

August 19th, 2002

**NEW CHALLENGES FOR HIGH LEVEL LEADERSHIP TRAINING IN  
PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE IN A GLOBALIZING WORLD**

Gordon S. Smith

This long title covers a broad range of issues. I welcome this initiative of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration. To situate where I am coming from in this paper, I shall begin with a few words about myself. It may help explain why I emphasize some points and (apparently) ignore others.

After obtaining a Ph.D. in Political Science, focusing on policy development and international issues, I spent over 30 years in the Canadian Government, mostly working directly with Prime Ministers and Ministers. It has led me to reflect and write about what information they require to take decisions, how one can best ensure the consequences of specific decisions are clear and, particularly difficult, whether there are ways of persuading people who are elected every four or five years to think longer term.

Throughout much of this period, Canada had a Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, who understood that the really big issues confronting Canada and the world increasingly required thinking ahead, acting before the problems became overwhelming. Yet, with the widespread conviction that markets were the only way to ensure efficiency, there was and is a tension. The private sector is ruled by quarterly reports. Governments cannot be, as they have the responsibility to prepare their countries for what is coming down the road in the years ahead. Senior officials have to listen to the people as much as to their political masters whose only concerns are re-election, although this is easier said than done.

Trudeau wanted issues debated in a rational way, was interested in how his Government could set priorities and was prepared to innovate. I advised him for a period on “machinery of government questions” – in other words which minister should be responsible for what subjects, how the departmental structure of government should be organized and what was the most effective way of organizing decision-making at the ministerial level. These are the Prime Minister’s prerogatives, although to implement them legislation may be required. He wanted to ensure the organization of government was responsive to the challenges facing it.

I was also responsible during part of this period for advice on senior appointments and human resource policy generally for the most senior levels of government. We introduced better succession planning and career development. We tried to relate this function as well to emerging priorities.

Trudeau believed that there needed to be a conscious setting of priorities, and that these priorities needed to be reflected in expenditure decisions and legislative priorities. While I would not want the reader to be left with the impression that everything worked exactly as it was supposed to, some real progress was made. There was success in looking longer term, in working on issues which cut across departmental lines and in bringing domestic and international issues together.

In short, Pierre Trudeau understood we live in an increasingly interdependent world, and that is the basis for my ideas about the training of senior public servants which follow.

For the last 15 years of my career in the Canadian Government, I was either a Deputy Minister or an Ambassador in a major post abroad. As Deputy Foreign Minister from 1994 to 1997, I was responsible for policy advice as well as management (8,000 people, \$1B US). I will draw heavily on that experience in what follows.

Foreign ministries used to deal with foreign policy. Relations with other states could be managed in a relatively compartmentalized manner – that is, separately from domestic policies. During the last century, particularly the latter half, foreign ministries increasingly dealt with economic issues, bringing them, not always harmoniously with other ministries in government, closer to domestic matters.

What struck me eight or nine years ago, as I contemplated my new assignment as Deputy Foreign Minister, was that there was a tsunami (or tidal wave) of global issues that were increasingly at the core of international discourse – environmental issues such as climate change, trans-national organized crime and the spread of infectious diseases, to cite three examples. These were not the traditional stuff of foreign policy. Our foreign ministry was not well equipped to handle them. The inter-departmental machinery was weak. Yet these were the issues which were increasingly on leaders' minds. I created a major bureau to focus on these global matters in the Canadian foreign ministry, and transferred resources away from some more traditional pursuits in order to support it.

It was also clear that the information revolution was going to have profound implications. Email and the Internet were going to change the way people communicated and information could be accessed. There were clear benefits, but also pitfalls. It was not just new technology that was arriving. The hierarchical organizational form of the ministry was going to be challenged by the flattening effect of these technological changes. The investment costs were high and in many cases those in senior management positions were not sufficiently conversant with the technology to decide what was needed and what was not.

We made major investments, even at a time of severe budget cuts, in information and communications technology, the benefits of which now are being reaped. There were many objections. But we persevered. We also thought through what all this meant for the way in which we did business. I tried to provide leadership in managing change.

## **Defining a “Globalizing World”**

There are many definitions about for the words “globalizing”, “globalization”, “globalism” and “globalist”. Too often globalization is seen only in economic terms. While economic globalization is an important reality, there is much more going on.<sup>1</sup>

There is, for example, a very important cultural dimension. Many fear that economic globalization is leading to cultural homogenization. That indeed is a danger. But new technology and increased migration are also leading to a potential for new networks and exposure that can facilitate cultural retention and development. There are both negative and positive dimensions, as there is in much of globalization.

As with economic globalization, the key is to have the capacity to shape globalization so that market forces do not determine everything. I shall return to this proposition later in the paper.

Critical environmental issues can obviously only be addressed at the global level. The two clearest examples are climate change and biodiversity. Some environmental issues must be addressed at the local level. Others require a national or regional commitment.

Security issues are nothing new at the global level. Ever since the development of nuclear weapons and their inter-continental means of delivery, we have become, more or less, used to living under that particular Sword of Damocles. We know our survival depends on events and decisions taken far away from us.

Technology is at the heart of this increasing interdependence. Information and communications technology have evidently been at the centre of economic globalization. We are living at a time of technological revolution, and it is not clear when, or if, this will end.

Genetic technologies raise profound global questions – intellectual property, equity issues, the potential for massive health benefits to poor countries, possible good or bad effects on ecosystems, security issues and so on. Energy technologies have the potential to throw the earth’s atmosphere into disarray or to heal it, to poison poor people or to lift them out of poverty.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> David Held and Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999). Held is the most important thinker writing today on the breadth of issues around globalization. He also puts them in historical perspective.

<sup>2</sup> P.J. Simmons underlined these points to me, and I appreciate them.

Globalization suggests a world in which integration is occurring. Increasing numbers of us – but by no means all – can easily talk to each other, read or watch the same news, invest in the same companies, listen to the same music and dress with the same logos on our shirts and running shoes. But at the same time the world is also fragmenting, in part as a response precisely to the perceived threat of homogenization – the need for a feeling of identity with others perceived as similar. James Rosenau has invented a word for this apparently contradictory but in fact understandable and consistent state of affairs - “fragmegration”.<sup>3</sup>

Rosenau has invented another word to describe an equally important phenomenon – the increasingly blurred boundary between international and domestic policy. That word is “intermestic”<sup>4</sup>, and interestingly it was picked up by the organizers of this year’s major symposium for senior executives in the Canadian public service as its main theme. No one, to the best of my knowledge, took exception to this characterization of what is going on. Yet the disappearance of the previously relatively clear boundary between domestic and foreign policy has major implications for public management.

The same U.S. Political Scientist has come up with a third new word to describe changes in global politics – “multi-centric”. The old world had a politics which was state-centric. States were virtually the only actors on the stage. Now, increasingly, there are other non-state actors, the most important being trans-national corporations and international non-governmental organizations. The state-centric world still exists, but it now co-exists with a multi-centric world with new actors which states ignore at their peril.<sup>5</sup>

In short, we live in a world in which interdependence is significantly increasing. Of course it is less apparent for those who have never made a telephone call, for those without electricity, and those whose livelihoods (if any) don’t depend on developments half a world away. But for the rest of the world, increased complexity is a major consequence for those charged with public management.

## **Governance**

Governments are no longer the only players in governance. Those simpler days have gone. So called “non-state actors” now have an increasing part to play. In some areas, such as the management of the Internet, they have played the dominant role. More often, governments work with international organizations, the private sector and representatives of civil society, and new forms of governance are arising. Non-state actors are increasingly being asked to deliver public services but often feel that their views on policy are not solicited.<sup>6</sup> As former Canadian Finance Minister Paul Martin has pointed out, governance has lagged globalization.<sup>7</sup> Martin, who has chaired the G20 Finance

---

<sup>3</sup> Rosenau describes this phenomenon in virtually everything he has written in the last decade. His conceptualization of changes in the international system is without peer.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> I am grateful to Elizabeth McAllister of the World Bank for making this point to me.

<sup>7</sup> For further amplification, see Gordon S. Smith and Moises Naim, Altered States (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2000).

Ministers, has said at meetings our Centre has organized that there is no greater challenge than managing our increasing interdependence in the world.

Governance at the global level is, of course, much more complicated than at the national level. At the national level, institutions gain legitimacy through political processes that involve citizens. There is really nothing comparable at the global level. Nor is there a “social compact” that works at the global level, something that at the national level is essential to cushion change.

Important work is now being done in analyzing how global governance actually works. The path-breaking work by P.J. Simmons and Chantal de Jonge Oudraat is worth underlining. The book uses a number of excellent case studies to produce a comparative analysis of, for example, how agendas are set, how negotiations lead to agreements and how decisions are enforced (if at all) in a way that a practitioner can draw out what would be the most appropriate regime in other areas. It helps answer questions as to what works and what does not.<sup>8</sup>

In simpler times policy could be made at the level of the state on most issues of the day. Now something that Wolfgang Reinicke has called “global public policy” is increasingly required. The problem is, of course, that there is no such thing as a global government, and nor is there likely to be for a very long time. There are international institutions – the United Nations being the most universal – but there is nothing resembling a “global democracy”, although some have advocated developing precisely that.<sup>9</sup>

Another development has been the proliferation of networks of many kinds. They may be exclusively of one of business, civil society or governments. Or they may be mixed. They may include individuals as well as institutions. They may be more or less formal. They may or may not be time limited. Information technology obviously facilitates the growth of such networks.<sup>10</sup>

## **Democracy**

Democracy is increasingly widespread. People have become more accustomed to electing those that make decisions which affect their lives. They believe that what they want should significantly determine what their “governors” decide. If they don’t, they “can throw the rascals out”. That fact helps ensure those elected listen to their constituents, or suffer the consequences if they don’t.

That is not to say that democracy always functions well.<sup>11</sup> It takes time to develop appropriate rules for political parties, a regime to manage corruption and a legal system

---

<sup>8</sup> P.J. Simmons and Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, Managing Global Issues (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001).

<sup>9</sup> David Held et al, Ibid. The argument Held and his colleagues make is overly optimistic in my view. Richard Falk has also written on this subject.

<sup>10</sup> Wolfgang Reinicke, Critical Choices (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2000). Note also the work of Anne-Marie Slaughter.

<sup>11</sup> United Nations Development Program, Human Development Report 2002 (New York: UNDP, 2002).

based on the protection of human rights, to cite but a few examples of what is needed. Institutions need to grow and a culture needs to develop. Nonetheless, expectations develop, the culture does change and institutions evolve, even if by fits and starts.

Expectations of international organizations therefore have also gone up, all the more so as the impact on the lives of people of the World Trade Organization, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund has never been greater. It is difficult to apply concepts of democracy developed at the national level to them, as their “constituents” are their member states or, more precisely, the relevant ministries of those states.

The Centre for Global Studies at the University of Victoria has recently carried out a survey of “best practices” to enhance transparency, participation and accountability in international organizations.<sup>12</sup> The degree of innovation is impressive, but so is the remaining degree of dissatisfaction in civil society as manifested in the continuing series of anti-globalization demonstrations. The most often repeated criticism is that it is the corporate agenda which dominates, and that governments have neglected their responsibility to shape globalization so that enough people benefit and the environment is not devastated.

These concerns about corporate priorities and the role of government are important and need to be addressed. It is in the end through elected governments that citizens will have an opportunity to do more to shape globalization. The voices of civil society being heard through NGOs are important, but not sufficient in themselves.

International institutions are in a particularly difficult situation. Their constituents are national governments – actually, specific departments of national governments. International institutions must and do respond to these constituents. This, however, does not occur through a transparent process, one that is open to civil society. More frustrating, the process is sometimes more open to business than civil society. That is a problem. As a consequence of the information and communications revolution, it is now easier for private citizens to know what is going on and for groups or even individuals to work with others in a strategic or even a tactical way. They are aware of and can respond to this perceived problem

The “withering away” of the state is not, however, near. States remain the key actors in international negotiations and institutions.<sup>13</sup> What has changed is that states, and hence their senior officials, need to operate in significantly different ways. They need to be prepared to share the stage. They need to work with other kinds of actors. This will require new wide-ranging knowledge as well as skills for senior government officials.

### **Challenges of Globalization to Public Management**

---

<sup>12</sup> The Centre for Global Studies, “Rethinking Governance” Handbook (Victoria: University of Victoria, 2001).

<sup>13</sup> Gordon Smith and Daniel Wolfish (eds.), Who is Afraid of the State? (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001).

There is no question that a significant number of people have reservations about globalization. There are too many people being left behind. There are too many people who feel left out. More people need to benefit. The environment needs to be protected. Issues of peace and security need to be high on the agenda. Even so committed a “capitalist” as George Soros has said that markets cannot provide for global public goods, such as protecting the environment and assuring security. There has to be governance at the global level which manages challenges at the global level and helps protect the interests of those who cannot fend for themselves. There needs to be a belief that other voices will be heard.

It is striking at the 2000 UN Millennium Summit that the leaders of the poorest countries in the world did not call for globalization to be stopped or reversed, as many of the protesters had been advocating. Instead they advocated a better shaping of globalization, a better managing of global issues.<sup>14</sup> The New York Times has just run a lengthy article on globalization which underlines that it is not more trade that has hurt the world’s poor but rather the “rigged system” that manages trade.<sup>15</sup>

There is a risk that the recent spate of corporate governance failures in the United States will feed the appetites of the truly anti-globalization protesters. The claim was already being made that it was corporate interests that dominated the global agenda, and that governments lacked the ability or will to play their proper role. Now, with what people are learning about Enron, Worldcom, and Arthur Andersen, to name but a few, this may well pour gasoline on the fires of opposition to globalization. Corporate governance and social responsibility will be increasingly closely scrutinized.

This presents big challenges to public management. The substance of public policy is complex, issues are interlinked, policies are difficult to explain simply to the public. On top of this, there is occurring an important fragmentation of power – up to higher levels of governance in international organizations, down to (supposedly) subordinate levels of government who demand a bigger say and out to civil society and the private sector.<sup>16</sup> All this is made worse by there being so much going on at the same time, leading to seemingly insurmountable complexity. This creates huge problems for developing countries, particularly, but not only, smaller countries.

Nevertheless, within most if not all governments, “stovepipes” remain. By this I mean that individual government departments (sometimes even branches of departments) operate as if they were independent fiefdoms. Turf battles persist. Horizontal management of issues is tough.

Many people don’t recognize that this fragmentation at the national level has serious implications at the international level. The WTO is “owned” by trade ministries. UNEP is “owned” by environment ministries. The IMF and World Bank are “owned” by treasuries. In Rome the FAO is “owned” by agricultural ministries and the WFP (World

---

<sup>14</sup> I am grateful to UN Deputy Secretary-General Louise Frechette who emphasized this point to me.

<sup>15</sup> The New York Times Magazine, August 18, 2002; the article was written by Tina Rosenberg.

<sup>16</sup> See Smith and Wolfish, *op. cit.*

Food Program) by aid agencies among donors. The result is that the FAO can't do development assistance programs and the WFP can't do agricultural development, and yet the two are interdependent if not interchangeable.<sup>17</sup> But the blame for the resulting lack of co-ordination cannot be laid at the doorsteps of the international organizations. It has deeper roots. Governments usually don't speak with one voice, except when that voice is the head of government's, and he or she cannot be everywhere.

While decision-making may be relatively straight forward at the sharply focused IMF, it is not necessarily good, balanced decision-making.<sup>18</sup> Good decision-making is difficult, even for the most developed countries, as it involves balancing a number of conflicting objectives. Setting priorities and weighting them are difficult. The pressures are huge. In developing countries, there is a serious international negotiation fatigue. There are inadequate resources in the South to cover all the various negotiations of importance – ranging from climate change to the WTO.<sup>19</sup> The result all too often is a “rigged system” as pointed out above.

Complications also stem from the need for longer term horizons dealing with many global challenges. “Short term pain for long term gain” is not a good election slogan, yet it precisely reflects the reality in facing an issue such as climate change.<sup>20</sup> The complexity of linked issues makes resolution even tougher. Responding to climate change cannot be divorced from the need to bridge the growing gaps between rich and poor in the world.

Improving governance has clearly arrived on the development agenda. Mark Malloch Brown of the UNDP recently stated that fully 60% of the resources of that organization are being devoted to governance.

The demands on senior officials have never been greater. Although it has been tried, at the top levels, policy development and management cannot be separated. They need to be brought together. These are high stress jobs – physically as well as intellectually demanding. Given this environment and the challenges it produces, what can be done to help officials at the most senior levels?

### **Training Needs and Opportunities**

There clearly needs to be an innovative approach to high level training. Indeed the very word “training” may be an impediment to obtaining senior level participation –

---

<sup>17</sup> My thanks to Jeremy Kinsman for pointing out the problems in Rome as an excellent example of the point I am making.

<sup>18</sup> Joseph Stiglitz does not hide his feelings on this subject in his recent book, Globalization and Its Discontents (New York: Norton, 2002).

<sup>19</sup> Adil Najam of Boston University is an authority on this subject, with an impressive capacity to combine persuasive analysis and humour.

<sup>20</sup> David Victor and I have a chapter dealing with this issue in a forthcoming book edited by Harold Coward and Andrew Weaver to be published by the press of Sir Wilfrid Laurier University.

something like “policy workshop” might be better.<sup>21</sup> The first challenge is to get people to come, to participate in the programs offered. That runs up against the unfortunate reality that the urgent always seems to push aside the important. Many (most?) senior officials either do not believe they need training which in any event they do not have time for or have doubts about the relevance and appropriateness of training courses being offered.

It seems senior levels in the private sector are much more convinced of the utility of training. They certainly spend more time at it. In government with senior officials there is more of a sense of a state of siege, that if their finger is no longer in the dike, the water will pour through.

What therefore make most sense are short, highly focused, courses. It is important to build training programs using principles of adult learning such as: building on the experience of the learner, working in group settings, making use of a variety of teaching and learning approaches in addition to the lecture model, and building in flexibility for program modification and change.

It is important to have people that have had experience give as much as possible of the courses.<sup>22</sup> Other participants must be at the same or very close to the same level, both so as to maximize the benefits of exchange of experience and to be more attractive to those participating.

Effective leadership training needs a live link to the world of policy and implementation in order to attract good people into learning and to shorten the feedback loop between learning and amending institutional machinery.<sup>23</sup>

There is a great deal to be said for the case method. Cases should describe real situations. Discussion groups should enable participants to raise cases from their own experience which they could share with others on the course.

Timing is important as certain periods during the year are always more busy than others. Weekends may turn out to be best.

I would propose courses in twelve areas, although they could obviously be combined or separated in a number of different ways:-

1. Setting the Context
2. Leadership and Managing Change
3. Literacy in Economic/Business Concepts/Language
4. Understanding New Concepts of Global Governance
5. Negotiation and Dispute Resolution Skills
6. Cultural Differences

---

<sup>21</sup> My thanks to Budd Hall, Dean of Education at the University of Victoria, for making this and other suggestions.

<sup>22</sup> Shirley Walters (ed.), Globalization, Adult Education and Training (London: Zed Books, 1997).

<sup>23</sup> Elizabeth McAllister underlined the importance of this point to me.

7. Dealing With the WTO and Regional Trade Bodies
8. Management of Horizontal Issues
9. Policy Analysis, Development and Mapping
10. Citizenship Engagement
11. Problem Solving Skills
12. Risk Management

Setting the context is a good place to begin, particularly in times of rapid change. This entails covering the sort of developments listed above in this paper. It cannot be taken for granted that participants will have reflected on all the changes taking place in the world. They don't have time. Interesting work has been done on scenarios which could be of value.<sup>24</sup> Scenarios should underline that the future is not fully determined or determinable. Rather it can and will be affected by choices that are made, choices over which senior officials have considerable influence. Globalization in the broad sense clearly needs to be understood, as do the debates about it.

Leadership skills and managing change are of critical importance. Good leadership has always been required, and it can be taught to a significant degree. But the leadership needed changes as organizations become flatter and lower levels become more "empowered". People need to understand the reasons for change. Objective setting, delegation and accountability are key skills to be developed. So is encouraging collaboration both within and among departments. Increasingly leadership also requires reaching out to people outside government altogether.<sup>25</sup>

Literacy in economic/business language/concepts is a fundamental requirement. Some senior officials have it as a result of their previous training and experience, but many typically do not. Economic policy cannot be left to the "experts" or those who perceive themselves to be exclusively responsible. A senior official in a social ministry needs to be able to talk to his colleagues in the finance ministry or representatives of the IMF. He or she needs to be able to explain the contribution his or her ministry can make and how to make new alliances, thus avoiding being or being perceived in a constantly negative role. Given the importance of markets, exports and investment, senior officials need to understand what drives trade and the flow of private finance. Another dimension could be in transforming private sector concepts of demonstrating results into the development "business". There is very little research or shared learning about how to get a results approach right – identifying mission critical results and appropriate indicators.<sup>26</sup>

It is important that senior officials understand the new concepts of global governance, and the existence of other actors than governments. Indeed it is important that such officials be capable of negotiating and even designing new forms of governance that best

---

<sup>24</sup> The work of Shell International has for years been a leader in this area, and I have appreciated the continuing advice of Ged Davis of Shell. He has noted in a comment on a draft of this paper that "the experience of scenario building and use is that those who learn most are those who build scenarios and that use is enhanced when the users are better able to clearly envisage different possible futures."

<sup>25</sup> Tony Campbell who has had experience teaching a number of these subjects argues that leadership and managing change ought to be taught separately – he has a good point.

<sup>26</sup> My thanks again to Elizabeth McAllister.

suit the needs of their countries. The interests of developing countries are hugely dependent on the sorts of regimes that are being built internationally, and it is vital they be reflected in the construction process. The role of international law and other forms of rule setting need to be understood. Senior officials need to know how to relate to business and NGOs. Managing new forms of partnerships with these non-state actors require a different outlook and skills from traditional public management. It is essential these partnerships succeed but they raise challenges, for example, in assuring accountability.

*Negotiation and dispute resolution skills* are something which can be taught. They include the ability to cross linguistic and cultural barriers. Individual developing countries will not likely have the numbers of trained negotiators ideally desired, but they need negotiators of quality. There are particular skills in the field of multi-lateral negotiation which, if employed, could significantly enhance the leverage of negotiators from the South. Dispute resolution techniques have advanced considerably over the last few decades, and could be of great value to senior officials if included in training programs.

The importance of understanding *cultural differences* is often not understood. Take the example of the photograph of Michel Camdessus, former head of the IMF, standing over Indonesian President Suharto, arms crossed. The message that photo conveyed to Indonesians with their cultural background was a superior force exerting total dominance over an inferior, exacting submission, in this case from their President. When then Vice-President Nixon arrived in Central America, he flashed an “OK” sign (making a circle with the thumb and forefinger with the other three fingers extended upwards). He was roundly booed. Was this Anti-Americanism? No, it signified to those waiting to greet him what can be described as “a carnal act of great agility”.<sup>27</sup> These may seem trivial examples, but they help show that for successful negotiation there must be good cross cultural understanding.

The rules governing trade have increasingly broad application. *Dealing with the WTO and regional trade bodies* cannot just be left to trade officials. The rules may seem (and may be) arcane, but need to be much better understood, and by more people. The impact of trade on culture and social policy is immense. It is vital that most senior officials be familiar, and indeed conversant, with this area of global challenge.

There has to be serious consideration of the *management of horizontal issues*, including the role of central agencies and lead ministries. Both can be structured in a number of different ways. There are questions as to at what level the management should take place, how one deals with accountability and whether it makes sense to undertake government reorganization.

*Policy analysis and development* are something which senior officials will not do on their own, but they must be aware of what is required and be able to select, train and motivate their more junior colleagues. There is a new approach called *mapping* which is being

---

<sup>27</sup> P. 76. Howard Richler, *Take My Words* (Vancouver: Ronsdale Press, 1996). In Germany Nixon would only have fared marginally better; this gesture signifies “you jerk”.

developed in several places, including by the Centre for Global Studies.<sup>28</sup> This takes as its departure point that even the best formulated policy proposal does not necessarily succeed. Mapping involves including an assessment inter alia of who will take the ultimate decision, what the timetable is, who and what are most likely to have impact, and what pressures can be brought to bear on the process. It is a very pragmatic process.

Non-state actors are clearly of increasing importance. New ways need to be found to enhance significantly citizen engagement. One sees this with the reaction in Africa to NEPAD. It is no longer adequate for leaders to announce a new development strategy. Polling, focus groups, community meetings and other innovative techniques need to be found. Imaginative ways of describing policy choices are needed. Engagement should not occur only after government has made up its mind on its intended course. Note that I have not focused just on NGOs, the number of which at the international level and in Southern countries is dramatically increasing.<sup>29</sup> They can play a significant but not sufficient role. What is necessary and not so obvious is how to engage average citizens in discussions about policies and programs that will have an impact on them. Their views may or may not be represented in established organizations.

Although it may sound very obvious, there is nothing more important than problem solving skills. To a significant degree, they can be learned. I have often been asked if I could name the one thing that led to my relatively successful career in government. I have concluded that it was one quality above all else, or at least so I have been told by my bosses – the capacity to solve problems. This takes one into the area of effective interpersonal relations and more. It involves the need for both lateral thinking as well as “thinking out of the box”, in other words, unconventionally.

Risk management has always been required of senior officials, but never more than today. There is a natural tendency to be risk averse when in government. But that can lead at worst to paralysis and, less damaging but still unfortunate, important missed opportunities. If one thinks of the challenges ahead in the field of biotechnology, it is clear that senior officials around the world need to be able to rely on the most sophisticated techniques of risk assessment. The potential benefits in terms of food security, health are enormous, but there are unquestionably risks. The choices that need to

---

<sup>28</sup> Terry Smutylo, Outcome Mapping (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2002); Analogous approaches of systematic decision making exist in the public sector context. (for example "Policy Analysis in Government", to be found at the Canadian government site <http://learnnet.gc.ca/eng/lrncentr/online/policy.htm#Four%20Major%20Steps> The "Decision Process Guidebook" of the US Dept of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation is another example of a systematic approach on how to influence decisions in government. IBR's Guidebook uses a ten step "Decision Process Worksheet" [www.usbr.gov/Decision-Process/](http://www.usbr.gov/Decision-Process/) .

<sup>29</sup> Ann Florini, now of the Brookings Institution, has done some outstanding work in this area. See her book The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000).

be made are supremely political, but need to be based on top notch risk analysis and management techniques.

Training could also be offered in different ways of integrating *policy priorities with resource allocation*. It is one thing for a government to say what it wants to do. It is another actually carrying it out. Budgets tend to be built from the bottom up. Cuts are often made from the top down. Neither process is necessarily related to the policy priorities of the government.

*Communication skills* of senior officials are often deficient. It does not work to turn over to the “communications department” how to explain to the public what has been decided. Support needs to be mobilized from a broad community. Strategies are needed to deal with misperceptions and confusion. The media may well compound the problem. The “framing” of issues is critical and is very much a learned skill.<sup>30</sup> If issues are not framed correctly, the result is often the creation of seemingly insurmountable problems of communications.

### **Post Script: A Further Idea**

This paper has focused on changes that are occurring in the world in order to set the context for the kind of training that would be of the most value to senior officials. This would be provided essentially through short courses. Another part of the UN/IASIA initiative is focused on the changes needed in schools of public policy, management and administration so as to train the next generation of senior officials. This is also most worthwhile.

There is an intermediate idea I would like to see discussed. That would involve support for the creation of degree programs for “Masters of Global Public Management”. These programs would be for mid-career people who are in, who are going in or who deal with international organizations, negotiations and other forms of global governance. Very few existing schools do this. It is a serious gap.

The best approach would be to follow the approach used by Royal Roads University (in Victoria, Canada) amongst others.<sup>31</sup> Three or four week residencies once a year for two years are combined with distance learning over the Internet. This makes it quite feasible for “learners” (they are not called students) to fulfill the responsibilities of their existing position while obtaining the skills they will need in the next phases of their career.

---

<sup>30</sup> See the excellent study, headed by Princeton Lyman, *From Values to Advocacy* (Washington: The Aspen Institute, 2002). The conclusion is that what is involved in successful communication is much more than presenting well the facts. Members of the public have, implicitly or explicitly, frames of reference, ways of organizing facts. Good communications often has to change the frame of reference in the first instance.

<sup>31</sup> See [www.royalroads.ca](http://www.royalroads.ca).