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**INTRODUCTION**

The IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference will be jointly organized by the International Institute of Administrative Sciences and the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. This is the first time two of the leading international flagship events from the International Institute of Administrative Sciences and the Nanyang Centre for Public Administration (NCPA) at the Nanyang Technological University will be held together on a single platform.

The IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference will take place at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore on June 18-21. It will focus on the theme of “Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Governance”.

The organizers hereby publish the calls-for-contributions they received in response to their call-for-proposals.

**BACKGROUND ON THE THEME**

This theme reflects the emerging consensus at United Nations level as to what the concept of good governance means in the Agenda 2030 context.

“Good Governance” remains strongly associated with the Structural Adjustment Policies and the Washington Consensus (Williamson, 1990). In the practice, it was used to mean a “night-watchman” state (Meles, 2011) fulfilling minimal functions and enabling the “unfettered” functioning of markets (Stiglitz, 2004). This model of governance “without government” (Rhodes, 1996) has fallen short of expectations.

In the meantime indeed, alternative, “unorthodox” (Headey, 2009; Wade, 1990) blueprints for development were synthesized on basis of the success stories of, Singapore, South Korea, and more recently, China. Despite significant differences, all cases have in common a strong role for government, with a professional public administration implementing powerful developmental visions designed at the top (Johnson, 1982; Leftwich, 1994). Most notably, Singapore’s success story lies on its continuous emphasis on integrity, confidence and trust in the form of an established governance structure and its embodying system.

Following the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) constitute the internationally legitimate framework for development. It sanctions the comeback of the state in development discourses. While baseline public administration constitutes a stand-alone development end in the 16th SDG, good governance is also an essential enabler, explicitly or not, of all other SDGs (Bouckaert et al., 2016).

It is also vital for governments and policy makers to put in place the enabling mechanisms to make the sweeping advances of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (“4IR”) towards achieving the SDGs. The 4IR characterised by the unique convergence of the physical, digital and biological worlds, offers huge potential to transform and realign our economies and societies but could also cause disruptions to citizens. The innovations and economic value unlocked by the 4IR must maximise positive social and environmental outcomes to bring abundance to all walks of society.

Although it is thus now widely acknowledged that public governance is part of the solution, there remains much room for discussion as to what constitutes intrinsically “good” governance. Fukuyama (2013)
addressed the question, suggesting indicators decoupled from the ends of governance systems, and opening a vivid debate in the literature, also regarding whether “it is possible to have good governance without democracy” (Mahbubani, 2013).

Mandated to monitor progresses in public governance in the SDGs framework, the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration has brought forward the following principles of good governance (Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2018):

- Effective governance, where effectiveness refers to competence, sound policymaking and collaboration;
- Accountable governance, where accountability refers to integrity, transparency and independent oversight;
- Inclusive governance, where inclusiveness refers to leaving no one behind, non-discrimination, participation, subsidiarity, and intergenerational equity.

**CALL-FOR-PAPERS**

The International Institute of Administrative Sciences and the Nanyang Centre for Public Administration with the School of Social Sciences of the Nanyang Technological University have invited their institutional members, partners and interested individuals to contribute to the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference by submitting proposals of call-for contributions.

Proposals were evaluated by the Scientific Committee, composed of Prof. Lichia Saner-Yiu (Center for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development) and Dr. Steve Troupin (IIAS) on behalf of IIAS, and Dr. Wang Jue and Dr. Guanie Lim (Nanyang Technological University), on behalf of Lien Conference.

26 call-for-contributions were accepted. They were clustered in four categories and the open track.

- Good Governance
- Technologies
- Inclusion
- Area Studies and Public Governance
- Open Track
GOOD GOVERNANCE

A first cluster of call-for-papers deals with good governance, and various aspects thereof. They all share a common objective which is to improve governance on some absolute scale.

Aggeliki Bourbouli and Vasiliki Makri, from the National Centre for Public Administration and Local Government in Greece (EKDDA), focus on how strategic management and leadership in public organizations can contribute to the realization of their mission. They call for papers i.e.: distinguishing different leadership styles, and emphasizing their impact on strategic management, and ultimately on the effectiveness of governance.

Pertti Ahonen’s (University of Helsinki, Finland) research interest lies in the governance of government ownership in joint-stock companies. The Chair observes that many principles of good governance thereof exist at various government levels, with significantly differing levels of compliance herewith. He also distinguishes several motives for governments to own joint-stock companies. He calls for papers providing fresh empirical evidence on this research topic from all regions of the world, analysed through sound theories and methodologies.

Ishaq Mohamed Ameen Al-Koohjeji and his colleagues from the Bahrain Institute of Public Administration aim to improve governance by calling for papers examining innovative (best) practices and experiences in the public sector. By emphasizing concepts such as coproduction, crowd-sourcing, technology and innovation labs, they indicate a range of possible avenues for improving governance of the public sector.

Jean-Patrick Villeneuve (Università della Svizzera Italiana, Switzerland) and his peers address one structural impediment to good governance, namely: corruption. They observe consistent failure of corruption-fighting policies, which is attributed to a decoupling between their formal adoption and actual enforcement. The Chairs are calling for papers evaluating anti-corruption policies, as well as conceptual and empirical papers. They hereby pursue the intellectual effort initiated during the 2018 IIAS Congress.

Siria Taurelli and J. Manuel Galvin Arribas sign the call of the European Training Foundation (ETF) – an IIAS partner whose mission is to support the improvement of Vocational Education and Training (VET) in the EU neighbourhood countries. They focus on the governance of VET, and four specific aspects thereof: multi-level governance, public-private partnerships, decentralization, and governance of training institutions themselves.

Andrew Podger is Honorary Professor at the Australian National University. He proposes to revisit the political-administration dichotomy in the contemporary period, characterized by a relatively stronger political pole. The Chair calls for papers discussing this statement and examining its consequences, seen from the administrative side of the dichotomy: how does public administration react to increasingly intrusive politics? He also welcomes panellists in a high-level forum on good governance.

Owen Podger from the University of Canberra in Australia calls for papers and panels on the theme of disaster recovery, understood in its broad sense, encompassing i.e. risk reduction and aiming at holistic recovery. The goal is to help governments and agencies to develop better policies. Case studies or policy recommendations are especially invited.

Leo Huberts and his peers from the IIAS Study Group on the Quality of Governance continue their research program during the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference. They ask the following research question: What is quality of governance and how can quality (and integrity) be advanced in multi-faceted national and international governance processes and structures? And they welcome paper proposal providing an answer to it.

George Labaki focuses on transparency and access to information. He calls for papers evaluating the legal schemes thereof for an effective, accountable and inclusive governance.
In the face of increasing problems and increasingly more sophisticated public needs, an imperative need for Strategic Management and Effective Leadership in the public sector has emerged. Public administrators need to form and implement a concrete and clear strategy in order to manage effectively their department units in public administration and deal efficiently with their colleagues and citizens in general.

Furthermore, management, among others, means managing teams of people. Therefore, strategic management and effective leadership are two crucial factors that are intertwined. In other words, they can be considered as different sides of the same coin, they are prerequisites for achieving effective, efficient, sound and qualitative governance.

As stressed by the Committee of Experts on Public Administration of the United Nations, effective management calls for experienced leadership (either transactional or transformational) (Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2018). The concept of transformational leadership was first introduced by James MacGregor Burns (1978). According to him, this type of leadership creates significant change in the life of people and organizations, given the fact that it redesigns perceptions and values and changes expectations and aspirations of employees. The transformational leader strives towards a positive change of the culture of the organization by creating a community of values across his or her employees. Furthermore, transactional leadership depends on self-motivated people who work well in a structured, directed environment, often confused with the transformational one.

Therefore, it is proposed to explore in this track the questions of

- How Strategic Management and Effective Leadership can be implemented in the public organizations in general?
- Which are the methods and techniques for achieving whole-aimed governance?
- Which is its impact in the organization itself as well as in the citizens.

Moreover, the conference track encourages the submission of papers that respond to the following research questions:

- What does strategic management mean and what are its major aspects?
- Which are the different levels and types of strategy?
• How can a strategy be implemented in the light of the ever-changing needs?
• How can the impact of the strategic management in the different aspects of the life of the organization be assessed?
• How is the notion and style of leadership changing and what are the driving factors for that?
• Which style of leadership can be more effective?
• How can the paradigm shift from the transactional to the transformational leadership be achieved and vice versa?
• Which are the competences required in order to exercise leadership in general and in the public organizations in particular? In which ways can these competences be developed, especially in terms the recent crucial crisis environment that globalization faces during the last decade?

The selected papers should address one or more of these dimensions in the discussion, based on academic research, theoretical considerations and/or practical experiences/case studies implemented under those perspectives, so that panel discussions can be conducted in a diverse and inclusive way, creating food for thought and fruitful dialogue among the members of the panel.

Other papers deepening the effects of the role of strategic management and effective leadership will be examined by the Committee.

**Track main topics:**

For both public administration and local government, indicative research topics that the prospective contributions (e.g., full research papers, research-in-progress papers, experience-in-the-field reports, case reports) include:

• Transactional vs transformational leadership (definition, history, characteristics, advantages, disadvantages, benefits);
• Leadership models (e.g. the leader as coach and mentor);
• Effective ways of leading civil servants (e.g. narrative techniques in public administration);
• Fostering social and civic responsibility by public administration and local government in favor of the citizens (e.g. social healthcare systems);
• Organizational crisis management;
• Global business citizenship: a model of social responsibility and ethical behavior for the 21st century;
• Excessive work and its business consequences public administration;
• HRM best practices and transfers;
• Cultural differences in perceptions of fairness in organizational contexts;
• Language issues and multinational management in a globalized environment.
Governance of Government Ownership in Joint-Stock Companies: Effective, Accountable – and Inclusive?

Pertti Ahonen
University of Helsinki, Finland
pertti.ahonen@helsinki.fi

Governance of government ownership in joint-stock companies comprises a timely theme that fits perfectly together with the general theme of the IIAS Lien Conference. Depending on the country, principles expounded by organizations of the UN system, the special part of the UN system comprised of the Bretton Woods institutions importantly meaning he World Bank and the IMF, the WTO, the OECD, European Union institutions, national cooperation bodies between government and private business, and national governments themselves have been introduced for the guidance of government ownership in joint-stock companies.

In word, in deed or both, different countries have been differently receptive to various principles for the governance of government ownership in joint-stock companies. Many of these principles emphasize effectiveness, more than a few take up accountability, and aspects of inclusion are not absent in the principles, either. In the track we wish to trace both cases in which these principles have been widely and keenly followed; applied only in selected respects; or hardly taken into account at all. We also wish to have coverage both of cases in which governments conventionally hold stocks in publicly traded companies for such reasons as focused strategic interests; privatize in the milder sense of turning public enterprises of other types into the company form; privatize in the deeper sense of turning away with government ownership of stocks; use the company form pragmatically better to govern certain functions seen as essential; or step in to save individual companies or broader branches of industry from systemic or other serious risks up to those of collapse.

The track prioritizes papers in the research article format, building upon a specific research problem, a theoretical or other systematic conceptual framework and research questions or specific hypotheses, a specific research method or methodology, and a delineated empirical subject matter and a specific research material – such as statistical or other ready-made data, public or other documents, or interview results. Moreover, we also wish to have a set of papers that represent well the different corners of the worlds and countries in different stages and phases of development and with different institutional traditions and different kinds of governance arrangements. We cordially welcome both female and male presenters. Each paper should have 6 000 or at the maximum 8 000 words in the English language all included, an abstract, and a keywords list. The papers could well be presented in the conference sessions with the support of a Powerpoint slide set.
Introduction

The terms "Governance" and "Good Governance" are being increasingly used in literature related to modern public administration. Major donors and international financial institutions usually based their aids, loans and partnerships on the condition that reforms in the public sector focus on "Good Governance" and that the principles of good governance are well undertaken. The concept of "Governance" is not new. It is as old as human civilization but has recently been getting more and more attention. Simply, Governance can be used in several contexts such as corporate Governance, international Governance, national Governance and local Governance. As a result, the definition of governance will vary according to the context. However, the elements of governance usually include the following terms: compliance, strategic direction and priorities, policies, organizational performance, managing risks, management performance, monitoring and evaluation, etc…

As per the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration good governance follows three main principles: Effective Governance (competence, sound policymaking and collaboration), Accountable Governance (integrity, transparency and independent oversight), and Inclusive Governance (leaving no one behind, nondiscrimination, participation, subsidiarity, and intergenerational equity). On the other hand, these three principles can be directly linked to the innovation lab concept as well as to other concepts such as "co-policy", "co-design", "crowd-sourcing", and "co-production".

Dimensions and Axes of the Session

This panel session aims to review the best practices, experiences and studies related to Good Governance (effective, accountable, inclusive) in order to develop recommendations to develop the Governance systems and policies, through optimizing the use of technology and innovation labs. This can contribute in improving the public sector's work system and assist in achieving the sustainable development goals and 2030 agenda.

Therefore, papers exploring one of the following topics are welcome:

- The alignment between theory and practice with regard to Good Governance in the public sector experiences in different countries around the world.
- The role of technology in achieving Good Governance within the public sector.
- The possible role of innovation labs and Good Governance in achieving sustainable development goals and 2030 agenda.
- The relationship between Good Governance and the terms such as co-design, co-production, co-decision, co-policy making.
- Alternative ways of "Good Governance" that need to be brought to the attention of the public sector based on recent experiences of countries around the world.

Key Questions

The key questions that will be answered through the research papers from the authors are as listed below (derived from the axes and dimensions of the session), where each axis includes a fundamental question to be answered through the methodology of scientific research:

- What is meant by Governance as a term, especially in the public sector?
- Examine the importance of Innovation lab in the public sector, and its relationship with Good Governance?
- How to achieve sustainable development goals and 2030 agenda through good governance?
- What is the relationship between Governance and the concepts of "co-design", "co-production", "co-decision", "co-policy making"?
- What is the relationship between Good Governance and Crowd-sourcing?
- How did different governments employ the concepts of "crowd-sourcing", "co-design", "co-production", "co-decision", "co-policy making" in the Governance process in the past few years?
- What could be the criteria for Good Governance in the public sector?
- What alternative views could be suggested with regard to "Good Governance" based on the experiences of different countries around the world?
Making Anti-Corruption Effective: Towards a Broader Understanding of Policy Solutions

Jean-Patrick Villeneuve
Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano, Switzerland

Giulia Mugellini
Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano, Switzerland

Marlen Heide
Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano, Switzerland
marlen.heide@usi.ch

Sofia Wickberg
Science Po, Paris, France

Corruption is a multifaceted phenomenon that involves different types of actors, activities and behaviors. Its complexity directly affects its understanding and problem definition, as well as the design, implementation and evaluation of public policies against it. These difficulties have not stopped public institutions to enact anti-corruption policies, whether aimed internally at its own operations or more largely targeting the public sphere. However, policy failure in this field is considered a persistent problem (Persson et al. 2010; Heeks 2011).

Numerous scholars have attempted to deal with this issue by either identifying the mechanisms of corruption (Rose-Ackerman 1978; Graycar 2015; Holmes 2015; Vannucci 2015) and its determinants (Persson et al. 2003; Chang and Golden 2004; Kunicova and Rose-Ackerman 2005) or by measuring it effectively (Blind 2011; Sequeira 2012; Mungiu-Pippidi 2016). Others have discussed the available policy options for anti-corruption (McCusker 2006; Graycar 2015, Zhang and Vargas-Hernández 2017) and evaluated their effectiveness. An overarching and persisting problem is the disconnection between de jure existence of mechanisms and legislations and their de facto effectiveness. (Kaufmann and Kraay 2008).

This panel seeks contributions concerning recent efforts to address administrative corruption, be it in its understanding upstream, its measurement midstream or its consequences and impact downstream, with the aim of reducing anti-corruption policies’ failure. More specifically, we are interested in contributions that evaluate and critically discuss anti-corruption mechanisms that contribute to a de facto reduction of corruption. Conceptual as well as empirical papers are welcome.

The panel will focus on administrative corruption occurring in public sector institutions, interactions and processes at central and local level (OECD 2015). This takes into account that the majority of anticorruption interventions and reforms in the public sector have been targeting corruption at the state administration level. (World Bank 1997, USAID 2009: 4, European Commission 2014).
Shaping and implementing Effective and Accountable Multilevel–Partnerships approaches for VET & Skills Development

European Training Foundation (ETF) – The European Training Foundation is a European Union agency that helps transition and developing countries harness the potential of their human capital through the reform of education, training and labour market systems, and in the context of the EU's external relations policy

Siria Taurelli
Siria.Taurelli@etf.europa.eu

J. Manuel Galvin Arribas
Jose-Manuel.Galvin-Arribas@etf.europa.eu

The European Training Foundation (ETF) working in Good Multilevel Governance in Human Capital Development, with focus on Vocational Education and training (VET)

The European Training Foundation (ETF) is a decentralized, specialist agency of the European Union. With core mission of helping transition and developing countries harness the potential of their human capital through the reform of education, training, and labour market systems, in the context of EU external relations policies.

The ETF works with 29 countries bordering the EU to improve their vocational education and training systems, analyze skills needs, and develop their labour markets. By doing so, ETF supports them to improve social cohesion and achieve more sustainable economic growth, which in turn benefits Member States and their citizens by improving economic relations.

The ETF collaborates on a country-specific as well as multi-country basis, building frameworks for continuity in policy and promoting the design of evidence-based policy and implementation. The ETF frequently operates in uncertain and, at times, unstable contexts. The ETF activities with partner countries cover a range of related areas. For instance:

- Skills and employment needs analysis
- System governance, including stakeholder engagement
- Social dialogue and private sector participation
IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference: Call-for-Papers

1.5. VET for Skills (Tarelli & Galvin-Arribas)

- Qualification systems and quality assurance
- Work-based learning
- Teacher training
- Entrepreneurial learning and core competences, and
- Career guidance.

By definition, governance in VET includes the policy areas of financing (who pays for services, and how), partnerships (who is doing what, and how, for win–win approaches) and assuring quality (making sure the service is good). According to international experience, governance is a key strategic policy area for effectively modernising VET, looking towards the future (1). The ETF is very much aware of this.

Good multilevel governance in VET allows involvement, coordination and public and private interaction to shape relevant skills. This approach must address the institutional, financial and informational aspects of steering VET policies and systems. All these issues have been brought to the fore to be urgently tackled by partner countries within the framework of the ETF Torino Process, which was launched in 2010 and has since had three additional rounds (2012, 2014 and 2016) (2). Since the first round, VET good multilevel governance has been identified by the Torino Process as a major issue for unleashing the potential to drive successful systemic VET reforms in partner countries.

**The European Training Foundation (ETF) operationalizing the Conference theme**

Ensuring good governance in VET and skills development more broadly is a difficult task as it is a complex policy area located at the intersection of education, training, and social, economic and labour market policies, contributing to socioeconomic national goals while balancing regional development (ETF, 2013). It is at the same time an objective within the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular within the SDG4. It is generally acknowledged however that the SDG4 is essential for achieving all other Goals.

The economic and social dimensions of VET skills are challenged by high youth unemployment in many countries worldwide. At the same time, technological changes and the rapid digitisation of many economic sectors and occupations are putting pressure on VET policies and systems, in both developed and developing countries, to provide high-quality skills in order to respond to such employment shifts.

ETF partner countries aim to raise the status and profile of VET, to be seen within a lifelong learning continuum. The parity of esteem of VET with other education sectors is a crucial issue in many countries. VET should become an optimal learning option for students, families and employers. There is also a need to tackle the effects of skills mismatches to improve the employability of the youngest cohorts and senior workers in the labour markets.

For all these reasons, the most attractive and innovative VET systems in the EU and worldwide build on the development of effective multilevel partnership approaches by giving an effective role to the social partners and other industrial (private) actors within the policy-making cycle, while enhancing the policy functions of regional and local actors. Ideal conditions would combine agreements on delegated responsibilities, with a view to attractive and excellent skills education and training provision that meets local needs, with accountability of the institutions.

Following this background, the ETF will coordinate panel(s), split in two core sessions, for operationalizing the following topics and issues within framework of Conference themes:

---

(1) Among some key sources, see, for instance, UNESCO (2015).
(2) The ETF Torino Process is a participatory process leading to an evidence-based analysis of VET policies in a given (EU partner) country. It builds consensus on the possible ways forward in VET policy and system development. This includes the determination of the state of the art and vision for VET in each country, or, after a two-year period, an assessment of the progress that countries are making in achieving the desired results. The added value of the Torino Process lies in the fact that it embeds VET within the socioeconomic context and ensures that the analysis is informed by relevant evidence and takes place through structured dialogue. In this respect, the ETF helps countries to gather information from different sources of evidence and fosters policy dialogue (www.etf.europa.eu).
- Multilevel-Governance and Partnerships approaches on VET and Skills systems within lifelong learning perspective.
- Public-Private Partnerships for Vocational - Skills development, including Financial and non-Financial arrangements for employer’s engagement in VET policy making.
- Decentralization forms of VET and Skills governance, including roles, functions and policy areas.
- Vocational School (self) governance addressing managerial, financial and/or accountability dimensions and policy practices.

The European Training Foundation (ETF) Call for Contributions: Guidance for Authors

Against this background, the ETF call for papers will build on the above-mentioned topics and issues to drive the presentations and discussion in the session(s). More in concrete the expected contributions for authors to participate in ETF panels are following

- Good Multilevel-Governance and Partnerships approaches on VET and Skills systems for realising lifelong learning for all
  Research and practices addressing the application of multilevel, participatory, inclusive governance approaches in human capital development/VET and skills policy making and policy cycles. Role and effectiveness of certain institutions (e.g. different types of Councils), inter-ministerial cooperation practices and other types of coordination mechanisms are essential for effective and inclusive governance. Transparency and accountability mechanism are key tools for deploying such cooperation arrangements. This also refers to how institutions perform, and what methodologies use for, assessing, evaluating and/or monitoring the implementation of such approaches, and learn how to improve governance and performance standards over time.

- Public-Private Partnerships for VET and Skills development, including Financial and non-Financial arrangements for employers’ engagement
  Research and practices oriented to analysis conditions and working processes for sustainable partnerships. Forms, different types of public and private cooperation at all possible levels (international, national, local, schools, company etc.), using fiscal arrangements, trust-building processes and other issues such as capacities of different actors and institutions involved are crucial for shaping implementing, monitoring and review PPPs for VET and skills development. Issues of equity are relevant in context of the SDGs.

- Decentralization forms of VET and Skills governance, including roles, functions and thematic policy areas
  Centralized approaches on VET and Skills policies seems not to be many times the best option for boosting demand-driven skills policies as other actors should be involved in systematic and structured manner. The role of regions and local environments are crucial in the formation and implementation of local partnerships for VET and Skills development. Empirical works and practices should support better on unravelling dilemmas for effective deconcentration, delegation or devolution of responsibilities to lower layers of implementing public VET and Skills functions and thematic areas (e.g. curricula, quality standards, etc.), whilst engaging in cooperation local employers, sectoral organisations, and other industrial regional networks. Steering from the centre and implementing VET and skills policies from local levels is a key issue to further understand.
Vocational School (self) governance addressing managerial, financial and/or accountability dimensions and policy practices.

The fourth industrial revolution is demanding quick responses to deal with occupational and sectoral changes. VET and Skills institutions are requested to deliver relevant skills for students, adult learners, migrants, and other groups whose human capital is supporting the socioeconomic development of local communities and countries as a whole. Educational institutions are challenged in such environment. Increasing managerial, pedagogic and financial autonomy going in line with accountability practices is an option that countries and public administrations are progressively empowering. Stronger autonomy is often a requisite for having more effective decision making processes and influential role on implementation of sound VET and Skills policies. Research and practices on how school operations deal with these issues is strongly needed to understand better how institutions are evolving and addressing leadership, management, funding practices, teaching and learning methods, hiring and firing policies, curricula and transversal competences, partnerships development, excellence and innovation, to provide skills of quality in the labour market.
Politics and Administration in the Modern Era

Andrew Podger
Honorary Professor of Public Policy, Australian National University

andrew@podger.com.au

A degree of separation of politics from administration has been a central aspect of democratic government since the nineteenth century. The degree varies considerably across countries, and also within countries depending on the functions involved. The rationale is essentially the same, however: to ensure administration is both responsive to the policies and priorities of the elected government and conducted fairly and efficiently for all. Public service values include merit-based employment, impartiality and non-partisanship as well as responsiveness to the elected government and accountability through elected officials to the legislature.

Authoritarian regimes may not separate politics from administration in any formal way but may nonetheless promote ‘merit’ and professionalism in government administration and policy advising. For example, China has imposed examinations for entry into government service for centuries, and currently has explicit policies to improve ‘talent’ in the public sector.

In the modern era with the ‘professionalisation’ of politics, partly in response to a more pervasive media using new communications technology, the distinction between politics and administration in democratic countries has become increasingly ‘thick’ or blurred. Political leaders have more support staff who are partisan and not formally part of the civil service; senior civil service appointments are often more closely managed by political leaders; the civil service is subject to closer political oversight; and it is held more openly accountable with less anonymity than in the past. More generally, civil services no longer have a monopoly in either providing advice or delivering public services and must operate through wider networks across society.

This panel aims to explore how different countries are responding to these developments. Papers are invited to facilitate this exploration. How important is a degree of independence for the civil service? How have relations with elected officials changed? How are senior public servants’ appointments and terminations made, and how firmly is the merit principle applied? What is the relationship between the civil service and political advisers? What rules apply to the political advisers and how are they held accountable? How has accountability of the civil service changed, including with regard to traditional notions of anonymity? Have public service values changed, and how are they now expressed? Has the public service ethos changed with the increasing role of external groups and organisations in policy advice and program delivery? Does and should the degree of independence vary across functions – policy advising, service delivery, regulation, research, ‘integrity’ functions, etc.?

These issues are all highly relevant to the conference theme of ‘effective, accountable and inclusive governance’. While focused on the relationship between politics and administration (including accountability and effectiveness), they are also highly relevant to the relationship between administration and the public (including inclusiveness).

In addition to presentation of papers, the panel plans to include a high-level forum to discuss trends, challenges and future directions for good governance.
Inclusive, Effective and Accountable Governance of Disaster Recovery

Owen Podger
Professional Associate, University of Canberra
owenpodger@gmail.com

Kristoffer Berse
National College of Public Administration and Governance, University of the Philippines
krisberse@gmail.com

Post disaster reconstruction in this new century has created unsurpassed inclusiveness and responsiveness, collaboration and shared accountability. The world has accepted a need to build back better, build resistance to future disasters, and to build lasting peace in place of man-made disasters. We are critically aware of the balance between planning disaster risk reduction and management of reconstruction for a traumatised people.

The focus of effectiveness is no longer just how many houses or bridges or ports are rebuilt; we look for more holistic definitions of recovery of societies and economies. Post disaster inclusiveness leaves no one behind, is non-discriminatory, and has concern for people of all ages. Victims are no longer passive recipients but participate in planning and activity. Emphasis is placed on enabling self-recovery.

NGOs, donors and governments are now far more demanding of competence and quality control in recovery. And collaboration is no longer just between different levels of government and with donors, but it embraces communities, business and markets.

More emphasis is now given to integrity of stakeholders, transparency and independent oversight. Perhaps the largest remaining gap in accountability is how we can build an overall shared accountability for achieving recovery, of seeing recovery as an entity that local community, government, and the international community are committed to achieving.

Rebuilding governance is a dynamic. Every disaster creates challenges to government, to the usual allocation of responsibilities between levels of government, and indeed arrangements within international agencies and civil society organisations supporting disaster recovery. Often existent arrangements must be discarded for one reason or another for a pragmatic collaboration to get things agreed and done, initiating a dynamic that works towards recovery of government, society and economy which may need to be different to what was there before.

This proposed Track at the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference is intended to present case-studies and explore policy for creating better governance frameworks for disaster recovery. Our concern is how such complex governance problems can be planned, led and governed to the point at which stable government, economy and society can be returned.
Call for contributions

Interested academics and practitioners are invited to submit paper and panel proposals. We are looking for ideas that withstand critical review that may help governments and international agencies working on disaster recovery to develop policies that lead to fairer and more sustainable futures. Criteria for selection, in addition to quality of proposals are:

- EITHER case studies of successes or failures of governance of recovery from a major disaster OR policy recommendations for governance of disaster recovery with argumentation and justification
  - Case studies will focus on one particular disaster or several disasters for comparison
  - Policy recommendations may refer to a particular national setting, but should include potential international implications
- Addressing governance of overall recovery (i.e.: not focusing on the work of just one recovery initiative or one sector). The exception is the use of IT to assist in faster and fairer recovery.
- Papers may address overall good governance, or focus on inclusiveness, effectiveness, or overall accountability, with a focus on how different levels of government work together and with business and industry. Papers on leadership will also be welcome.
- Papers may address man-made and/or natural disaster. If there is enough demand, we may propose a separate sub-track for the special problems of overcoming man-made disasters.
Quality and Integrity of Governance

IIAS Study Group on the Quality of Governance

Leo Huberts  
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
I.huberts@vu.nl

Adam Graycar  
Flinders University  
adam.graycar@flinders.edu.au

Tina Nabatchi  
Maxwell Syracuse University  
tnabatch@maxwell.syr.edu

The Quality of Governance Study Group aims at relating, connecting and synergizing different fields of study in a global context with as leading question: **What is quality of governance and how can quality (and integrity) be advanced in multi-faceted national and international governance processes and structures?**

After challenging meetings at previous conferences, the next SG Sessions at the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference in Singapore will build on that. On our agenda are a number of basic questions on the content of the quality and integrity of governance and its relevance for good governance. Good governance will be a central topic at the conference, with several basic values mentioned in the Call: effective governance (competence, collaboration), accountable governance (integrity, transparency, independency) and inclusive governance (leaving no one behind, non-discrimination, participation, subsidiarity, and equity).

In addition, a number of challenging topics are mentioned in the Call, with food for thought and discussion based on research (including ‘is it possible to have good governance without democracy?’; and: is Singapore’s success explained by ‘its continuous emphasis on integrity, and confidence and trust in the form of an established governance structure’?).

Our SG would of course like to contribute to the conference theme, and sessions on three topics are planned:

- Quality and integrity of governance: what public values are crucial (including the meaning and significance of effectiveness, accountability and inclusiveness, and democracy)? In addition to a (further) exploration of effectiveness and accountability, we will explicitly focus on the meaning of inclusive governance and how it relates to good governance.
- Conflicting public values and how to cope with tensions? (also at the level of political and governance systems, with varying values as the ‘winners’?)
- Quality and integrity of governance: what helps? Which instruments, policies, systems contribute?
This call for papers and proposals builds on that challenging agenda. For now, we invite you to submit an abstract that focuses on the mentioned topics/questions.
Transparence et accès à l’information

George Labaki
Ecole Nationale d’Administration, Liban
ggeorgelabaki@gmail.com

Les lois favorisant l’accès par les citoyens à l’information sous toutes ses formes assurent un contrôle sur la transparence, l’efficacité et le besoin de ne laisser aucun citoyen à l’arrière par le service public. Quant aux valeurs qui sous-tendent les lois sur l’accès à l’information, elles ont un caractère largement universel et associent étroitement transparence et reddition de comptes par les gouvernements et par l’administration publique et à combattre la corruption. De plus en plus de pays accordent ce droit à leurs citoyens.

Ainsi, le 21 février 2002, le comité des ministres du Conseil de l’Europe adopta la Recommandation 2 (2002) portant sur l’accès aux documents détenus par les autorités publiques. Le comité recommande « Un large accès aux documents publics, sur une base d’égalité et en application de règles claires : permet au public d’avoir un aperçu suffisant et de se former une opinion critique sur l’état de la société dans laquelle il vit et sur les autorités qui le gouvernent, tout en favorisant la participation éclairée du public aux affaires d’intérêt commun ; favorise l’efficacité de l’administration et contribue à maintenir son intégrité, en évitant le risque de corruption ; contribue à affirmer la légitimité de l’administration en tant que service public et à renforcer la confiance du public dans ses autorités ».

En 2004, on dénombrait plus d’une cinquantaine de pays ayant adopté une législation dans ce sens, Les interventions d’organisations internationales comme le Conseil de l’Europe, la Banque mondiale ou le Fonds monétaire international ont poussé à l’adoption de telles législations.

L’appel à contribution

Il s’agit d’évaluer le rôle du droit d’accès à l’information dans le renforcement de l’efficacité du service publique, de l’obligation de rendre compte et d’inclusion de tous les citoyens dans le cadre des services assurés par le service public.

Parmi les sujets proposés, citons à titre d’exemple:

- Le droit à l’information et son développement
- Les défis de la reconnaissance du droit à l’information (juridiques, culturels…)
- Les réformes visant à faciliter l’accès à l’information
- Le droit à l’information et l’éthique
- Les modes d’accès aux informations détenues par les Etats
- Les technologies et l’accès à l’information
- Les freins à l’accès à l’information
- L’expérience des divers pays dans le domaine de l’accès à l’information
- L’accès et le combat de la corruption
TECHNOLOGIES

Other scholars have embraced the technological component of the call-for-proposals, namely the fourth industrial revolution (4IR) which is underway. Characterized by the unique convergence of the physical, digital and biological worlds, 4IR entails unique opportunities of economic redeployment, but can also trigger disruptions to citizens.

Jue Wang (Nanyang Technological University, Singapore) and Xiao Lu (Chinese Academy of Sciences) call for papers and panel presentations on Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) policies, through which governments prepare, adjust to, and support technological developments. They include, i.e.: STI economics, management practices, and societal programs.

Eugenia Lokana and Dimitris Kyparissis (National Centre for Public Administration and Local Government, Greece) question the policies governments should adopt and implement to ensure citizens are equally able to seize technological opportunities of our digital era. Topics for discussions include: institutional frameworks for new technologies, educational and vocational training systems, demographics and governance.

Naomi Aoki (National University of Singapore) and her peers explore Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Asia. Most governments in the region have adopted ambitious strategies to seize the opportunities offered by AI for economic development and public service delivery. The Chairs expect contributions to emphasize contextual factors supporting or hindering to seize these opportunities.

Serene Ho (RMIT University, Australia) and Geert Bouckaert (KU Leuven, Belgium) emphasize the challenge of urbanization, captured by the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11. Poor quality urban data is blamed as a source of most urban governance issues, and new technologies, while having potential to address this issue, do come with own risks and pitfalls. The Chairs call for contributions exploring the application of new technologies for addressing urban governance challenges in particular, and on the relation between technologies, trust and governance in more general terms.
Governance in the Era of Industry 4.0: Implications for Science, Technology and Innovation policies

Jue Wang
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Xiao Lu
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Track Description
In the emerging knowledge economy, science, technology and innovation (STI) has been applauded as effective tools to connect the nature world to the human welfare and promote sustainable economic development. Broadly defined, STI policy includes scholarship investigating the creation and supporting STI resources and the coordination of STI activities. Spanning across a wide spectrum, STI policy can be studied from the economic, social, and political perspectives. The demand for STI policy has been escalating along with rapid development of technology. Different levels of government, legislatures, public organizations, and other types of funding agencies are increasingly demanding systematic policy and program evaluation. Looking ahead to the next 50 years, we believe that STI policy is increasingly critical with the information and insights that brings for better decision-making, good governance, and sustainable development for the well-being of all.

Call for panel and individual proposals
This track aims to increase recognition and collaboration among the researchers in STI policy domain, while exchanging advanced research in selective domains. It calls for the discussion of the overarching STI policies from around the world, including but not limited to the economics of STI, research and policy evaluation, STI management practice, public spending on technology and innovation, the development and training of human resource, university-industry collaboration, other policy programs for innovation such as incubators and science parks, regulation and ethics for science, and the institutional framework for research and innovation. We invite both promising scholars and established researchers to share their ideas, reflections, and cutting-edge research related to STI policy. We welcome submissions from different disciplinary frameworks, analytical methods, and world regions, for both panel and individual presentations. Proposals should be 500 words maximum, written in English and double spaced. Theories/perspectives, research methods, results and findings should also be briefly described. For additional information or queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Transforming the Public Sector in the Digital Era:
The Challenge of Linking and Strengthening Inclusive Governance,
Accountability and Social Values.

National Centre for Public Administration and Local Government of Greece

Eugenia Lοκana
Research and Studies Officer
dkyparissis@ekdd.gr

Currently, public sectors worldwide are under pressure to improve transparency and the performance in their services delivery and provide the conditions for Inclusive Governance. Hence, it is increasingly considered as “public rights” to monitor the transparency and efficiency of public administration.

In this context, when national, regional, or local administrations make a coordinated effort to integrate input from citizens and provide services to all citizens equally, they contribute to improve the public policy effectiveness, and co-ownership of results. This is done through enhancing a set of internal organizational as well as external factors enabling accountability and integrating social values.

This consideration can be fostered, as public sector is becoming ever more reliant on how digital technology can be used on the part of public servants themselves but also on the part of citizens as “users” of policy and services. Having the skills and capacity to harness its benefits is becoming a crucial aspect of inclusive governance in the new digital era. The challenge for public administrations is achieving equality of access to, and use of, digital technologies for the most vulnerable members of their communities and enable them to harness the benefits of public policies.

Drawing on the above, we’ll seek to invite theoretical and empirical analyses, comparative and case studies touching on the following questions that could feed the discussion and give rise to the Track Main Topics of the Call for Contributions.

- How the administrative tools and social values could be adopted by the public administration and adjusted to the requirements and conditions of new digital technologies and inclusive governance settings?
- How national policies, legislative frameworks and tools are supporting trust, inclusiveness and accountability mechanisms to the recipients of services and the beneficiaries of public policies, and how these are combating digital exclusion?
• What are the skills and knowledge needed to get the most out of digital technologies and how these can be developed and obtained?
• How our educational and lifelong learning systems can be adopted to enable citizens acquired skills and trust in the digital technology?
• How demographic factors - especially the ageing of civil servants (45 years plus) - will exacerbate inequalities at the workplace as well as social inequalities?
• What inclusive governance mechanisms and approaches are necessary to ensure that no one is left behind as the world moves deeper into the digital age?

**Track main topics**

Call for Contributions will encourage proposals to unearth the following Themes:

• Enhancement of a multi-pronged strategy for the Inclusive Governance in the new digital era.
• Fostering the administrative tools (accountability, internal audit, evaluation) by combining with a broader range of social values (Trust, Integrity, Gender equality, Social Inclusion)
• Innovative approaches, mechanisms and required data to citizen engagement for effective services.
• Upgrading Human Resources according to acquired new skills, changes in educational and lifelong learning systems, re- skilling the ageing civil servants.
• Strengthening Inclusive Governance at local, regional and national level in terms of the required political, financial, administrative and community consensus.
Good Governance in Asia in the Age of Artificial Intelligence
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Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy
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This panel aims to explore good governance in the age of artificial intelligence (AI) with a focus on Asia – a region arguably emerging as a powerhouse of AI development. The panel highlights the significance of the region's geopolitical, cultural, socio-demographic, and regulatory contexts in which “AI-powered” governance operates.

AI is not new, but it has received considerable attention in recent years due to its remarkable advancements. This development has propelled some advanced national and local governments to adopt, or at least consider adopting, AI-powered technologies in the provision of public services, from using robotics in elder care to using facial recognition and fake news detectors for national security – services which are pertinent to the Sustainable Development Goals. While AI currently in use is mostly in its “weak” forms, much more robust use is expected in the future. AI will enable governments to perform existing or entirely new tasks with a proficiency comparable to, or better than, that of human administrators. Moreover, its use has critical implications for administrative discretion – a topic that has always been contentious in the field of public administration. Using AI in governance means relegating some administrative discretion to an entity that is not even human, and this has opened a new realm of debate about its implications for the responsiveness and accountability of governance (Barth & Arnold, 1999).
Against this backdrop, the panel seeks to deepen the discourse on AI-powered governance in Asia. Our regional focus is timely; China has released a national AI development plan, with the objective to become a world AI leader by 2030 (Churchill, 2018). Singapore aspires to be a top-notch digital economy and has launched AI for Everyone (AI4E) and Industry (AI4I) to educate or train 10,000 people from among the general public and 2,000 people from the industrial sector in the use of AI technologies by 2021 (Kwang, 2018). Japan’s Society 5.0. aims to use emerging technologies such as AI to meet the demands of the nation’s rapidly ageing and shrinking society (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, n.d.) – a challenge that will be shared by many other Asian nations in the future, if not today.

The panel sheds light on the contexts in which AI-powered governance operates. Asian nations share similarities and differences with respect to geopolitical, socio-demographic, and regulatory contexts. In regard to AI-powered governance, are there any challenges or opportunities unique to the contexts of Asian nations? In addition, studies have found that national culture has an impact on the level of people’s acceptance of technology (Straub, Keil, & Brenner, 1997; Veiga, Floyd, & Dechant 2001). In some places, AI is seen as a threat to humans, while in others it is seen as a human partner (Kaplan, 2004). How do these contexts matter to what is and should be considered “good AI-powered governance”? This panel seeks to address these critical questions and deepen debate on this topic.
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Advancing Sustainable Development Goal 11:
Technology, Trust and Transformation for Urban Governance
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Track Proposal

This track proposes to explore the intersection of technology and trust to deliver urban transformation and governance in support of Goal 11, ‘Cities and Communities’, of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Cities are the engines of growth and realising prosperous and resilient cities and communities is predicated on sustainable urbanisation. Most of the world’s population will live in cities by 2100 with the brunt borne by Asia and Africa. This rate of urbanisation outstrips the rate of physical development: 60 percent of the global area expected to be urban by 2030 is yet to be built and the required infrastructure investment to service this is estimated at cost around US$3.7 trillion annually. Governments are struggling to house, service and support urban communities, particularly in developing countries; consequently, while the proportion of global urban population living in informal settlements have decreased, absolute numbers have increased. For these communities, the coalescence of the complexity and intensity of the urban physical environment with social and economic fragility also conveys increased vulnerability in the face of increasingly common hazard events.

Sustainable urbanisation is the contemporary challenge of our times and improving governance has emerged as a key priority. In many countries, the ability to achieve the targets and indicators under Goal 11 is fundamentally inhibited by poor quality urban data and governance. For example, less than 50 percent of countries (only 13 percent in Africa) have comprehensively mapped or registered land in capital cities, and less than 30 percent of countries maintain digital land data for effective urban decision-making. How can governments make good planning and infrastructure decisions if they do not know who owns what and where? Further, land administration chronically rates amongst the most corrupt of public institutions and often falls to poorly capacitated local governments. This leads to dissonance between public expectations and government performance, i.e. (dis)trust, creating immense risk for current and future urban populations, especially women and other vulnerable groups.
In response, many cities are harnessing ICT to facilitate knowledge and learning between multiple stakeholders to deliver more efficient, responsive and citizen-centric public services and decisions. We see this in the rise of the ‘smart city’ concept, but also in widespread interest in applying those new technologies being mainstreamed under the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) that are better, faster, cheaper and more scalable. 4IR technologies such as mobile devices enabled with high accuracy GPS, the Internet of Things, blockchains and UAVs, are being framed as transformational instruments offering myriad possibilities for overcoming challenges of scale, integrity and capacity for sustainable development. These technologies attract millions in donor-funding with investment predicated on the reasoning that participation produces positive outcomes in satisfaction, trust and governance.

The potential of 4IR is however, not without pitfalls. Indeed, inequality, a key determinant of trust, is the greatest concern associated with 4IR and there are growing calls for a human-centred approach. How does the developing world engage and benefit if most of the global south remains disconnected? The digital divide is most pronounced in Asia and Africa, where only 48 percent and 35 percent of the population respectively have access to the internet. While new technologies provide new opportunities for citizens to engage with governments, it also provides governments with new methods of control. How can this be reconciled? Conversely, how should governments contend with the growing volume of co-produced urban data and harness it for decision-making, especially if it undermines their role as authoritative sources of information? Finally, there are noticeable trends in borrowing technocratic concepts such as ‘agile governance’ as proposed by the World Economic Forum, who note that, “There is an urgent need for a faster, more agile approach to governing emerging technologies and the business models and social interaction structures they enable” (p.4). How do local governments, emphasised in the New Urban Agenda as key actors in realising sustainable urbanisation but who are often limited in institutional and administrative resources and capacity? deal with such new paradigms?

**Call for Contributions**

Given the opportunities and challenges outlined, this panel invites contributions that advance our understanding of the intersection of new technologies and trust to deliver urban transformation and governance. Potential themes include, but are not limited to:

- Interrogating the concept of 4IR: how can we define this in the context of Goal 11 and advancing urban governance, and move to a concept more responsive to the skills and capacity of developing countries?
- Showcasing inclusive human-centred approaches in the application of new technologies for contending with urban governance challenges.
- Investigating the effectiveness of public sector strategies for dealing with the disruption these technologies impose on both social and technical structures.
- Revealing the impact of new technologies on state-society trust relationships.
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INCLUSION

Six call-for-papers further develop the “inclusive” dimension of the Conference theme. They mobilize research themes such as participation, access, sustainability, human rights, among other humanistic objectives and outcomes of public action.

Marco Meneguzzo (University of Rome Tor Vergata, Italy) and his colleagues launch their IIAS Study Group on Social Innovation, Commons and Administration during the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference. With social innovation are meant government-steered initiatives involving all relevant societal actors in the management of common goods. The Chairs call for conceptual contributions, interdisciplinary perspectives on the Commons, and explicitly invite contributions from practitioners as well.

Raymond Saner (Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development) and his peers observe that the worldwide population is increasingly ageing and ask what governance systems need to do to cope with this change, in terms of services and infrastructures to be provided, in order to ensure inclusion. They call for fresh empirical evidence and innovative theoretical lenses.

Loredana Nada Elvira Giani (Università Europea di Roma, Italy) and Aristide Police (Università degli Studi di Roma, Italy) focus on the concept of sustainability, both as a principle and as an outcome of governance systems, captured in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) agenda. Contributions examining good governance seen from this perspective, are welcomed.

Edoardo Chiti (University of Tuscia, Italy) and Gabriella M. Racca (University of Turin, Italy) question the transferability of participatory instruments. The Chairs argue that these processes reflect varying values of the governments using them. They ask whether this cultural diversity should be protected or give way to a greater homogenization, possibly supported by technological developments.

Scott Brenton and Erik Bækkeskov (University of Melbourne) focus on the role of non-elected officials, including civil servants, in maintaining human rights, sometimes against the will of political leaders. They also call for contributions questioning the universality of human rights, examining the institutions in place to maintain them, and evaluating their impact and the will of citizens. Theoretical and empirical contributions are welcomed.

Amitava Basu (Center for Environmental Management & Participatory Development, India) calls for papers supporting inclusive development and three related subthemes of participatory development (aimed at leaving no one behind), transition to inclusiveness, and sustainable development. Conceptual, theoretical, and empirical contributions are welcomed.

Marcel Ramirez (Universidad del Pacífico, Peru) and Fredy Vargas welcome contributions ultimately allowing the private sector to provide a more significant contribution to development, by emphasizing barriers and enablers of trust between the private and the public sector, strategies allowing the coproduction of strong developmental visions, and the exchange of good practices facilitating the implementation thereof.

Marco Meneguzzo and his peers focus on Social Impact Investing (SSI), which refers to private sector companies investing in public goods. The chairs call for contributions providing fresh empirical evidence on and/or evaluating the impact of SSI initiatives.

Sara Valaguza and her peers from the European Association of Public Private Partnership (EAPPP) ask how public-private partnerships can contribute to inclusive, responsive and participatory governance.
Social Innovation, Commons and Administration
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Social innovation is one of the most interesting trends of the 21st century, and it involves many sectors of society. In fact, not only different social actors come up with innovative and creative ideas, they also build new relationships with other stakeholders. While we have many examples of social innovation driven by private companies and by the civil society, this track is aimed at investigating the manifestation and effects of social innovation in the public sector, especially when public authorities are involved. Social innovation in public administration can be interpreted as an evolution of Public Governance, which stressed the importance of networks, multilevel governance and collaborative relationships. The perspective of social innovation is aligned with these assumptions, since it is based on the idea that innovation is most effective when it stems from cooperation between different actors. As a natural consequence of social innovation, new relationships are created between those who participate to the innovation process, and also between the beneficiaries of the innovation. An open issue has to do with the legal foundations of such a new paradigm, from the point of view of constitutional principles (e.g. subsidiarity, administrative efficiency), hard law and best practices.

Public administrations have started to include external parties in their policy-making processes, in various fields. This inclusive phenomenon regards participation by stakeholders and populations (especially at the local level) in administrative decisions, as well as the joint management of commons. Moreover, an important challenge for scientists nowadays is the proper definition of the concept of commons itself, whose notion may deeply influence the choice of suitable tools of use and management. The objective of this track is the creation of a fruitful dialogue between researchers and practitioners in different fields (e.g.: management, law, administration, political science, philosophy, etc.), as well as in their relationships with business, government and civil society.

The track welcomes contributions regarding, but not limited to, the following topics:

- Social innovation and participation in administrative actions and commons;
- Legal foundations and implications of social innovation in the public administration;
- Definitions of the concept of “commons” and its application in public administration;
- Privatisation and the redefinition of borders between public and private sectors;
- Inclusive governance fostered by socially innovative practices and cross-sectoral cooperation;
- Cooperative management and governance of commons.
Governance for Sustainable Ageing

IIAS Study Group on Population Ageing

Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development (CSEND)

The Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development (CSEND) promotes inclusive, equitable, sustainable and integrated development through dialogue and institutional learning. CSEND provides policy research, capacity development and consulting services on institutional development and change processes especially in the area of institutional strengthening, human and social capital development, trade and development, quality education, aid effectiveness, international negotiations and new diplomacies.

Throughout its 24 years of history, CSEND has played a leadership role in several knowledge areas that were acknowledged and sometimes further developed by other scholars and institutions. Contributions made by CSEND take the form of policy briefs and policy reviews which are disseminated through publications, seminars, and dialogue sessions as well as through training activities and informal meetings.

CSEND has also left strong footprints in the space of public administration reform in countries of different socioeconomic systems.

National Interdisciplinary Institute on Ageing (NIIA)

The National Interdisciplinary Institute on Aging (NIIA), founded on May 15, 2015, is the first national research base for the study of aging, jointly established by the National Committee on Aging in Southwest Jiaotong University (SWJTU). NIIA takes full advantage of SWJTU’s interdisciplinary studies on the ageing population to build a world class faculty, to nurture top students with international perspectives and to pilot for experimental studies that will treat the ageing issue with an integrated approach covering palliative care, social protection, physical space, mobility, economic performance. It will uphold the principles of being competitive, interdisciplinary and international, NIIA aims to become the leading institute in China on ageing and to make its work recognized globally.
**Rationale**

The world’s population is ageing. Virtually every country in the world is experiencing growth in the number and proportion of older persons of their population. Faced with different developmental stages, societies rely either on private or family provision or public social protection for the elderly. The high percentage of older population in many developing and least developed countries are known to face a precarious old age, especially for the older persons who have been at the bottom of the social pyramid throughout their life working in an informal economy. Healthy and active ageing for most will not be easy as they were less endowed and prepared to deal with their “retirement” and old age.

Providing for senior citizens with sustainable living, care, and access to opportunities of continued participation in different spheres of life has become a major policy challenge in many countries. What type of governance measures and mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure achievement of the spirit of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda and ensure that “leaving no one behind”, is a lived reality. How will such governance performance be designed and managed?

As the overall framework in defining “good governance” (Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2018) stated in the 2019 Conference Programme involves the following principles:

1. Effective governance, where effectiveness refers to competence, sound policymaking and collaboration;
2. Accountable governance, where accountability refers to integrity, transparency and independent oversight;
3. Inclusive governance, where inclusiveness refers to leaving no one behind, nondiscrimination, participation, subsidiarity, and intergenerational equity.
Contribution to the Conference Theme

This call aims to receive contributions dealing with the following questions:

What are the needs of senior citizens to be able to live a dignified, productive and meaningful life? What could be the right policy mix to address these needs and reflect the principles of good governance?

- How to adopt an integrated approach in measuring and monitoring the various policy effects so that inclusiveness of these policies can be realised, improved and embedded in the policy ecosystem? In delivering accountable governance, how are stakeholders engaged in the governance processes?
- What are the basic governance requirements or infrastructure in ensuring the wellbeing of the older persons? What would or could be the contribution of technology and artificial intelligence?
- How to regulate or supervise the ageing support and services sector so that the rights and dignity of the older persons be protected?
- What are the examples of social, financial, technological, institutional innovations that have worked in different countries?
The Role of “Sustainability” in Building Effective and Accountable Models of Governance. Sustainability: Principle or Organizational Model?
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The aim of the panel is to investigate the concept of sustainability in order to verify its relevance for the construction of efficient and responsible models of governance.

The macro target of the survey is the analysis of the same concept of sustainability in a double perspective referred to:

1. Administrative action, being as a “general principle” to which the activity of the administration must tend and,
2. Administrative organization, due to the functional connection between activity and organization.

In this perspective, the panel intends to investigate the profiles aimed at ascertaining to what extent the principle has been recognized in the action and organization of public administrations, and to identify models of governance aimed at ensuring the achievement of the objectives of sustainable development.

Governance plays a fundamental role in achieving the objectives of sustainable development, supporting the three dimensions (economic, social and environmental) that characterize it, defining the behavioral rules of the any organization and, in this case, the public administrations.

Due to the diversity and inhomogeneity of peoples and cultures, and consequently of the administrations, it is impossible to establish a single regulatory complex, therefore it is necessary to identify some general principles of governance that can be shared. Following the principles set out in the White Paper on European Governance of the European Commission (2001), they can be identified and declined as follows:

- Accountability and Consistency: administration is a complex system that must ensure a coherent approach, identifying the objectives for which it is responsible consistent with the needs emerging from the communities, and clearly defining decision-making processes, roles within of decision-making processes and responsibilities;
- Transparency: administrations have a duty to be transparent because they can be held accountable only if citizens are informed of their actions and their behavior and by doing so it is possible to increase citizens’ trust in complex institutions;
- Participation: the array of participatory tools is likely to facilitate the identification of the “real” needs of the community as well as to create more confidence in the end result and in the institutions as it reinforces the sense of belonging of the community;
Effectiveness: administrations must be organised in such a way that their action is effective and timely, producing the required results based on: clear objectives; the assessment of their future impact; and, where possible, the experiences acquired in past.

The panel survey intercepts the 17 objectives of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 25.09.2015, which are functional for the full and effective realization of human rights and the achievement of gender equality through the balancing and harmonization of the three fundamental elements for sustainable development: economic growth, social inclusion and environmental protection.

The call for papers concerns also the possibility to test the models of governance in the framework of Agenda 2030 referring to the following macro-themes: welfare and living; quality education (as an inclusive instrument of prevention), culture and creativity; urban regeneration; environment and circular economy.
Participatory Instruments as ‘Transferable Technologies’?
Administrative Law, Political Culture and the Complexity of Administrative Convergence
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In most Western systems, administrative law provides a set of procedural principles and rules governing participation in administrative proceedings. Admittedly, there are several differences between the existing administrative disciplines. To begin with, participation is strongly protected in relation to administrative adjudication, while it is weakly protected in relation to administrative rule-making. Moreover, each legal system relies on a specific set of procedural instruments. Beneath the surface of such variations, however, a process of convergence is taking place: both in the field of adjudication and rule-making, in all legal systems participation is sustained through legal arrangements that tend to share a number of common features.

Unsurprisingly, the participatory instruments on which such arrangements are based are often represented as universal and ‘transferable technologies’. The panel would like to question such assumption. By focussing on participation to adjudicatory proceedings - the field in which convergence seems to be particularly clear - it aims at exploring the political and administrative culture that informs the specific legal arrangements through which participation is operationalized in a number of polities (France, US, England and the EU). What values and ideals do these arrangements reflect? Do all systems promote the values of the rule of law and democracy, that have shaped every Western administrative State in the XXth century? Or do they encapsulate different values, such as for example human rights or good governance? And what kind of economic ideologies (economic liberalism, governmental regulation, etc.) lie behind these different values? In case the procedural arrangements of the various national systems promote similar values and share homogenous political and bureaucratic cultures, how can the process of convergence be explained? And what are the possible shortcomings of this process? Should cultural diversity be protected? In case the existing procedural arrangements reflect different cultures, how can we explain the parallel processes of consolidation of apparently similar participatory instruments?

How technologies and data analysis can affect participation? How democratic participation and civic engagement might change through gamified governance?
Human rights are often the prerogative (or not) of elected officials or oversight institutions, whether articulated in constitutions, international agreements or similar instruments or debated within public political forums, at least in liberal democracies. Many other actors obviously also play significant roles, from civil society groups, to journalists and academics, or the citizenry in various guises, to name but a few. Yet what is the role of non-elected government officials, such as civil or public servants, recognised advisors to government or others within government who must serve the elected government of the day while retaining a commitment to broader public interest, or democratic and social goals that may be viewed by some as too political? How do insiders use their positions to advance agendas contrary to populist or non-democratically inclined politicians without overstepping? Is it possible to administer or implement directives in ways in which steer policies away from extremes?

There are many entry points into this topic, such as debates about human rights and its universality to the relationships with governance systems and components such as integrity systems or elections. Consideration could be given to what the public interest actually is and who decides outside of electoral politics, to thinking about the privileged role of working in and for government and motivations beyond simply serving the elected executive. How is serving the citizens, the community, and broader society, including into the future factored in if there is conflicting drivers and demands? Whether it is deficits or a supposed negative turn in established democracies in recent years or in other systems that are grappling with questions of how to reform politically, how do we know what the public are really thinking or in the interest of humankind when electoral outcomes can be confusing or offer only a limited insights? What is guiding our conceptions of human rights?

This panel seeks contributions theorising, empirically-testing or exemplifying initiatives or outcomes advancing or protecting human rights where non-elected government officials have been or are leading. Possibilities include solidarity networks within government around gender or sexual identity, Indigeneity or disability; interpretative practices around policy, delivery and implementation; relationships and exchanges with civil society groups and the broader citizenry; and opportunities to oppose or question elected government officials, among many others, and in a range of contexts and especially non-democracies or less advanced democracies. What hope can educated, skilled and publicly-spirited individuals working within government offer us?
Governance for Development

Center for Environmental Management & Participatory Development
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Development covers economic growth and human advancement. In other words, development is not merely improvement of gross domestic product but also enhancement of human development index. It may be argued that economic growth facilitates human development. However, there are instances of economic growth benefitting a small group of people and not percolating to the grass root level; and hence, vast populace remains trapped in poverty and bereft of human development attainments. True development is all encompassing growth covering economic and human development and pervading through the entire society.

It is the primary goal of public administration and good governance to foster inclusive development. To achieve this goal, the cardinal principles that need to be followed are:

- Sustainability of Goal
- Clarity of Process
- Equality in Participation
- Transparency in Implementation
- Flexibility of Management
- Accountability of Decision

Development goals are to be set in consultation with and participation of all sections of the society and converged to target the greatest good for the greatest number. The process to pursue for meeting the set development goals need to be well-defined with least room for confusion and manipulation. The process to attain these targets also requires wide discussion, deliberation and build on credible scientific basis and in systematic manner. Both – development targets and processes – entails involvement of public from all strata of the society through proper representation. Implementation of the decided processes underlines the need for transparency in execution of work and carrying out activities to mitigate the scope of corruption that significantly holds back development permeating to the bottom of the society. In implementation stage, there ought to be flexibility to facilitate addressing different situations that may arise during the course of execution of work. In other words, rigidity and adherence to the letter of rules need to be relaxed for the sake of pragmatism to deal with occasions as they arise; and, of course, without compromising transparency and blatant violation of laws. And, the decision-making and its execution should be accountable for the eventual outcome, which lays the foundation for responsible governance and administration.

It is in this background that the need for effective, accountable and inclusive governance assumes paramount significance. Irrespective of ideological differences, the central theme of good governance stands on the pivot of efficient, effective, responsible administration engaging all and aiming to serve the common interest for good. Countries across the globe having varied political ideologies and administrative structures
showcase successful and failed development primarily owing to governance factor. These experiences provide lessons for “Dos” and “Don’ts” for good governance. In sum, governance has to be for the people and by the people to attain sustainable development supported by able and responsible public administration system.

This Conference jointly organized by the International Institute of Administrative Sciences and the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore provides the platform to discuss, exchange thoughts, views and experiences to learn from one another on impact of good governance on economic progress and human development.

**Call for Papers**

In recent times, the term “inclusive development” has gained global traction. To achieve shared prosperity, which is underlying inclusive development, there is profound scope to examine what aspects of the current system needs to be adapted, refined, regulated or rethought. The key question is how to place shared prosperity at the heart of economic and social policy-making, creating a basis for renewed governance system. Across continents and countries, practical ways to deliver their vision for inclusive growth are being innovated.

It is in this backdrop, papers are invited on the following sub-themes in the broader context of the general conference theme to foster collaboration, share best practice and generate discussion and debate on how inclusive growth can best be achieved through good governance policies and practices.

- **Participatory Development**
  Poverty and inequality remain the overarching concerns in many of the developing and underdeveloped countries. With high degree of inequality in incomes, there is unequal access to education, health, water and electricity, as well as huge disparities in voice, assets, and opportunities for the poor and the marginalized. This has created severe tensions affecting the faith of people in democratic systems to solve their problems. Empowerment of the poor and accountability of public institutions and administration are critical components for poverty alleviation and restoring faith in administration.

  In this context, strengthening the capacity of civil society organizations to contribute to the formulation and implementation of public policies that seek to reduce poverty, removing obstacles to and mobilizing resources for the empowerment of the poor, augmenting strategic partnerships among actors who seek to reduce poverty and strengthening and promoting social accountability mechanisms assume priority importance. Various countries have taken steps in this direction, which have yielded positive results.

- **Transition to Inclusiveness**
  Understanding and recognizing the needs of people in exclusion is a pre-requisite to plan adequate and effective facilities and services, supported by prompt and people friendly attitude and behaviour of service providers. These constitute the fundamental characteristics of good governance. And to move in this direction, the key factors that are essential for public administration to imbibe are – (a) Accountability: being answerable for decisions, actions and behaviours towards people; (b) Integrity: being honest and fair; (c) Responsiveness: responding with empathy, courtesy and pro-activeness to people and their needs; and (d) Gender Equality: a social construct that differentiates roles, responsibilities and needs of man and woman.

  This lays the foundation of good governance, which implies efficient public service delivery, engaging citizens, ensuring rights of citizens, and empowering citizens; and paves the way for equal participation; equal treatment, equal rights before the law, rights to access to services; equitable access to resources and opportunities; and representation and meaningful participation in state institutions and decision-making process. For countries especially in transition to democracy and those in post-conflict stage need to learn to adopt these essential features for clean, transparent public administration and sustainable growth and restore faith in government. There are examples of countries treading this path and their challenges and solutions provide lessons to learn.
Sustainable Development

Sustainable development implies care to preserve existing environmental resources for the benefit of future generations. Tackling high rates of social exclusion and poverty are important challenges for many developing and emerging economies. This has led to development without paying heed to the norms of ecology and sustainability. Despite failure on this front, there are exemplary models of advancement in democracy, economic growth, environmental health and quality of life. Several initiatives such as skill development, application of information technology and the likes have been taken to mainstream the underdeveloped areas and the deprived sections of society. There are different challenges of achieving development and balancing between the ecology, economic and social equity and providing good life for individuals and community is critical. The experiences in this regard could be lighthouse models for governance for development.

Guidelines for Authors

An abstract for a paper to be presented at the conference should only point out what the paper is about; how the paper is related to previous research on the matter; the method used to answer the main question underlying the paper, what are the contents of the paper, how the paper contributes to the theme of the panel. The abstract should not exceed 400 words.

Papers addressing the above-mentioned topics should have clear conceptual and theoretical basis and meet methodological standards. The papers can be based upon empirical research, and/or case studies. The final paper should not exceed 6000 words. The final paper should contain:

- Cover Sheet, stating the author/co-author names, address, institution, position in the institution, country and e-mail address;
- Title Page, mentioning: full title, subtitle and abstract (up to 400 words) with background, aim, method, results, conclusion;
- Manuscript, with: table of content; main text; footnotes; references, tables.
Contribution of the Private Sector to the Long-term Sustainability of Public Policies for Development: Designing a Self-sustainable Public-private Social Pact
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Conference theme

In emerging economies, public sector leaders are important agents seeking to transform the socio-economic situation in their territories in the pursuit of development.

However, in the effort to generate this change, public leaders are faced with multiple limitations, which can occur both in the generation of vision and in the implementation thereof:

- Regarding development vision, challenges involve prioritizing what is really important, and ensuring legitimacy of the project.
- Regarding implementation, challenges are of managerial nature, and relate to sustainability and continuity.

One of the keys to achieving this is to broaden the scope of action and strengthen leadership by incorporating other social actors (academia, civil society and the private sector), guaranteeing medium and long-term continuity. This requires in turn to rethink the relationship between the Government and the Private sector, that is to engage in a new and broader pact based on trust and the common good, where

- Government is not seen as the enemy or opponent but as the facilitator who fulfils a subsidiary role; and where
- The Private Sector is seen not as a generator of economic resources at any price but as a fundamental agent of contribution to the collective welfare, which clearly appreciate both the means and the goals to achieve.

In the context of searching for a new social equilibrium, the tools that used to materialize this agreement and the importance of generating shared future visions and strategies to make them come true are fundamental. In this sense, Prospective Studies (Foresight), due to its power in generating future images as its eminently participatory character, is presented as one of the most important alternatives in this respect. However, the visions proposed will not generate a change in society if they are not related to relevant strategic processes that seek to implement them (fundamentally based upon public policies, planning, management and projects with clear orientation to results and in an environment of clear accountability).

Creating an enabling environment to achieve the above in practice is not easy, given that there are multiple limitations to develop trust between the actors and to align their aspirations towards common objectives, born of social decisions and choice, that at the same time be effective, accountable and inclusive.
This is an important challenge that the academia has in the coming years, understanding how is this possible and what are the limitations that we face in this regard.

If we manage to create a system that seeks to materialize the contributions of each of the social actors in the generation of long-term equilibria that lead us to development, sustainable change in our societies can be generated.

**Call for contributions**

There are thus multiple challenges to achieve a balance in _public-private participation for the generation of good public policies_, which benefits all citizens. To be able to contribute to this purpose and to create a _governance system_ that guarantees its success, _paper proposals_ addressing cutting-edge issues and innovative ideas, taking as a base among others the following research subtopics, are welcomed:

- **Vision and Strategy**
  - How can the public and private sectors coproduce long-term development visions?
  - How can training instill a long-term orientation in public-sector leaders?
  - How can the private sector contribute to sustainable development visions at long term?

- **Trust**
  - How can trust between the public and private sectors be strengthened?
  - What cognitive, cultural or institutional barriers impede joint decision making by the public and private sector leaders?
  - How can public-private partnerships support equitable development?

- **Effectiveness of Policies and Equity**
  - How can the private sector contribute to develop more effective, accountable and inclusive public policies, also at the territorial level?
  - How can private sector knowledge regarding strategy and execution be transferred to the public?
  - How can the private sector contribute to social-welfare policies?

- **Accountability**
  - How can governance systems ensure societal control over public policies?
  - How can the accountability of public and private leaders regarding long-term development goals be strengthened?
  - How can mixed public-private mechanisms to prevent corruption be developed? How to develop a governance that prioritizes ethics?

The Conference aims to bring together an interdisciplinary community of scholars and practitioners who are doing creative, rigorous and solution-oriented research on such a way as to define the profile of a new and more effective public management in developing countries. The following submissions are welcome:

- Original research papers;
- Policy and practice-oriented case studies.
Social Impact Investing: Innovative Policies and Solutions for Funding Public Infrastructures and Social Services (health, education, social) at Global Level
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Social Impact Investing (SII), term coined in 2008 by JP Morgan and Rockefeller Foundation, consists of innovative policies from at least two points of view. Firstly, they involve different actors: the Government (national or local), private investors, financial intermediaries, social enterprises. Secondly, they seek to achieve a double objective: a strong social impact and an economic gain, thus reaching an equilibrium among the financial payoff and the community benefits.

The time is ripe for this type of approach because, over time, the contrast between charity and profit has faded away. Today, the scarcity of public resources is pushing towards a different mentality, one in which generating positive social impacts making a “fair” profit is not only possible, but also convenient.

This opens a large variety of possibilities, based on the assumption that private capital can intentionally contribute to the scaling up social innovation initiatives and projects, also in combination with public funds, in order to empower the societal capacity to find solutions to the most complex social challenges.

SII aims at:
- Producing a positive impact and therefore a social change;
- Measurable objectives to be achieved through a collaborative arrangement among the actors involved;
- Orientation towards outcomes (perceived change in the whole community) rather than output (quantity of services provided);
- Economic return for investors.

The first country to use SII was the United Kingdom, where in 2010 the Government developed the first SIB (Social Impact Bond), followed by the United States, in particular by the city of New York (2012). Almost 10 years after the birth of this phenomenon it is interesting to channel into a track, and a study group, the point of view of academia and practitioners, with a particular attention on the perspective of PA, usually involved in SII as regulator and guarantee.

The track welcomes contributions regarding, but not limited to, the following topics:
- Social impact investments and emerging social needs;
- Social impact investments and the role of different stakeholders;
- Social impact bonds and Social impact investment funds;
- Measurement and measurability of social impact investments;
- Social impact investments and sustainable growth;
- Any other related topic

What interest the most is to investigate the main public policy implications: redefinition of public-private relations (Government–Business–Social Enterprise partnerships) and stakeholders management related to the spread of social impact investing. A particular emphasis is dedicated on the collaborative patterns aimed at generating positive social and environmental impacts. The focus will be on the experiences of use of alternative financial tools to regenerate welfare systems. On this topic a Permanent Study Group will be proposed.
Promoting Participatory Democracy: Responsive Governance through Public-Private Partnership

The European Association of Public Private Partnership (EAPPP) is a research association of European academics and professionals which promotes interdisciplinary and international studies on public private partnership.
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Context

More than being a method to alleviate financial burden from public authorities, public private partnership is increasingly being regarded as a method of promotion of inclusive growth and good governance.

Able to overcome the difficulties that public authorities may face in answering the needs of the administered community, public private partnership involve citizens and businesses in finding new and innovative methods to provide public value. In this way, the private sector directly participates in the selection of relevant interests and in the choice of the administrative actions needed to satisfy them. In a sense, the private actors find themselves on the “supply side” of public services.

If some authors consider this dynamic as problematic, as it may be able to de-legitimize public authorities by taking away their monopoly over the care of interests determined within the democratic cycle, other scholars have proposed the idea that public private partnership is supported by a different kind of democratic principle, not ‘representative’ but ‘participatory’.
In this perspective, public private projects may be legitimized by their results and, more specifically, by their effectiveness in satisfying the community’s needs. A pivotal issue then becomes that of monitoring the execution of the project, in order to verify the success of public private partnership.

The Track intends to further this debate, deepening the question of how the participation of private actors to the satisfaction of public needs changes the paradigm of democratic legitimation. The discussion will focus, from both a theoretical and practical perspective, on how proposals deriving from the private sector are able to impact to the responsiveness of governments and, consequently, to the applicable rules and principles of administrative action. Moreover, discussion will encompass the methods applied to master public private partnership complexities and to monitor deliveries of the projects (i.e. timing, level of performance, quality of the services, accessibility).

**Key questions**

The Track encourages the submission of papers that respond to the following research questions:

- In which sense public private partnership can be regarded as a participatory instrument of governance?
- How do the concepts of democracy and accountability change in cases of public private partnership?
- How can public private partnership promote inclusiveness and solidarity between the private and the public sector?
- How does the concept of ‘public interest’ change in light of the involvement of private actors in the satisfaction of the community’s needs?
- How can the success of public private partnership be evaluated?
- How is it possible to effectively monitor public private partnership projects?

Other papers deepening the effects of the spreading of public-private partnership in the promotion of participatory and inclusive governance will be taken into consideration.
AREA STUDIES AND PUBLIC GOVERNANCE

The fourth cluster of call-for-papers is characterized a specific geographical focus which is adopted, a will to initiate learning processes with other countries or regions through dialogue, and to approach area studies with a public governance perspective.

Koh Keng We & Liu Hong (Nanyang Technological University, Singapore) focus on Singapore’s Bicentennial in 2019. Dominant historical narratives frame Singapore as a former colonial entrepot which evolved towards a nation-state with one of the most dynamic economies and effective governance systems in the world. The Chairs welcome contributions examining this narrative from different angles and interrogating its policy implications in terms of national development strategies, social management structure, and multicultural practices. Full panel contributions are especially welcome.

Liu Hong and his peers from Nanyang Technological University in Singapore examine a particular kind of capacity-building strategy, namely: South-South knowledge transfer paralleling economic development. Paper and panel proposals are called for, examining, i.e.: the drivers of South-South knowledge transfer, cases and best practices thereof, evaluative contributions, and innovative theoretical approaches of this emerging topic.

In their Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) track, Liu Hong and Guanie Lim (Nanyang Technological University, Singapore) focus on the more assertive stance adopted by China in global affairs and its (public) policy implications. They ask whether it challenges the current global order and wonder about the development outcomes of Chinese strategies in the infrastructure (BRI), financial (New Development Bank), trade, movements of population, and other sectors.

In their track short-titled “Public Administration Theory in Different Worlds”, Chung-An Chen (Nanyang Technological University, Singapore) and Bangcheng Liu (Shanghai Jiaotong University, China) wonder how civil servants trained abroad do apply the skills they learned back home: do they copy-paste, do they adjust to local context, or does that latter one fully prevail? They call for research outputs which are context-based, comparative, and/or large-sample/cross-country.

Ukertor Gabriel Moti (AAPAM & University of Abuja, Nigeria) and Steve Troupin (IIAS & KULeuven, Belgium) chair the AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce for Public Administration Research Capacities in Africa, whose aim is to further develop scientific literature on African governance systems. The Chairs add explanatory and evaluative objectives to the descriptive ones that were pursued during the 2018 IIAS Congress and are kept on the agenda. They therefore call for papers examining how to get good governance systems in Africa?

Koichiro Agata (Waseda University, Japan) chairs the sessions of the Japan Study Group of IIAS, which meets for the third time on row to discuss contemporary governance challenges and solutions in Japan. This year, the focus lies on three specific themes, where the contributions should fit: personnel administration, administrative organization and administrative analysis.
Singapore’s Bicentennial: 
Governing Singapore’s Heritage, Development and Identity
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Singapore’s bicentennial has elicited controversy even before the onset of the actual event. While the 50th anniversary of independent Singapore seemed to have been a straightforward affair, the commemoration of modern Singapore seemed to have run into a postcolonial backlash. In the past year, debates about the meaningfulness of commemorating 1819 and, through association, celebrating colonialism and Singapore’s colonial past, as well as the actual place of Raffles and 1819 in the historiography of Singapore, have revealed the politically and ideologically charged undertones of Singapore’s history and historiography.

The commemoration of 1819 is just not a celebration. It presents an opportunity for Singapore to reflect on its management and governance of historical narrative, national development, culture, heritage and tourism. Balancing the evolutionary needs of Singapore as it develops into a nation state with the management of historical narratives and preservation of cultural heritage has always been a delicate affair. It involves a myriad group of societal and state actors that continue to shape the pathway of cultural heritage preservation and development. This calls for scholars to examine Singapore cultural governance beyond the responsibilities of the state actors, but to also include other societal actors and their complex relationships with the state. Concurrently, placing this discussion within Singapore’s evolution from a colonial entrepot to its subsequent development as a nation-state into one of the major economies in Asia and the world.

This proposal aims to shed light on this multifaceted topic by asking and answering the questions: ‘How should we understand the idea of ‘heritage’, and ‘Singapore’s historical narratives’? ’ What are the forces shaping current ideas and narratives?’, ‘How should Singapore manage its cultural heritage sector in light of rapid modernization and urbanization?’ ‘What are the outcomes of existing frameworks and strategies on Singapore’s society and national development?’ Topics of interest can include, but are not limited to:

- Re-examining Singapore’s historiography and history, especially in the regional and global context;
- Evolution, characteristics and challenges of Singapore’s public administration and public policy;
- International/Local frameworks and their impact on Singapore’s Cultural Heritage Governance;
- Government strategies, challenges and their impact on heritage, memories, narratives, archives, architecture and museums;
- The evolving roles and impacts of local and global networks of societal actors in cultural and heritage sector;
- Heritage, Tourism and Development;
• Singapore in a comparative perspective of East-Asian development trajectories;
• Multi-culturalism and public governance in a changing world.

The Guest Chairpersons cordially invite proposals for panels. Proposals should be between 300 and 500 words and should include the main points that will be explored. Theories/perspectives, research methods, results and findings should also be briefly described.
Transnational Knowledge Transfer in the Global South: Capacity Building Towards Sustainable Development Goals
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Every sector of society has been in the process of interpreting and pursuing sustainability and sustainable development within their specific contexts. Moving towards the Sustainable Development Goals advocated by the United Nations and following the updated definition of “good governance” which emphasizes effectiveness, accountability and inclusion, capacity building is becoming an urgent task. How to seize opportunities among the sweeping advances of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (“4IR”)? How to make government an effective enabler supporting various actors to play their roles in a cohesive manner? How to avoid reinventing the wheel and make advantage of prior practitioner’ successful experience? Transnational knowledge transfer might be an answer. Through knowledge sharing on various platforms, the goal of capacity building of those less advanced countries or regions might be realized with more efficiency.

A major trend of the past two decades has been the transformation of growth and development performance and prospects in the global South. Increases in economic output and major improvements in key human development indicators as well as the rapid expansion of trade, investment and financial, technological and other flows between developing countries have been remarkable. Along with this trend, the global development cooperation landscape is changing rapidly. Emerging economies and other developing countries have become key actors in the new development architecture through their contribution to overcoming pressing development challenges. In addition, the diversity and richness of the shared practices and experiences, the lessons they offer for building common agendas at global and regional levels, and the leadership they promote, particularly at the local level, have also played a major part in the global transformation.

South-South transfer and cooperation has since emerged as an important vehicle to accelerate human development and will assume greater importance in the future. It has increasingly demonstrated its contribution to development results through a variety of flexible cooperation modalities, including knowledge exchanges, technology transfers, financing, peer support, and neighbourhood initiatives, as well as countries forming common development agendas and seeking collective solutions. Therefore moving away from the traditional one-way learning flow from the North (Western developed countries) to the South (those less developed countries) as well as deviating from the conventional donor-recipient relationship, this track looks at the transnational knowledge transfer models, processes, practices among countries in the Southern hemisphere,
to facilitate knowledge, skills expertise and resource sharing in the political, economic, social, cultural, environmental and technical domains.

- Here come some very interesting questions deserving further exploration:
- What are the major drivers behind the thriving knowledge transfer in the Global South?
- What are the major features, opportunities and challenges in the process of transnational knowledge transfer?
- In light of contemporary conditions and the evolving context in the Global South, what is a new conceptual framework to understand South-South transfer and cooperation?
- How are the learning outcomes or effectiveness? Can some “best practices” workable in one country/region/setting be transplanted to another country/region/setting? Besides, we also expect
- Theoretical innovations which could explain the phenomenon from new and insightful perspectives, especially given that the trend is departing from the conventional knowledge transfer route.

Interested scholar could submit paper or panel proposals centering on the above several topics. For individual paper proposal, an abstract of about 300 words are required; and for panel proposal, the panel convener is expected to submit a five-page proposal including an introduction of the panel and three to four paper abstracts constituting the panel.
Belt and Road Initiative, Governance and Economic Development: A Tapestry of Possibilities
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Since its launch in late 2013 by Chinese President Xi Jinping, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) has become a significant factor in shaping China’s economic and diplomatic relations with the world. The BRI is seemingly solidifying China’s already prominent role on the international arena, with Beijing adopting a more assertive stance in global as well as regional economic and financial affairs. For example, China has cooperated with other like-minded economies in launching alternative institutions such as the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and the New Development Bank (NDB) (formerly referred to as the BRICS Development Bank). Relative to the existing Western-led, Bretton Woods institutions, these Chinese-driven institutions are welcomed by many emerging economies, especially those along the BRI routes. Increasing Chinese clout is also witnessed in the business arena, with investment associated with the BRI surpassing the USD 1 trillion-mark. One of the most obvious manifestations of this form of market power can be seen in the Chinese firms’ landmark cross-border acquisition of large, established brand name firms such as IBM (information technology), Club Med (luxury holiday provider), and Volvo (automobile).

This proposal aims to shed light on this multifaceted topic by asking and answering the question: ‘Is China’s ascendency challenging the pre-existing political and economic order? If so, what are their outcomes on local and regional development?’ To this end, the proposal is soliciting fresh insights that would enable the scholarly community to gain a deeper understanding on the aforementioned subjects. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

• The rise of alternative, China-driven institutions such as the AIIB and the NDB, with a focus on their impacts on the pre-existing Western-centric political and economic order;
• The political economy of new, region-specific mega free trade agreements, especially the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) and the US-lite version of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP);
• The proliferation of Chinese-sponsored infrastructure (e.g. high speed railway and maritime ports) and their development outcomes for the relevant economies;
• The evolving global and regional production networks of goods and services orchestrated by Chinese transnational corporations (TNCs) and their impacts on governance;
• Public administration and public policy in the context of the BRI;
• Comparative public governance in the BRI-related countries and regions;
• Economic strategies of selected economies in tapping into the BRI.

The Guest Chairpersons cordially invite proposals for panels. Proposals should be between 300 and 500 words and should include the main points that will be explored. Theories/perspectives, research methods, results and findings should also be briefly described. Enquiries are welcome and are to be directed to Dr Guanie Lim.
One Public Administration Theory in Different Worlds: Lessons from Local and Comparative Angles
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In recent years, knowledge transfer has become a buzzword in public administration. A typical example is the experience of Singapore: Many developing countries have sent public officials to Singapore for short-term or long-term training, expecting to learn from Singapore or “copy/transfer the Singapore model.” In academia, in fact, knowledge transfer occurred even earlier. Thousands of international students have been to the US or UK to study modern theories of public management in the last couple of decades. Many of these international students have been back to their hometown, serving as high-rank public officials. This may be deemed another kind of knowledge transfer.

In all the cases of knowledge transfer, do learners simply “copy and paste” the successful experiences, and accordingly make their own stories of success? If so, do we have enough cases to make it a general theory? Or alternatively, do learners modify a general theory or best practice based on the local context? In this case, should we assume that the local context matters, and learners should further compare their experiences with those in other countries/contexts in order to construct a general theory? In fact, since the beginning of this century, generic management scholars have started to call for more studies of “Asian management” (Hofstede, 2007), to some degree stressing the importance of the context. In the field of public administration, context-based research, comparative research, and large-sample cross-country studies are still relatively scant.

This proposal aims to address this insufficiency. We invite both promising scholars and established researchers to share their ideas. Submissions in all subfields of public administration, such as local governance, regulation, public personnel, public budgeting, etc. are welcome. Submissions should focus on at least one of the following themes:

- Context-based research
- Comparative research
- Large-sample, cross-country research
Evaluating Good Governance Systems in Africa

AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce for Public Administration Research Capacities in Africa

The AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce for Public Administration Research Capacities in Africa (AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce) is the joint vehicle of the African Association for Public Administration and Management (AAPAM) and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) for the further development of a scientific body of cumulative knowledge on governance systems in Africa, of a sustainable international network of scholars supporting it, and of publication and other professional opportunities for it.

The AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce published its first calls-for-paper in the framework of the 2018 IIAS Congress in Tunis, Tunisia. 11 papers were presented, and three presentations made. The findings were presented in the 39th AAPAM Roundtable Conference in Gaborone, Botswana. Building on this successful first experience, the AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce publishes its second call-for-paper in the framework of the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference.

On behalf of AAPAM:
Prof. Gabriel Ukertor Moti, University of Abuja, Nigeria
ukertor@yahoo.com

On behalf of IIAS:
Dr. Steve Troupin,
International Institute of Administrative Sciences & KU Leuven University, Belgium
s.troupin@iias-iisa.org

Background

The Tunis sessions of the AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce aimed at describing systems of governance actually in use in African polities. Out of the eleven presented papers, three dimensions appear needed to capture their full empirical diversity (Troupin & Moti, forthcoming):

- Type of authority: rational-legal authority, as opposed to charismatic or traditional ones;
- Type of leadership: transformational or mobilizational, versus transactional leadership; and
- Inclusiveness, referring to the extent to which various governance systems empirically coexist.

These findings contradict the neo-patrimonial hypothesis (Bratton & Van De Walle 1994), which is dominant in the field (Olivier de Sardan 2016): neo-patrimonialism is but one of the eight types of governance these dimensions give to see.
Call-for-papers

The IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference focuses on the theme of “Effective, Accountable, and Inclusive Governance”. This theme captures the emerging consensus, at the level of the United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration, as to what constitute good governance in the contemporary era, characterized by a global consensus on the goals of development –captured by Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) agenda– and the decreasing prominence of liberal recipes to realize these.

Accordingly, the AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce wishes to pursue its work in three directions:

- Pursue the descriptive empirical work
  The papers presented during the Tunis sessions left many regions, countries, and sectors unexplored.
  The AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce remains committed to the systematically collection of case studies and thick descriptions of governance systems actually in use in the African continent, in any policy sector, country or government level.
  With governance system is meant any structural arrangement leading to the production of public goods.

- Understand the context in which governance types emerge
  The AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce invites contributions explaining why certain types of governance are in place.
  Neo-institutionalist explanations are preferred, putting emphasis on, i.e.: the interests rationally pursued by the actors at play; the ideologies, ideas and blueprints for development, and their circulation; and the historical events as they unfold in a given time-space context.
  Of particular interest here is how Western, Chinese, and other values and interests lead to path dependencies.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of types of governance for the SDGs
  The AAPAM-IIAS Taskforce invites authors to develop evaluative statements regarding types of governance in use in Africa.
  Out of the eight theoretically possible types of governance, three appear dominant in Africa, from the limited evidence collected in Tunis: (1) modern or Western governance, characterized by rational-legal type of authority, transactional leadership, and the inclusion of citizens through free elections; (2) developmental or Asian governance, with transformational/mobilizational leadership exerted by an exclusive elite on a rational-legal way; and (3) neo-patrimonial governance, characterized by pervasive (i.e.: inclusive) patterns of transactional relations between traditional/charismatic leadership and its clientele.
  The Taskforce welcomes papers emphasizing the (absence of) developmental records attributable to these types of governance.
Evaluer les systèmes de bonne gouvernance en Afrique

Taskforce de l’AAAPM et de l’IISA pour des capacités de recherche en administration publique en Afrique

La Taskforce de l’AAAPM et de l’IISA pour les capacités de recherche en administration publique en Afrique (Taskforce AAAPM-IISA) est l’outil conjoint de l’Association Africaine d’Administration Publique et de Management (AAAPM) et de l’Institut International des Sciences Administratives pour la poursuite du développement d’un corps scientifique de connaissances cumulatives sur les systèmes de gouvernance en Afrique, d’un réseau international durable d’académiques le soutenant, et d’opportunités de publications et autres pour ce réseau.

La Taskforce AAAPM-IISA a publié son premier appel à contributions dans le cadre du Congrès 2018 de l’IISA à Tunis en Tunisie. 11 papiers y ont été présentés, en plus de trois présentations. Les résultats ont été présentés à la 39ème Conférence de la Table-ronde de l’AAAPM à Gaborone au Botswana. Construisant sur cette première expérience positive, la Taskforce AAAPM-IISA publie son second appel à contributions dans le cadre de la Conférence IISA-Lien 2019.

Pour l’AAAPM:
Prof. Gabriel Ukertor Moti, Université d’Abuja, Nigeria
ukertor@yahoo.com

Pour l’IISA:
Dr. Steve Troupin,
Institut International des Sciences Administratives & KU Leuven Université, Belgique
s.troupin@iias-iisa.org

Rappel
Les sessions de Tunis de la Taskforce AAAPM-IISA visaient à décrire les systèmes de gouvernance réellement en vigueur dans les régimes africains. Des onze papiers présentés, trois dimensions semblent nécessaires pour rendre pleinement compte de la diversité empirique (Troupin & Moti, forthcoming):

- Type d’autorité: autorité rationnelle-légale, opposée aux types charismatique ou traditionnel;
- Type de leadership: transformationnel ou mobilisationnel, par opposition au leadership transactionnel, et
- Inclusivité, renvoyant à la mesure ans laquelle différents systèmes de gouvernance coexistent.
Ces résultats contredisent l’hypothèse néo-patrimoniale (Bratton & Van De Walle 1994) qui est dominante dans le champ (Olivier de Sardan 2016): le néo-patrimonialisme n’est qu’un des huit types de gouvernance que ces dimensions laissent à voir.

**Appel à contributions**


C’est pourquoi la Taskforce AAAPM-IISA souhaite poursuivre ses travaux dans trois directions :

- Poursuivre le travail empirique descriptif
  Les papiers présentés dans les sessions de Tunis ont laissé de nombreuses régions, pays, et secteurs non-explorés.

  La Taskforce AAAPM-IISA reste dévouée à la collecte systématique d’étude de cas et de descriptions fines des systèmes de gouvernance effectivement utilisés sur le continent africain, dans tout secteur politique, pays ou niveau de gouvernement.

  Le terme système de gouvernance renvoie à tout arrangement structurel menant à la production de biens publics.

- Comprendre le contexte dans lequel les types de gouvernance émergent
  La Taskforce AAAPM-IISA sollicite des contributions expliquant pourquoi certains types de gouvernance sont en place.

  Les explications néo-institutionnelles sont préférées, mettant l’accent sur, par exemple : les intérêts poursuivis de façon rationnelle par les acteurs en présence ; les idéologies, idées et modèles de développement et leur circulation ; et les événements historiques tels qu’ils ont lieu dans un contexte spatio-temporel donné.

  La façon par laquelle les valeurs et intérêts occidentaux et chinois mènent à des dépendances de sentier présente ici un intérêt particulier.

- Évaluer l’efficacité des types de gouvernance pour les ODD
  La Taskforce AAAPM-IISA invite les auteurs à développer des propositions évaluatives relatives aux types de gouvernance en vigueur en Afrique.

  Des huit types de gouvernance théoriquement possible, trois semblent dominants en Afrique, sur base des résultats empiriques limités collectés à Tunis (Troupin & Moti, forthcoming) : (1) la gouvernance moderne ou occidentale, caractérisée par une autorité rationnelle-légale, un leadership transactionnel, et l’inclusion des citoyens via des élections libres ; (2) la gouvernance développementale ou asiatique, avec un leadership transformationnel/mobilisationnel qui s’exerce par une élite exclusive d’une façon rationnelle-légale ; et (3) la gouvernance néo-patrimoniale, caractérisée par des relations profondément transactionnelles entre un leadership traditionnel/charismatique et sa clientèle.

  La Taskforce invite les papiers mettant en évidence des résultats développementaux (ou leur absence) attribuables à ces modes de gouvernance.
Historical Reflection on the Ideas and Thoughts of Public Administration in Japan

Prof. Dr. Koichiro Agata
Council of Administration Member IIAS
Former President of Japanese Society for Public Administration
agata@waseda.jp

Which objects and how has the discipline of Public Administration in Japan researched? Which level of the research has it reached? These are the topics of our panel.

In the last three years a study group composed of nine professors in Japan has been engaging in these topics to reflect on some selected categories of PA from the historical sight by reading extensively forgoing researches and analyzing their viewpoints of discussions.

We would first like to compile and analyze the research achievements in the field of PA in Japan and then give some perspectives for the future orientation of PA in Japan also by introducing comparative approaches.

In this session three concrete categories of PA, namely Personnel Administration, Administrative Organization and Administrative Analysis, should be selected and discussed by three of the member professors.
**Open Track**

**Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Governance**

Lichia Saner-Yiu  
General Rapporteur of the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference  
Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development  
yiu@csend.org

Interested individuals – scholars and practitioners alike – willing to provide an original (i.e.: not fitting in any of the 22 other tracks) contribution to the IIAS-Lien 2019 Conference may submit a contribution in this Open Track.

The contribution should be relevant to the Conference Theme “Effective, Accountable and Inclusive Governance”. This theme reflects the emerging consensus at United Nations level as to what the concept of good governance means in the Agenda 2030 context. It also incorporates concerns regarding the adaptation of governance systems to the ongoing Fourth Industrial Revolution.

- Effective governance, where effectiveness refers to competence, sound policymaking and collaboration;
- Accountable governance, were accountability refers to integrity, transparency and independent oversight;
- Inclusive governance, where inclusiveness refers to leaving no one behind, non-discrimination, participation, subsidiarity, and intergenerational equity.

The contribution can be a paper proposal or a panel proposal. Paper proposals indicate the theory, the empirical evidence, and preview the findings. They are limited to 500 words.

Panel proposals include a general description of the panel, identify the chairperson(s) of the panel, and contains a list of speakers, with their institutional affiliation, email, and the title of their intervention.
How to Submit a Contribution?

In order to submit a contribution, please visit this webpage: https://www.conftool.org/iias-lien-conference2019/register.php.

After an account is created, you will be able to submit an abstract in a given Conference track. Unless stated otherwise in the call, abstracts are limited to 500 words. In each track, at least one corresponding author is mentioned: you may contact him/her in advance if you have questions. The deadline to submit is set at 3 March.

The chairs and/or the reviewers will evaluate your contribution, on basis of three criterions, leading to an overall judgment: relevance for the track, quality of the substance, and quality of the form. You will be notified when the decision is made, on March 15th latest. It can be acceptance, rejection, or conditional acceptance.

Registrations will be open from late February onwards.
The full paper (if applicable) is expected by May 31st.


The organizers can be contacted at info@iias-lien-conference2019.org.


Après avoir créé un compte, vous serez en mesure de proposer un résumé dans un atelier de la conférence. Sauf disposition contraire dans l’appel, les résumés sont limités à 500 mots. Dans chaque atelier, au moins un auteur correspondant est mentionné : vous pouvez le/la contacter à l’avance si vous avez des questions de contenu. Le date limite est fixée au 3 mars.


Les inscriptions seront ouvertes à partir de fin février.

La contribution complète (si applicable) est attendue d’ici le 31 mai.


Les organisateurs peuvent être contactés à info@iias-lien-conference2019.org.
ABOUT THE ORGANIZERS

The International Institute of Administrative Sciences

The International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) is an international non-profit organization headquartered in Brussels (Belgium). Established in 1930, its mission is to:

- Organize high impact events for academe and the public service,
- Produce and disseminate relevant knowledge on public governance,
- Enable strategic projects with its members and partners, and
- Accredit training programs.

Every year in late June, the IIAS organizes its flagship Congress, gathering more than 300 scholars, students and civil servants in a different region of the world.

The IIAS is also a Group of several public governance societies contributing to its mission through own events, publications, projects and accreditation services:

- The International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA)
- The European Group of Public Administration (EGPA)
- The Asian Group of Public Administration (AGPA)
- The Latin American Group of Public Administration (LAGPA)

Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

A research-intensive public university, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore (NTU Singapore) has 33,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students in the colleges of Engineering, Business, Science, and Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, and its Graduate College. NTU’s Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine was established jointly with Imperial College London. In 2018, NTU was placed 12th globally in the Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) World University Rankings. It was also ranked the world’s best young university (under 50 years old) by QS for the fifth consecutive year. In addition, NTU was named the world’s fastest rising young university by Times Higher Education in 2015.

The Nanyang Centre for Public Administration (NCPA) is a leading institution in Asia that provides policy-oriented postgraduate education and executive training programmes as well as cutting-edge research on public governance. The School of Social Sciences which includes Economics, Psychology, Public Policy and Global Affairs, Sociology, Geography and Urban Planning has directed extensive academic attention to the central themes of effective, accountable and inclusive governance.

Every alternate year, with generous funding support by the Lien Foundation, NCPA organizes the Lien International Conference on Good Governance where more than 200 scholars, researchers and practitioners from all over the world gather to examine major issues in governance and public service delivery in the national and global contexts.