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Item 1 – Approval of the Agenda

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Public Management Committee, Mr. Adam Wolf of Denmark. The agenda was adopted without change.

Item 2 – Election of Committee Officers

2. The current Bureau members were re-elected for one year and two additional members were elected. In light of the fact that only 2 posts were vacant, Poland withdrew its candidate but announced its intention to resubmit a candidate in the Autumn. The new members of the Bureau are Mr. Eric Embleton of Ireland and Mr. Kang Soon Shin of Korea.

3. Elections will take place again at the Autumn Committee meeting. Ms. Nicole Jauvin of Canada will reach the end of her three-year term at that meeting and has announced her intention to step down at that time.

Item 3 – Opening Remarks by the Chair

4. The Chair introduced Deputy Secretary-General Sally Shelton-Colby who explained the importance of the prioritisation exercise within PUMA’s programme of work and budget to the OECD’s overall resource reallocation exercise.

5. Ms. Shelton-Colby also provided an update of the OECD’s budget situation (no 2000 budget passed at the time of this meeting) as context for understanding the current budget and staffing situation of PUMA. She noted, however, a substantial increase in Council support for PUMA work, particularly in the areas of governance and regulatory reform (both Member and non-member). She also noted that the Secretary-General is committed to PUMA and that there is no doubt as to future growth in PUMA resources, potentially linked with a possible restructuring plan.

6. The Chair announced that Ms. Geraldine Byrne-Nason, the Acting Director of PUMA would be leaving the Organisation in the summer. He noted with pleasure the expectation of additional resources, but expressed deep concern that PUMA was not being provided with the resources now to meet expectations, particularly in light of the ambitious new mandate recently approved by OECD Council.

7. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Bob Bonwitt, Head of the SIGMA programme, provided a presentation on SIGMA’s current funding situation.
8. The Chair raised two additional issues: 1) observership and 2) consultations between the PUMA Bureau and the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC).

9. While the Committee has been somewhat conservative regarding non-member observership in the past, outreach has now become an important part of the PUMA mandate and future work programme. While no decisions were needed immediately, the Chair suggested that a decision be taken before the next meeting. He asked the Secretariat to prepare a summary proposal to current Members with a view to reaching a decision before October. If the Committee members cannot agree, then observership will be placed on the agenda for the Autumn meeting. The Chair reminded the Committee that observership reports are considered by individual Committees on request of the Council. Final decisions with respect to observerships are made by the Council.

10. Ms. Byrne-Nason promised to consult within the Organisation and to take account of other Committees dealing with the observership issue in an outreach context. The Secretariat would look at criteria, new developments and background decisions in the broader context of practice within the Organisation. She also confirmed that PUMA had outstanding requests for observership from Brazil, Chile and Israel.

11. The Chair noted that the upcoming Brasilia conference may provide some inspiration for non-member countries that are moving very fast and contributing to the governance agenda.

12. The Chair reported that the TUAC consultation was constructive and positive. TUAC members expressed strong support for the PUMA mandate and draft work programme. Their top priority was human resource management (HRM), but they also saw policy coherence, transparency, accountability and arms-length agencies as priority items. In addition, they saw defining the difference between individual citizen reactions and organised citizen reactions to be an important undertaking. TUAC members reminded PUMA of the importance of taking into account local-level issues, and offered their contacts with local government.

13. TUAC members expressed strong support for the Ethics report. They will advise their affiliates of the forthcoming report and will actively use it to address issues of ethics from a trade union perspective. They also supported regulatory reform and PUMA leadership in co-ordinating this work.

14. TUAC members wanted continued dialogue with PUMA as well as a dialogue at the country level between individual governments and their trade unions. They raised concerns about PUMA resource levels and staff vacancies.

**Item 4 – Approval of the Summary Record of the 20th meeting of the Public Management Committee**

15. The summary record of the Committee’s 20th session, held on 28-29 October 1999, was approved without amendment.

**Item 5 – Presentation of the PUMA work programme for 2001–2002, including the prioritisation exercise**

16. Ms. Byrne-Nason reminded the Committee of the four guiding themes in the PUMA mandate that were used in the development of the work programme: 1) coherence, 2) transparency, 3) effective intervention, 4) delivering on policy commitments.
17. She noted that the document [PUMA(2000)1] was not an elaborated programme of work, but rather a framework. When PUMA presents the work programme to the Council, the discussion will mainly rest at the broad level of the eight blocks of activities presented in the work programme.

18. The Secretariat worked on the premise of the need for a more horizontal approach. It therefore did not consider the lines around the boxes to be completely closed. Outreach, for example, cuts across the programme with an element in each activity.

19. Committee members received forms to 1) identify the top and bottom two priorities so that the Secretariat can develop a proposal to the Secretary-General for the resource allocation exercise, and 2) identify output priorities as part of an internal prioritisation exercise to provide additional informal guidance to the Secretariat.

20. France requested more information on how activities would be implemented and on financing. It noted that the most structured proposals were those that PUMA has already been working on, but that for some of the newer activities, such as risk management, details were less clear. Several countries agreed that more details were required.

21. The Netherlands expressed support for a statement on governance priorities for the 21st Century that was due in June. It urged clarification both on what governance is and what good governance is, and suggested another look at the work programme to see if it is on target once the statement of governance priorities is available. It also felt that the outputs (papers, conferences) were very traditional, and urged exploration of CD Roms and other non-traditional products.

22. In addition, the Netherlands expressed disappointment that few relationships were made between the work of other OECD services and that of PUMA. It did not feel that the horizontal work received sufficient emphasis. Several other countries agreed with this point. Finally, it proposed a new work activity on budgeting in a surplus environment which was distributed to Committee members (see Annex).

23. Germany raised the issue of government’s role in responding to demographic challenge, including harnessing new technologies. It asked for balance between strategic management issues and more technical programmes. It felt that concentrating on activity B best formulates future risks for administrations, and that it could incorporate some existing work such as ethics. It thought that activity E could also help to meet future challenges.

24. Germany felt that F and H were low priorities and that activity C was duplicative with other OECD work. It also felt that PUMA should sum up the ethics activity and rather than continuing to try to incorporate the findings into other work in this area.

25. Canada felt that it was also important to be able to prioritise the middle ground since the prioritisation exercise was not for resource reallocation purposes only. It recognised that it is very difficult to shift from traditional outputs, and felt that more work needs to be done. It is not just a question of simply regrouping existing activities in order to make it look new. Its specific priorities were as follows: E is the highest, then A, B, H, D.

26. The United States expressed strong support for the work programme. It felt that the lack of detail was understandable, given the budget and leadership uncertainty. It agreed that PUMA should not get involved in natural catastrophes in a substantive fashion, but felt that many countries share many of the same process concerns in how to respond in terms of decision and action.
Ms. Byrne-Nason responded that, prior to the Committee meeting, the Secretariat did not feel it appropriate to invest many resources in elaborating detailed proposals without any additional guidance. She noted that the Secretariat had begun the work internally to lay out detailed activities, but was waiting to hear the results of the Committee discussions to report back. The major investment in resources would be activities B, D, with much less for activities G and H. She pointed out that the work programme does not show the already significant resources that OECD puts into regulatory reform which falls under Activity F. She reiterated the Committee’s commitment to greater horizontality, but agreed that it could be made more explicit.

With regards to outputs, Ms. Byrne-Nason agreed that the work programme rested on traditional outputs. This is, in part, the Secretariat’s judgement about what carries the best message to a targeted audience, but it is also, in part, about improving communications. She promised to take another look at how to come up with more innovative outputs.

Finally, she noted that risk management was a new item. While natural disasters might not be the right focus to move this forward, the Secretariat was looking for other issues such as food safety. The goal is to avoid substantive duplication and focus on the machinery of government for responding to risks.

The Chair noted that, with limited resources, it is very important to have a horizontal approach, which also makes it more difficult, however, to assign resources to any one activity.

Ireland asked what the next steps were and reminded the Committee that the work programme would be reviewed part way through the mandate. It noted that if this programme is to work, it would not be easy to proceed with some activities and not others since they are all interdependent. This raised fundamental questions about how PUMA should be organised to support horizontality.

In response to a question about how the resource allocation exercise worked, Ms. Byrne-Nason emphasised that the plus/minus 3 per cent exercise was a decision of the Council. The point of the exercise was to get Committees to prioritise. Three percent of PUMA’s budget represents 0.5 million francs – a junior staff person. A budget reduction would mean reducing the investment in that activity by that amount. The Secretariat, however, always has the possibility of reallocating within PUMA. A reduction would reduce PUMA’s margin for manoeuvre. Some Committees have identified activities that would not be done unless there was an increase in 3 per cent. The number and quantity of outputs under each activity could also change.

On the internal structure, Ms. Byrne-Nason noted that while PUMA was made up of divisions, it was moving towards project-based management. The Secretariat has already moved some staff between divisions and no activity will completely belong to just one division. This affects recruitment. PUMA will be looking for people who can move between activities.

Item 6 – Discussion on the role of PUMA networks

The Chair introduced representatives of the PUMA working groups:
- Senior Budget Officials (SBO) represented by Anthony Bestebreur, Netherlands
- Human Resource Management (HRM), represented by Barry Forrester, United Kingdom
- Regulatory Reform, represented by Luigi Carbone, Italy
- Senior Officials from Centres of Government (CoG), represented by László VASS, Hungary
The goal of this discussion was to improve communication between networks and the Committee and to make sure that the new mandate is reflected in the work of the networks. The Chair then invited countries and network representatives to comment on future work of networks.

35. Representing the SBO network, the Netherlands felt that, with better communication, the SBO could assist in meeting Committee goals, but first it needed better definition of Committee objectives and better communication within Member countries. The SBO agenda [PUMA/SBO/A(2000)1] already reflects some governance issues. It invited reactions to the agenda which will include fiscal transparency best practices.

36. As the host of the next meeting of Senior Officials from Centres of Government (CoG) in October, Hungary proposed strengthening relations between PUMA and heads of government centres. It also wanted better co-ordination between the meeting topic and the PUMA work programme and to create a database for future work. It suggested “Governance and Coherence” as a good topic for the CoG meeting, but emphasised that discussion would focus not just on policy coherence, but also the decision-making process and information flow. The Committee agreed on this topic. Hungary added that it would be useful to agree on the theme at the Spring Committee meeting in order to give 6 months’ preparation time for CoG meetings and suggested the creation of an electronic network.

37. Representing the regulatory reform working party, Italy mentioned the support that it has seen for regulatory reform work. In the regulatory review report, the discussion of the single country reviews and the self-assessments received a lot of support. Best practices are also becoming principals of good regulation. In the recent meeting of the European Council in Lisbon, the OECD principals on good regulation were discussed. Italy also reported that the Mayor of Naples was committed to reforming municipal regulations, citing OECD regulatory reform principals. Finally, Italy raised the question of co-ordination in regulatory reform. Should countries have a central unit to co-ordinate regulatory reform?

38. Representing the human resource management network, the United Kingdom noted that the group had met in January for the first time in two years. Priorities fell into two categories: 1) areas that could be taken care of through bi-lateral relations between countries (off the record networking) with no real role for PUMA except one of co-ordination; and 2) areas where PUMA could add value, support good governance and be forward-looking. Examples of these areas include demographic threats, promoting leadership, professionalism, knowledge management and competition for staff. The next meeting of the human resources network would be held on 3-4 July 2000. Leadership has been identified as a key issue. The group is working on defining a clear project on leadership with a clear output.

39. The Deputy Secretary-General found the earlier discussion on leadership to be very interesting and was struck by the number of leaders in the education field. She asked that PUMA work with DEELSA to see how university curricula can be shaped to foster leadership.

40. The Secretariat responded favourably to a suggestion that the SBO present the conclusions or lessons learned in a report to the Committee, and will raise the issue at the SBO meeting in May. It will also follow up on the idea of an electronic network of CoG officials. Finally, the Secretariat will list the members of each network as a reference both for Committee members and for the networks themselves.
Item 7 – Report and recommendations by the Communications Group

Public Affairs and Communications

41. Mr. Chris Brooks, Director of the Public Affairs and Communications Directorate (PAC) began the discussion by addressing the new OECD Communications Strategy. Reform of OECD communications has focused on creating a more comprehensive and coherent system. OECD communications tend to be fragmented because of the diverse range of Committee work. PAC is seeking to bring it all together to create an OECD brand. PAC has reorganised publishing in two ways: 1) improved quality of publications – publish less and publish better; 2) increased “reading” quality through editorial process.

42. The OECD internet site has grown enormously: 25,000 pages and 11 million hits per month. Online users are younger and more likely to be from non-OECD Member countries than traditional OECD book readers. The OECD is now publishing in 22 languages. Many documents play an outreach function through joint-ventures with external publishers.

43. PAC has also reorganised its approach to relations with the media. It has a more custom-based approach which focuses on issues rather than events. As a result, print coverage has increased by 100 per cent. Quality of coverage is also better. More editorial comments and feature articles rather than the simple use of OECD figures.

Communications Group Recommendations

44. Mr. Jonathan Breul, United States, presented the Communications Group’s recommendations for increasing the influence and impact of OECD. The recommendations focused on: 1) front-end prospects and 2) back-end product guidelines:

45. Front-end prospects:
   - Who is the audience?
   - What is the message?
   - When should it be delivered?
   - What do we want the audience to do when they receive it?
   - How do we engage their attention?

46. Back-end product guidelines:
   - Content: more policy relevant (not simply descriptive).
   - Style: one-page executive summary; short and direct style: “reduce the issue to its pulsing essence”.
   - Timing: when is it needed?
   - Accessibility: understandable, accessible, fewer publications in more languages.
   - Instruments: outputs should be “fit for the purpose”; choose tools which maximise impact and influence; non-traditional outputs (briefings and seminars, web-based documents).

47. The Chair proposed that the Secretariat come back with specific output proposals, including original ways of communicating. He also noted that the PUMA website had 190,000 hits in February. The Secretariat noted that focusing on communications should include looking for communication skills in new recruitment.
Best Practices Institute

48. The Secretariat presented the Best Practices Institute, an OECD pilot project to distil key OECD policy messages and make them available on the Internet. (http://infomgt.oecd.org/puma/bpi/BPISite.nsf/pages/BPIHome)

What are best practices?

− A term of art in the public and private sectors.
− A good way of conducting public policy (transparent and analytical).
− A comparative approach to policy in Member and non-member countries and among different levels of government.

What can the BPI contribute to PUMA?

− Policy Leadership
− Policy Innovation
− Communication and Outreach

49. The Secretariat noted that, while it is now housed in PUMA, the plan is eventually to integrate the Best Practices Institute into a broader communications strategy. The Secretariat will continue to look for ideas on how to use this website within PUMA and will come back to the Committee with additional ideas. The Secretariat requested that countries provide feedback, particularly through the on-line BPI user survey.

50. The United States emphasised that customer satisfaction was very important. A standard that it has found useful to avoid Internet dumping (putting pages on the Internet that were not written for the Internet) is a “3-clicks” rule: having to go beyond 3 clicks to reach a desired page can be a source of frustration.

51. The Chair noted that capitals frequently request information on practices in other countries, leading to an overload of information requests. He asked if the BPI could be used to bring together some of this information through a more interactive role. This could potentially reduce constant requests for information.

52. Portugal mentioned that a European Union Conference on Best Practices in Administration would be held on 10-12 May, bringing together EU ministers responsible for public administration. The conference would present case studies of best practices. The main objectives would be to look at experiences and achievements of Member countries and to promote international co-operation and exchange.

53. The Committee agreed to the recommendations of the Communications Group. The Chair asked that everyone be a watchdog on innovative new communications tools.
Fulfilment of Ministerial Mandate on Governance and Outreach

54. Deputy Secretary-General Sally Shelton-Colby introduced the Governance and Outreach Initiative which was called for last year by Council at Ministerial level. Governance is one of OECD’s eight priorities for the 2001-2002 budget cycle. She reminded Committee members of an up-coming high-level seminar on governance outreach to be held on 9-10 May in Paris, “Partnerships in Governance: Common Responses to the Challenges of Globalisation”.

55. The Secretariat is now focusing on how to follow-up the seminar with additional work with non-members. In addition to the Brasilia conference, PUMA will co-sponsor with the Korean government a conference on public management reform to be held in Seoul, Korea, 22-23 June, as part of its strategy of both international and regional outreach. The Deputy Secretary General also noted the OECD’s long-standing relationship with the World Bank. The Secretariat is identifying new priority areas for focussing work with the World Bank and has proposed that governance be one of those focus areas.

56. The Secretariat is drafting a statement on governance priorities in the 21st Century and will distribute a draft for Committee comments. The Statement will be presented to the OECD Ministerial in June. The annex to document PUMA(2000)3 provides a summary of previous governance activities. Several countries commented on the quality and relevance of this report.

57. Several countries reiterated support for governance outreach, and suggested better co-ordinating corporate and public governance efforts, noting the strong relationship between economic development and good governance. They also supported PUMA as the leader of governance work in the OECD.

58. Several countries felt that the Statement on Governance in the 21st Century was very important in order to provide some clarification on the definition of governance, given the strong link between governance and outreach. What does governance mean for OECD countries themselves? Of the three pillars that the Secretary-General has defined for OECD work – economic growth, social stability and good governance – the Committee felt that the third should be the work of PUMA.

59. One country emphasised that governance goes beyond government and should also include business and civil society as partners in the governance agenda. This broader sense of governance requires that attention be paid to these two critical partners. In order to cover these aspects of governance, it suggested limiting the number of topics raised and the number of countries invited to the high-level seminar. Another country suggested that the Ukraine be added to the list of high-priority countries to be invited to the seminar.

60. While supportive, countries were also concerned about finding an appropriate approach to outreach. Japan noted that the level of democracy in non-member countries is not the same as in OECD countries, and cautioned the Secretariat about too broadly applying conclusions to non-member countries. It raised doubts about the availability of funds for governance outreach work under the current budget situation.

61. The Deputy Secretary-General noted that the rapidity of work on the seminar was consistent with the support of a number of delegations for accelerating governance work with non-members. She also informed Committee members that the Secretariat plans to draw on the experience of eminent persons in its outreach work. For example, the Honorable Malcolm Fraser, the former Prime Minister of Australia has helped in the planning of the high-level Seminar. Mr. Fraser is the head of the InterAction Council, a group of democratically-elected former heads of government.
62. The Deputy Secretary-General agreed that there were differences in the definition of governance and felt that the Statement on Governance would start shaping a common definition. She also agreed that PUMA should take a lead on governance work. In terms of co-ordinating governance work, she pointed out that there are 7 different OECD bodies working on outreach. The PUMA Secretariat is looking at governance work in other parts of the OECD to develop a more coherent set of information about upcoming governance activities. She also mentioned the creation of an Inter-Directorate Steering Group on Governance Outreach which should improve coherence of Secretariat work in this area.

63. Finally, she agreed with Japan about the need to avoid a “one-size-fits-all” solution, and instead to tailor solutions. She asked the Committee if the governance outreach work should remain focused or whether it should broaden to include countries with which the OECD has had less experience, including countries on the African continent.

64. Countries were pleased to hear of PUMA’s central role in OECD work on governance, but cautioned against the creation of new bodies for co-ordinating governance work. One country felt that SIGMA’s problems in technical assistance seems to reveal an incoherency on governance issues. Instead of creating new programmes, it asked, why not support SIGMA which has already proven its ability to do outreach? Another country mentioned the need to balance symposia and technical assistance to countries when doing governance outreach.

65. The Chair noted that many of the comments reflected unease with moving ahead so quickly on outreach. Given the interest in governance outreach, however, he hoped that PUMA would be able to play a larger role at the next Committee meeting after the Council at Ministerial level meeting.

Managing Ethics: Standards, Trends and New Directions

66. The Committee approved unanimously the ethics report and supported sending it to the next Council meeting at Ministerial level on 26-27 June 2000. Country representatives in the review of the document:

- emphasised the quality of the product (appreciated the balanced and practical approach of the document) and appreciated the work of the Reference Group;

- planned to circulate the report widely within the administrations of some countries (e.g. France, Poland, Turkey);

- instructed the Secretariat to elaborate a one-page-long preface and to focus on the communication of the report by finding the most appropriate forms for the targeted groups -- on the basis of the recommendations of the Communication Group -- for example a policy brief for decision-makers and explore the intensive use of the internet to make available the content of the report for the widest audience possible;

- recognised its value as an outreach tool;

- understood that the Secretariat will integrate future activities (described in the Chair’s statement, e.g. application to the political level, regional and local government, mutual learning with the private sector and lobbying) into the projects of the ongoing and future PUMA work programme, including activities on transparency and human resources management.
Item 9 – Discussion of policy coherence as a key cross-cutting issue in the PUMA work programme

67. Ms. Laura Chapman, Executive Director of the Canadian Policy Research Secretariat gave a presentation of the Policy Research Initiative. After the presentation the Chair paid attention to the close relation between the line in the Canadian initiative and the projects proposed in the PUMA work programme. Furthermore, the Chair noticed the need to involve citizens in initiatives targeted at improving coherence and underlined the important role of a culture of coherence in the civil service. The subsequent discussion centred on the possibility of providing neutral policy advice on coherence and on administrative and financial practicalities of the Canadian Policy Research Initiative.

Item 10 – Country presentations of noteworthy developments and innovations

68. Japan’s presentation of its programme for central government reform was impressive to other delegates both in terms of its scope and its ability to reduce resistance to reform from labour unions.

69. Spain gave an overview on the administrative reform programme contained in the White Book for the Improvement of Public Services. Apart from a strong focus on quality management, Spain has also made a lot of progress with one-stop shops for businesses.

70. Korea presented an electronic system of the Seoul Metropolitan Government for processing applications, "Internet-based open processing of citizen’s applications". This system allows applicants to monitor any movement of the case over the internet in real time. The system obtained two desired results. First, securing transparency: no official can sit on a case without justifiable reasons nor make arbitrary decisions. Second, preventing corruption: free access to administrative procedures eliminates the need for personal contact with officials and giving a bribe, "express fee".

Item 11 – Innovative approaches to improve compliance with regulations

71. The work on regulatory compliance is intended to assist Member countries in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of public policies carried out by regulation and alternative policy tools. The Secretariat presented the draft of a report reviewed by the Working Party on Regulatory Management and Reform that will be published in September 2000. The report overviews emerging issues for regulatory compliance, and focuses on assessing the level of compliance with regulations by target groups, and possible explanations for why compliance levels are low or high. It found that the explanation of the level of (non-) compliance fall into three categories:

- The degree to which the target group knows of and comprehends the rules.
- The degree to which the target group is willing to comply – either because of economic incentives, positive attitudes arising from a sense of good citizenship, acceptance of the policy goals, or pressure from enforcement activities.
- The degree to which the target group is able to comply with the rules.

Item 12 – Report and discussion of recent PUMA activities

72. The PUMA Secretariat presented highlights of its recent work:
Human Resource Management Working Group

73. An HRM expert meeting was held on 25-26 January 2000. The purpose of the meeting was to identify Member countries’ main HRM needs in light of PUMA’s new mandate. It was suggested that the work of PUMA over the next few years should focus on the following issues:

− promoting leadership;
− strengthening ethics and professionalism in HRM;
− enhancing the competitiveness of public sectors in the view of demographic changes; and
− managing knowledge in the public interest.

Expert meeting on Aligning Political Priorities and Budgetary Funding

74. The expert meeting on aligning political priorities and budgetary funding was held on 10-11 February 2000. Participants agreed that reallocation was a key budgeting issue. While many countries have used across-the-board cuts as a reallocation tool, reallocation between ministries remains an important challenge. Participants also identified reallocation in a surplus environment to be an important challenge.

Citizen Information and Participation/Information Technology

75. The Secretariat reported on progress achieved to date under the activity "Strengthening Government-Citizen Connections" and future activities, including:

− 1999-mid 2000: first results of the general questionnaire (25 responses), questionnaire on use of new information and communication technologies (ICTs) as a tool for connecting governments and citizens (23 responses) and initial set of five country case studies;
− 2000: completion of additional country case studies in sectoral policy making or policy evaluation; drafting of Final Report and of Policy Briefs for targeted audiences (in line with the recommendations of the Communications Group);
− 2001-2002: building on the strong support voiced by the OECD countries, the Secretariat will launch a work programme to: identify key elements and tools for consultation and active participation of citizens; review government's relations with civil society (in particular, NGOs) and, finally, develop an on-line demonstration package.

Country Profiles of Public Management Institutions

76. Building on existing work on issues and developments in public management, on data collected through various surveys or through a project to update country profiles, the Secretariat is looking at the creation of a comprehensive governance database which includes both statistical and written resources on Member countries. This project would be carried out in conjunction with other OECD Directorates and the World Bank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY</td>
<td>Mr. Klaus-Henning ROSEN</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of the Interior</td>
<td>Tel: 004918886812170, Fax: 004918886811649, E-Mail: <a href="mailto:klaus-henning.rosen@bmi.bund400.de">klaus-henning.rosen@bmi.bund400.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Sven-Oliver PROKSCH</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>German Delegation to the OECD</td>
<td>Tel: 0155745700, Fax: 0155745740, E-Mail: <a href="mailto:s-o-p@web.de">s-o-p@web.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIE/ AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>Ms. Carmel McGREGOR</td>
<td>Australian Delegation to the OECD</td>
<td>4, rue Jean Rey</td>
<td>Tel: 0140593518, Fax: 0140593394, E-Mail: <a href="mailto:carmel.mcgregor@free.fr">carmel.mcgregor@free.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTRICHE/ AUSTRIA</td>
<td>Mr. Robert STOGER</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>Austrian Delegation to the OECD</td>
<td>Tel: 0153922341, Fax: 0140508705, E-Mail: <a href="mailto:robert.stoeger@bka.gv.at">robert.stoeger@bka.gv.at</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BELGIQUE/ BELGIUM

M. Jean-Marie MOTTOUL
Chef de Corps des Conseillers de la Fonction publique, Directeur
ABC Bureau Conseil en Organisation et Gestion
Résidence Palace
Rue de la Loi 155
B-1040 BRUXELLES

Tel: 003222874007
Fax: 003222874010
E-Mail: jeanmarie.mottoul@mazfp.fgov.be

M. Luc RIFFLET
Conseiller
Délégation de la Belgique près l’OCDE
14, rue Octave-Feuillet
F-75116 PARIS

Tel: 0145249905
Fax: 0145249925

PAYS-BAS/ NETHERLANDS

Mr. Ton BESTEBREUR
Head, Financial Management Section
Ministry of Finance
P.O.Box 20201
NL-2500 EE DEN HAAG

Tel: 0031703427322
Fax: 0031703427934
E-Mail: a.bestebreur@minfin.nl

Mr. Koos ROEST
Advisor on Strategic Policy
Directorate-General for Constitutional Affairs and Kingdom Relations
Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations
Postbox 20011
NL-2500 EA DEN HAAG

Tel: 0031704267438
Fax: 0031704267634
E-Mail: koos.roest@minbzk.nl

CANADA/ CANADA

Mr. Scott WADE
Counsellor
Canadian Delegation to the OECD
15 bis, rue de Franqueville
F-75116 PARIS

Tel: 0144432012
Fax: 0144432099
E-Mail: scott.wade@dfait-maeic.gc.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORÉE</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Kang Soon SHIN</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Administrative Reform Bureau</td>
<td>Tel: 0082234965011</td>
<td>Fax: 0082234807652</td>
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