- Corrocher, N., & Ordanini, A. (2002). Measuring the digital divide: a framework for the analysis of crosscountry differences. *Journal of Information Technology*, 17, 9-19.
- Cummings, S. (2005). *Kazakhstan: Power and the Elite*, London: I.B. Tauris.
- Dave, B. (2007). *Kazakhstan: Ethnicity, Language and Power*, London: Routledge.
- Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2004). National Program for Building-Up E-government for 2005-2007, No.1471, November 10, 2004. Retrieved July 14, 2013,

- from <http://www.e.govce.kz/index.php/en/zakonodatelstvo/programmnye-dokumenty/8-gosudarstvennaya-programma-formirovaniya-elektronnogo-pravitelstva-v-respublike-kazakhstan-na-2005-2007-gody>
- Deloitte and Touche Consulting (2000). *At the Dawn of E-Government: The Citizen as Customer*.
- Emrich-Bakenova, S. (2009). Trajectory of Civil Service Development in Kazakhstan: Nexus of Politics and Administration. *Governance*, 22, 717-45.
- Fernie, S. (1998). *Call Centres: The New Sweatshops*. London: London School of Economics.
- Fink, C., & Kenny, C. (2003). W(h)ither the digital divide? The World Bank, Washington, DC. Retrieved July 14, 2013, from http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs/background/themes/digital_divide/fink-kenny.pdf
- Glen, S., & Reeves, S. (2003). Developing Interprofessional Education in the Pre-registration Curricula: Mission impossible? *Nurse Education in Practice*, 4, 45-52.
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2005). *Establishment of Public Service Centres on a Pilot Basis by the Ministry of Justice, Tax Committee and Agency for Land Resource Management*. Government Resolution.
- Government Resolution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2006). Program for Bridging Digital Divide in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2007-2009. No.995, October 13.
- Government Resolution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2000). On Development of Unified Information Environment in the Republic of Kazakhstan and Establishment of Joint Stock Company “National Informational Technologies”. No. 492, April, 4.
- Government Resolution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2007). Program for E-government Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2008-2010. No. 1155-1, November, 30.
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2007). *Establishment of State Entities – Public Service Centres of the Ministry of Justice of RK*. Government Resolution No. 1.
- Government Resolution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2010). Program for Information and Communication Technologies Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2010-2014. No. 983, September 29.
- Government Resolution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2011). On Several Measures to Optimize Public Service Centers. No. 1325, November 11, 2011.
- Grant, G., & Chau, D. (2006). Developing a generic framework for e-government. In Hunter G. & Tan F. (eds.) *Advanced Topics in Global Informational Management* (pp. 72-101). Vol. 5, London: Idea Group Publishing.
- Greer, P. (1994). *Transforming Central Government*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Heeks, R. (2003). Most eGovernment-for-Development Projects Fail: How Can Risks be Reduced? iGovernment Working Paper Series, Paper no. 14.
- Heeks, R. (1998). Information Technology and Public Sector Corruption. Information System and PublicSector Management Working Paper Series, No. 4. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Hood, C. (1991). “A Public Management for All Seasons.” *Public Administration* 69, 3–19.
- Hudson, B. (2002). Whole Systems Working, Care Services Improvement Partnership, in *Integrated Care Network*.
- Jandosova, J., Baitugelova, N., Jandosova, F., & Kunitsa, S. (2002). *Perceptions of Corruption in Kazakhstan: by Parliamentarians, Public Officials, Private Business and Civil Society*, Sange Research Centre and United Nations Development Programme, Almaty. Retrieved July 14, 2013, from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/undp/unpan011504.pdf>
- Janenova, S. (2008). “The Kazakh One Stop-Shops: Challenges and Recommendations.” In B.G. Peters (eds). *Mixes, Matches and Mistakes: New Public Management in Russia and the Former Soviet Republics*. Budapest: Open Society Institute, 117–150.
- Janenova, S. (2010). “Public Service Integration in Kazakhstan: Why Alternative Access Rather Than Single Access?”, in *State and Administration in a Changing World*, Juraj Nemeč,

- B. Guy Peters, 2010, NISPAcee Slovakia.
- Knox, C. (2008). Kazakhstan: Modernizing Government in the Context of Political Inertia. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 74, 477-96.
- Kubicek, H., & Martin, H. (2000). One-Stop Government in Europe: An Overview, University of Bremen.
- Lachman, R., Nedd, A., & Hinings, B. (1994). Analyzing Cross-national Management and Organizations: A Theoretical Framework. *Management Science*, 40, 40-55.
- Larbi, G. (1999). "The New Public Management Approach and Crisis States." *United Research Institute for Social Development Discussion Paper*, No.112, September.
- Lau, E. (2003). Challenges for E-government Development, OECD E-Government Project, presented at 5th Global Forum on Reinventing Government, 5 November. Retrieved July 14, 2013, from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN/UNPAN012241.pdf>
- McCourt, W. and M. Minogue. (2002). *The Internationalization of Public Management: Reinventing the Third World State*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- McLaughlin, K., S. Osborne and E. Ferlie. (2002). *New Public Management: Current Trends and Future Prospects*. London: Routledge.
- MTC (Ministry for Transport and Communication of the Republic of Kazakhstan) (2012). Regulation on the Government Institution, Committee for Control over Public Services Automation and Coordination of Public Service Centers, No. 147, 4 April. Retrieved July 14, 2012, from <http://mtc.gov.kz/index.php/en/komitet-po-kontrolyu-avtomatizatsii-gosuslug-i-koordinatsii-deyatelnosti-tson/polozhenie-o-komitete>
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) (2003). The e-government imperative, OECD report, OECD Journal on Budgeting, 3(1), 62-96.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, Wokingham, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Perlman, B., & Gleason, G. (2007). Cultural Determinism Versus Administrative Logic: Asian Values and Administrative Reform in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30, 1327-42.
- Perri L., D. Seltzer, K., & Stoker, G. (2002). *Towards Holistic Governance: The New Reform Agenda*, London: Palgrave.
- Pollitt, C. and G. Bouckaert. (2000). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rais Abdul Karim (1999). *Reengineering the Public Service: Leadership and Change in an Electronic Age*. Kuala Lumpur: Pelanduk Publications.
- Ray, B. (1999). "Good Governance, Administrative Reform and Socio-Economic Realities: A South Pacific Perspective." *International Journal of Social Economics* 26, 354-369.
- Schatz, E. (2004). *Modern Clan Politics: the Power of "Blood" in Kazakhstan and Beyond*, Seattle London: University of Washington Press.
- Sennett, R. (2000). Street and Office: two sources of identity, in Hutton, W. and Giddens, M. (eds) *Global Capitalism*, New York: New Press.
- Sozen, S. and I. Shaw. (2002). "The International Applicability of 'New' Public Management: Lessons from Turkey." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 15, 475-486.
- Sullivan, H., & Skelcher, C. (2002). *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Tandon, H. (2005). E-governance: an Indian Perspective, *Policy and Society*, 24 (3), 1-28.
- Transparency International (2014). Corruption Perception Index 2014.
- United Nations (2008). *E-Government Survey 2008: from E-Government to Connected Governance 2008*.
- United Nations (2014) *E-Government Survey 2014: E-Government for the Future We Want*. <http://unpan3.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Reports/UN-E-Government-Survey-2014>
- World Bank (2006). Kazakhstan E-government Program and the Road Ahead, Washington, DC:

- Joint Economic Research Program with the Government of Kazakhstan.
- World Bank (2012). Country Partnership Strategy with the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2012-2017.
- Zafarullah, H. and A.S. Huque. (2001). “Public Management for Good Governance: Reforms, Regimes, Reality in Bangladesh.” *International Journal of Public Administration* 24, 1379–1403.