

Название статьи: Эффективности государственного управления: сравнительный анализ опыта стран ОЭСР в области управления для реформы государственного управления

Автор: Доктора философии (PhD) по экономическим наукам, Сарвар Саидов Хайруллоевич

Место работы и должность: Ответственный сотрудник Центра оценки руководящих кадров при Агентстве эффективности управления при Президенте Республики Узбекистан

Телефон: +998 98 143-50-35

Электронная почта: server4ek@mail.ru

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается институционализация эффективности государственного управления в контексте реформ государственного сектора, опираясь на сравнительные данные стран ОЭСР с конкретными примерами из США, Великобритании и Сингапура. Используя институциональный и сравнительный анализ, исследование выявляет применимые принципы управления, механизмы координации и цифровые инструменты, а также подчеркивает ключевые риски управления эффективностью. Полученные результаты предлагают аналитически обоснованные выводы для адаптации международного опыта к национальным контекстам реформ.

Ключевые слова: государственное управление, эффективность, институционализация, реформа управления, подотчетность; цифровое управление, рамки эффективности, реформа государственного сектора.

Article Title: Government effectiveness: comparative governance lessons from OECD countries for public administration reform

Author: Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Economics, Sarvar Saidov Khayrulloevich

Position and workplace: Responsible officer at the Executive personnel Assessment center under the Agency for governance efficiency under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Phone: +998 98 143-50-35

Email: server4ek@mail.ru

Abstract

This article examines the institutionalization of government effectiveness in the context of public sector reforms, drawing on comparative evidence from OECD countries with focused cases from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Singapore. Using institutional and comparative analysis, the study identifies transferable governance principles, coordination mechanisms, and digital enablers, while highlighting key risks of performance management. The findings offer analytically grounded insights for adapting international experience to national reform contexts.

Keywords: public administration, efficiency, institutionalization, governance reform, accountability; digital governance, efficiency framework, public sector reform.

Introduction

In recent decades, the effectiveness of public administration has become a central concern for governments facing accelerating socio-economic change, digital transformation, fiscal constraints, and rising public expectations. In advanced governance systems, effectiveness is no longer understood as procedural compliance or administrative efficiency alone, but as the capacity of the state to deliver measurable public outcomes, ensure institutional resilience, and sustain trust among citizens and businesses. This shift has led to the emergence of results-oriented, performance-based,

and evidence-driven governance models across leading OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries.

International experience demonstrates that improvements in government effectiveness are closely linked to the institutionalization of performance management frameworks, the consolidation of accountability mechanisms, and the strategic use of data and digital tools. Countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Singapore have moved beyond fragmented reform initiatives toward system-wide approaches that integrate strategic planning, budgeting, human resource management, and performance evaluation. At the same time, these reforms reveal important limitations, including the risks of over-reliance on formal indicators, bureaucratic overload, and the unintended consequences of sanction-oriented performance regimes.

For countries pursuing comprehensive public sector reforms, the key challenge lies not in replicating international models mechanically, but in adapting them to national institutional contexts. Reform trajectories are shaped by administrative culture, levels of managerial capacity, digital maturity, and the balance between central coordination and organizational autonomy. International best practices therefore provide not ready-made solutions, but analytical reference points for designing context-sensitive governance systems.

Within this perspective, the reform agenda of the Republic of Uzbekistan reflects a broader transition toward results-oriented public administration embedded in a national reform framework aimed at improving policy coherence, institutional accountability, and service delivery outcomes. The current phase of reforms places particular emphasis on overcoming functional fragmentation, strengthening coordination across government bodies, and embedding performance information into decision-making processes. These priorities resonate with global governance trends,

while simultaneously raising questions about institutional design, implementation risks, and long-term sustainability.

This article seeks to contribute to the comparative governance literature by analyzing the experience of selected advanced countries – OECD members in general, with focused case studies from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Singapore – through the lens of their applicability to the reform context of Uzbekistan. The purpose of the study is not to evaluate national reforms directly, but to identify transferable institutional principles, practical instruments, and critical pitfalls that merit attention when adapting international experience. The research aims to balance positive lessons with a critical assessment of constraints, thereby offering an analytically grounded perspective on how global governance practices can inform, but not predetermine, national reform trajectories.

Methods

The study applies a qualitative, comparative, and institutionally oriented research design aimed at identifying transferable governance mechanisms rather than benchmarking performance outcomes. Methodological choices are guided by the objective of analyzing how advanced countries have institutionalized government effectiveness and how these approaches may be adapted within a distinct national reform framework.

The primary method employed is comparative institutional analysis, used to examine how selected OECD countries structure performance management, accountability, and coordination mechanisms across government. This method enables the identification of common design principles – such as centralized strategic oversight, differentiated operational autonomy, and integration of performance information into policy cycles – while also capturing institutional variation shaped by national administrative traditions.

A case-based approach is applied to the United States, the United Kingdom, and Singapore as analytically contrasting models of results-oriented governance. These cases were selected based on three criteria: (i) the maturity of performance management systems, (ii) the presence of legally or institutionally embedded effectiveness frameworks, and (iii) documented use of performance information in budgeting, personnel management, and policy adjustment. Each case is analyzed not as a best-practice template, but as an institutional configuration with both strengths and observable limitations.

In addition, functional analysis is used to assess how effectiveness-related instruments interact with core public management functions, including strategic planning, budget allocation, civil service management, and digital governance. This approach allows the study to move beyond formal structures and examine how performance mechanisms operate within decision-making processes, thereby distinguishing symbolic compliance from substantive managerial use.

The research also incorporates critical synthesis of international analytical sources, including OECD governance reviews, policy evaluations, and institutional assessments, to contextualize national cases within broader governance trends. Rather than aggregating indicators, the analysis focuses on causal logics and implementation dynamics that explain why certain arrangements have produced sustained effects while others have generated limited or temporary outcomes.

The applicability of international experience to Uzbekistan is examined through an adaptive analytical lens, emphasizing institutional compatibility, implementation capacity, and risk sensitivity. This perspective allows the study to identify not only potentially transferable elements, but also critical aspects requiring caution, such as the dangers of indicator inflation, excessive centralization, and sanction-driven performance regimes. The methodological framework thus supports a balanced and context-aware

interpretation of international experience relevant to ongoing public administration reforms.

Results

OECD-Wide Trends in Institutionalizing Government Effectiveness

The comparative analysis of OECD countries demonstrates that sustained improvements in government effectiveness are associated with the transition from fragmented performance initiatives to government-wide performance frameworks. In most advanced systems, effectiveness is institutionalized through a limited number of core mechanisms: centralized strategic goal-setting, standardized performance reporting, and the formal integration of results into budgeting and policy review cycles. These frameworks reduce informational asymmetry across government and enable senior decision-makers to identify systemic bottlenecks rather than isolated organizational failures.

However, OECD experience also reveals that the mere existence of performance frameworks does not guarantee their managerial use. In several countries, performance information remains underutilized when institutional incentives prioritize compliance over learning. This finding highlights a critical distinction between performance measurement and performance management, with the latter requiring explicit institutional linkages to decision-making authority.

United States: Performance Information as a Policy and Budgetary Instrument

The United States provides an illustrative case of legally anchored performance management through the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and its subsequent modernization. The U.S. model emphasizes strategic plans, annual performance plans, and performance reports aligned with budget processes. A key strength of this system lies in its formal linkage between performance objectives and

federal programs, which enables cross-agency comparisons and outcome-oriented budget discussions.

At the same time, empirical evaluations show that the U.S. system performs best when performance data are used diagnostically rather than punitively. Periods characterized by strong analytical capacity within central agencies were associated with meaningful program adjustments, whereas sanction-oriented applications led to defensive reporting behavior and indicator manipulation. This experience underscores the importance of positioning performance data as an input for policy correction rather than as a tool of administrative control.

United Kingdom: Central Coordination and Selective Accountability

The United Kingdom's experience with Public Service Agreements and subsequent performance frameworks illustrates a model centered on strong central coordination combined with selective accountability. Central authorities defined a limited set of cross-government priorities, while departments retained flexibility in implementation. This approach reduced indicator proliferation and focused political attention on outcomes of strategic relevance.

Nonetheless, the UK case also demonstrates the risks of excessive centralization. Over time, frequent revisions of targets and performance criteria weakened institutional continuity and reduced trust among implementing agencies. The UK experience suggests that performance systems must balance adaptability with methodological stability to maintain credibility and long-term effectiveness.

Singapore: Integration of Performance Management and Human Capital Development

Singapore represents a distinct governance model in which performance management is deeply integrated with civil service development and leadership accountability. Effectiveness indicators are explicitly linked to long-term national

objectives and individual managerial competencies. This alignment has enabled Singapore to avoid narrow short-termism and to embed performance management within a broader culture of strategic governance.

A critical feature of the Singaporean model is its emphasis on capability-building rather than compliance. Performance assessments are used to inform leadership development, succession planning, and organizational learning. While this model benefits from high administrative capacity and political continuity, its transferability depends on the existence of a professionalized civil service and robust merit-based systems.

Additional Comparative Insights: Coordination and Digital Enablement

Across all examined cases, digital tools increasingly serve as enabling infrastructures for performance management. Government-wide dashboards, integrated data platforms, and analytical reporting systems enhance transparency and timeliness of information. However, the analysis confirms that digitalization amplifies existing institutional logics rather than substitutes for them. Where governance structures support analytical use of data, digital platforms strengthen decision-making; where such structures are absent, digital tools tend to reinforce reporting formalism.

Implications for the Uzbek Reform Context

Synthesizing international experience reveals several implications relevant to Uzbekistan's reform trajectory. First, the effectiveness of performance systems depends on the existence of a clearly defined institutional center responsible for methodology, coordination, and analytical interpretation. Second, performance indicators must be hierarchically aligned with national priorities to avoid fragmentation. Third, performance information should be systematically embedded into budgetary, programmatic, and human resource decisions to ensure managerial relevance.

At the same time, international cases highlight critical risks requiring careful attention: the over-expansion of indicators, the use of performance data for sanctioning purposes, and the rapid modification of methodologies without sufficient institutional learning. Addressing these risks is essential to ensure that performance management evolves into a stable governance mechanism rather than a transient reform initiative.

Discussion

The comparative analysis confirms that international experience in improving government effectiveness offers valuable analytical guidance, but not transferable templates. Across OECD countries, effectiveness reforms have succeeded where they were embedded as institutional governance arrangements, rather than introduced as isolated managerial tools. This finding is particularly relevant for reforming systems where the primary risk lies in formal adoption without substantive integration into decision-making processes.

One of the central lessons from advanced countries is the importance of institutional centrality without operational micromanagement. In the United States and the United Kingdom, periods of greatest reform impact coincided with the presence of a central coordinating function capable of setting strategic priorities, harmonizing methodologies, and interpreting performance data, while leaving implementation flexibility to line agencies. Where this balance was disrupted—either through excessive decentralization or rigid central control—performance systems lost credibility and managerial relevance. For Uzbekistan, this suggests that the effectiveness agenda should be anchored institutionally, but designed to support, rather than constrain, managerial discretion.

A second critical insight concerns the use of performance information. International experience consistently shows that performance systems generate value only when data are actively used to adjust policies, redesign programs, and reallocate

resources. Sanction-oriented or compliance-driven approaches undermine data quality and foster defensive behavior. The U.S. and UK cases demonstrate that learning-oriented use of performance data requires both analytical capacity and political acceptance of adaptive policy change. In the Uzbek context, this implies that effectiveness indicators should function as diagnostic tools within the national reform framework, rather than as instruments of administrative pressure.

The Singapore case highlights the strategic advantage of integrating performance management with human capital development. Linking organizational outcomes to leadership competencies and career development has allowed Singapore to maintain long-term policy coherence while avoiding short-term target fixation. However, this model also illustrates the limits of transferability: it relies on a highly professionalized civil service, strong meritocratic norms, and stable institutional environments. For Uzbekistan, the implication is not to replicate this model directly, but to gradually align performance evaluation with managerial development and institutional capacity-building.

Digitalization emerges as a necessary but insufficient condition for effective governance reform. Comparative evidence shows that digital performance platforms enhance transparency and analytical capacity only when institutional roles, data ownership, and interpretive authority are clearly defined. In the absence of such clarity, digital systems tend to reinforce reporting formalism rather than support strategic decision-making. This underscores the importance of sequencing reforms: digital tools should be introduced as part of a broader institutional architecture, not as standalone solutions.

Several critical risks identified in international practice deserve particular attention. These include indicator inflation, frequent methodological revisions driven by political cycles, and the erosion of trust among implementing agencies. Advanced

countries have mitigated these risks by limiting the number of strategic indicators, ensuring methodological stability, and maintaining clear communication about the purpose of performance systems. For Uzbekistan, safeguarding institutional predictability and analytical consistency will be essential to prevent reform fatigue and ensure long-term sustainability.

Overall, the international experience suggests that the effectiveness of public administration reforms depends less on the sophistication of performance metrics and more on the quality of institutional design. When performance management is positioned as an integrative governance mechanism—linking strategy, budgeting, human resources, and digital infrastructure—it becomes a durable component of public policy. Conversely, when treated as a technical or reporting exercise, its impact remains superficial. The critical task for Uzbekistan is therefore to adapt global governance principles in a manner consistent with national institutional realities, ensuring that effectiveness becomes an embedded feature of public administration rather than a temporary reform initiative.

References

1. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Public Governance Reviews: Public Sector Efficiency and Trust-Based Governance. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2017.
2. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Government at a Glance. Paris: OECD Publishing, selected editions 2019–2023.
3. Kamarck, E. C. Lessons for the Future of Government Reform: The National Performance Review Experience. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2013.
4. United States Congress. Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–62); GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–352). Washington, DC.
5. Hood, C., & Dixon, R. A Government That Worked Better and Cost Less? Evaluating Three Decades of Reform and Change in UK Central Government. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
6. World Bank. Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Framework. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2020.
7. Civil Service College Singapore. Performance Management and Leadership Development in the Singapore Public Service. Singapore: Civil Service College, analytical reports, 2016–2022.