

# OCCASIONAL PAPER

MAY 2022  
ISSUE 15.5

## HOLISTIC GOVERNANCE

## THE TASK AHEAD





# HOLISTIC GOVERNANCE: THE TASK AHEAD

The new agenda for government for the next six years and beyond is clear. At the heart of holistic governance is the efficient and effective delivery of public goods and services through a better bureaucratic structure and system. It takes the solution of peoples' livelihood as the core. While upholding the value of efficiency, it underscores the values of justice, fairness and responsibility, civil rights, popular sovereignty and public interest to fully demonstrate the publicity of public administration.

At the core of public administration is good governance. The good governance community has grown in the past decades, producing a host of good governance indicators which are of several types (Arndt & Oman, 2006; Boivard and Löffler, 2003; Hood et. al., 2007; Knack et. al., 2003; van de Walle 2006). The World Governance Indicators (WGI) are the community's most prominent which combine standalone measures into aggregate indicators of six governance concepts which are widely used in academic literature namely: voice and accountability; political stability and absence of violence/terrorism; government effectiveness; regulatory quality; rule of law; and control of corruption.

With the rising demands of the populace from the government for better education, high quality general welfare like health, housing, and safety, infrastructures, and social order, government has been bereft of available resources and effective and efficient mechanisms to deliver pressing public goods and services to the people. Although economic and political reforms have made some successes albeit slowly and intermittently between early 1990s and in the last decade, the government's performance and growth have been restricted and arrested in terms of proficiency, productivity, and innovation. Above and beyond, government has inherited a bureaucracy that is structured along the lines of functions and services rather than solving structural problems that breed inter alia poverty, powerlessness, and social injustice.

Solving complex problems that cut across social, political, and economic boundaries, new approaches are needed. Government needs to become more holistic, working towards greater integration across the public sector. Holistic governance incorporates internal structures of government, rules, standards, and norms of behaviour of civil servants. Achieving this requires that government does not only provide public services and enforce laws but also changes cultures.

Moreover, holistic and effective government will require that government moves steadily towards a sharper focus on real outcomes such as better health, lower unemployment or less crime, rather than the measures of activity which have dominated the most recent phase of reform. Hence, the nature and goal of holistic governance is the creation of a new paradigm in which directly appeals to the needs of the public.

This paper is a brief exposition of one of my proposals in my previous paper on political governance (Buendia 2022). It discusses holistic governance – its concept as a possible alternative in re-structuring the country's bureaucracy in the next six (6) years and beyond., intents and purposes, and strategies in advancing its institutionalization to address issues of good and effective governance, and engender effective exercise of state's power and authority towards the mitigation of peoples' socio-economic and political problems.

\* THE VIEWS AND OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN THIS PAPER ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THOSE OF THE INSTITUTE.



## THE CONCEPT AND HOW IT DIFFERS FROM THE REST

The British scholar Perri 6<sup>1</sup> was the first who advocated the concept of “holistic government” in 1997 in his book *“Holistic Government.”* Departmental fragmentation is the key problem that holistic governance wants to address, and coordination and integration of the related departments seems to be the answer. Holistic governance thus incorporates internal structures, rules, standards, and norms of government.

Perri 6 argues that in order to avoid governance fragmentation derived from functional divisions, government should be integrated across public sector (holistic), avoiding problems from occurring rather than curing them (preventive), focused on persuasion and information sharing rather than coercion and command (culture-changing), and directed on outcomes and not on measures of activity (results-oriented). Hence, government’s accountability mechanisms are aimed at ensuring that public servants’ behaviour leads to long-term organizational success and realizing efficient and effective delivery of public goods and services.

Then referred to as “joined-up government” (JUG) under the administration of former British Prime minister Tony Blair in 1999, was intended to deal with the problem of departmentalism existing within the rigid structures of public institutions which hinder the effective utilization of resources and taking on incentives. Articulated in its White Paper, *“Modernising Government”* (U.K. Cabinet Office 1999), JUG recommends that all parts of the executive government should be interconnected and complementary to one another by increasing their integration and coordination across fields of policy formulation and implementation. Mulgan (2005) argues that the main reason in instituting JUG has been the acknowledgement that some problems of government cannot be resolved solely within the departmental boundaries of good government but with participation of other departments. Additionally, departmentalism merely leads to

complex and complicated procedures in delivering desired policy outcomes.

Otherwise known as “horizontal management” in Canada, “connecting government” in Australia, and “whole of government” (WoG) in New Zealand (Farland 2004, p. 42), JUG was not a uniquely British phenomenon as other countries face similar problems on departmentalism. Perri 6 contends that the “silos” perspective of different departments hampers the problem-solving capability of government. A highly hierarchical organization has no or less interest in thwarting problems, as the credit and benefits of a preventive action often go to another department. It veers toward a turfing issue – a competition between departments for recognition. Tackling cross-cutting concerns between and among departments are less initiated and settled in spite of government’s admission that cross-cutting objectives need to be achieved (6, 1997, p. 31).

Apart from the generalities provided by JUG and related typologies on holistic government, Perri 6 advances twelve (12) major changes of policy and style of government management (6, 1997, pp. 10-12). These are:

1. Holistic budgeting: budget should be organized not by functions or organizations but around outcomes and geographical areas;
2. Organizations defined around outcomes;
3. Integrated information systems: One-stop shops should become the principal means by which the public deals with government;
4. Case Workers: The roles of frontline staff should be developed, empowering them to purchase services that suit the needs of the individual;
5. Outcome-based contracts;
6. Audits for prevention;
7. Enhancing the status and role of preventive work;

8. Early warning systems with safeguards: All public agencies should make greater use of risk assessment tools, futures tools, contingency planning and scenario planning;
9. Smarter purchasing;
10. Culture audits. Audits on the cultural dimensions of key problems to identify beliefs, attitudes, values, habits and assumptions among service users and the wider public;
11. Building information and persuasion into budgets; and
12. Cross-functional outcome measures.

Notwithstanding few revisions on the aforesaid list, Perri 6 together with his associates expanded the concept of holistic government to holistic governance. In their book, *“Towards Holistic Governance: The New Reform Agenda”* (6 et.al. 2002), a paradigm switch emerges with the change of approach from “public affairs” to “the public” referring to citizens, taxpayers, and clients. The former refers to traditional bureaucratic paradigm of Max Weber. It is a mechanistic view of organization which prevailed before the 1980s embodying the principles of Weberian bureaucracy, namely: hierarchy of authority, salaried careers, specialization and technical qualification, and written rules.

On one hand, New Public Management (NPM), a related approach, emphasizes professional management, performance, benchmarking, competition, market-orientation, and decentralization. It is an effort to make the public service more “business-like” and to improve its efficiency by using private sector management models; citizens are viewed as “customers” and public servants are regarded as public managers. On the other hand, holistic governance tended not simply to provide more opportunities for citizen engagement but also to place a heavier weight on the role of enterprises, especially the rising internet enterprises, in the digital government context (Emerson et.al. 2011). Table 1 below displays the similarities and differences between the three paradigms of public administration.

Holistic governance covers “vertical and horizontal modes of public affairs governance” that involves an increased participation of the private sector/actor to co-produce and co-distribute public services (Gao et.al. 2013). With the phenomenon of globalisation and internet revolution, the meaning of governance encompasses levels of sub-national, national, and cross-national governments as well as the variety of public bodies and public-private partnerships (Flinders & Smith, 1999; Light, 2000). The advancement of information technology makes e-government an inevitable governing option. Public e-services and projects are carried out within the framework of holistic governance. (Felix, R., et.al. 2017). Among its key features is laying emphasis on the unique role of governments which provide information, data, aggregation processes, and other policy tools in an attempt to empower enterprises to deliver public services (Hardi and Buti 2012).

In addition, integrated budgeting has a high probability to be technically feasible. The government’s accountability mechanisms are directed to ensure that behaviours lead to long-term organizational success and responsible activity. Thus, holistic governance is a system of action incorporating strategic and monitoring activities that determines the way a government prioritizes its responsibilities to its constituents and its civil servants as well.

Along these lines, holistic governance uses coordination, integration and responsibility as mechanism, utilizes information technology to integrate different levels of governance, function of governance, public-private co-operation and information system organically, increasingly facilitates the process from decentralized to centralized, from parts to the whole, and from fragmentation to integration. Compared to JUG, holistic governance covers more ground and poses a daunting challenge to current level of governance. In realizing holistic governance, Peng (u.d.) proposed three strategies: online governance; integrated organization; and active civil service.

TABLE 1 . PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PARADIGMS

Public Administration Paradigms	Traditional Bureaucracy	New Public Management	Holistic Governance
Time	Before 1980	1980-2000	After 2000
Management Concept	Public Management	Private Sector Management	Public/Private Partnership Central/Local Partnership Join-up Departments
Operational Principle	Functional Division	Partially Functional Integration	Integrated Operation
Organizational Type	Hierarchy	Market Specialization	Network
Performance Criteria	Input	Output	Solving People’s Problems
Operation of Power	Centralization	Decentralization	Sharing of Power
Financial Base	Annual Budget	Market/Competition	Integrated Budget
Civil Service	Rule Bound	Discipline/Efficient	Ethics and Values
Main Resources	Manpower	Information Technology	Online Governance
Public Service	Offer Public Service	Ensure Public Service	Meet the Needs of Public Service

SOURCE: PENG, T.C-P. (U.D.). STRATEGIES TO BUILD UP HOLISTIC GOVERNANCE. INSTITUTE OF EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN STUDIES, ACADEMIA SINICA. AVAILABLE FROM <  
HTTPS://WWW.EA.SINICA.EDU.TW/FILE/IMAGE/STRATEGIES%20TO%20BUILD%20UP%20HOLISTIC%20GOVERNANCE.PDF> P.6.

Briefly, online governance is set to achieve efficiency, quality, and democracy through a digital technology that is able to foster governmental operations for an enhanced delivery of integrated public services (Grönlund 2002). In holistic governance, people can obtain a whole range of public services from a single-entry portal. This requires three dimensions of website integration: integration among different levels of governments, integration among different departments, and integration among websites.

When the single government portal advances to the fully integrated level, online governance can be truly realized. Peng (u.d.) contends that online governance will be the main driver for holistic governance. Once understood and accepted by political actors, administrators, and the general public, he claims that the integration problems of administrative activities and website presentation can be solved professionally and administratively rather than politically.

Secondly, promoting an integrated government organization calls for two (2) dimensions: horizontal departmental integration and integration with a matrix type organizational framework and the cross-cutting departments that serve the purpose of coordinating cross-boundaries issues. A matrix type organizational framework refers to the combination of functional departments while cross-cutting departments include departments of human resource management, planning, and information technology.

The integration of government functions needs not only an integrating mechanism but also a changing of values structure in government operation. These values that include: integrity, accountability, service, equity, innovation, teamwork, excellence, honesty, commitment, quality, openness, communication, recognition, trust, effectiveness, and leadership (Kernaghan et al, 2000, p. 269). These organizational values are dynamic, interactive, forward-looking, and active in nature. Cultivating these values and making them the backbone of governmental operation demands a different breed of civil servant.

Finally, and in relation to the second strategy, holistic governance becomes a reality when an active civil service exists. As articulated by Denhardt and Denhardt in their New Public Service (2003), the public sector has to possess the following qualities (Denhardt and Denhardt 2003, p. 189): (a) commitment toward organizational values; (b) dedication to serve the public; (c) staunchness to empowerment and leadership sharing; and (d) allegiance to pragmatic incrementalism. An active civil service therefore needs a new system of human resources management that recruits and selects civil servant possessing qualities like moral sense, firm commitment, and initiative taking.

When the governing environment becomes even more complex and delicate, the knowledge expertise required of these civil servants will be enormous. A new development plan for civil servants' career

has to be created accordingly. And only when the idea of holistic governance enters civil servants' blood stream and integrated operations become natural can the success of holistic governance be achieved (Richards and Kavanagh 2000, p. 9). Gawthrop (1998) further asserts that administrators should have strong democratic and ethical convictions, deep belief in the superior values of democracy, and the moral vision of democracy (p. 24). And so, it is evident that political leadership will play the most important role in achieving the momentum that the holistic governance ideal demands.

### **BRIEF STATE OF PHILIPPINE BUREAUCRACY: ADMINISTRATIVE INEFFICIENCY AND POLITICAL PATRONAGE AND SPOILS SYSTEM**

Philippine bureaucracy is classified into three broad categories. One, by constitutional origin that comprises the constitutional commissions – Commission on Civil Service (CSC), Commission on Election (COMELEC), and Commission on Audit (COA). Two, by branches – Executive, Legislative, and Judiciary. And by levels of government – national, regional (including autonomous and administrative regions), and local governments. Distinction is also made between bureaucracies in the regular departments of government and those in corporate or semi-government entities otherwise known as government-owned and controlled corporations (GOCCs). As of August 2021, there are approximately 1.7 million civil servants employed. Majority of the total non-career positions hold casual and contractual positions (CSC).

Principally, the administrative structure of government is composed of cabinet departments under the executive branch, which are divided into administrative units called bureaus, commissions, offices, or other units of equivalent level. In turn, bureaus are subdivided into divisions and finally into sections. Presently, there are 24 departments<sup>2</sup> under the executive branch. Philippine bureaucracy

is organized along sectoral lines, having extreme influence upon the organization of field offices in local government units (LGUs).

Historically, the structure of the Philippine government has been notoriously fragmented and disparate. Reorganization or administrative reform has been a continuing agenda of the national government to address this problem. It is the traditional response to perceived inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and irresponsiveness of the bureaucracy. Practically, all elected presidents of the country have reorganized the government one way or the other.

Despite the promise of better delivery system of public goods and services to the people through changes in the functions, structures, and management of agencies within the executive branch of government, reorganization has created more administrative dysfunctions. These have been manifested through duplication and overlapping of functions, red tape, and administrative inefficiency. The bureaucratic pathologies do not only debilitate the capacity of government to respond to the people's growing needs and demands. It also erodes, eventually, the credibility and legitimacy of government as a political institution tasked to safeguard and serve the interests of the people.

Reyes (1993, p. 251) affirms that the insignificant impact of reorganization is due to its narrow focus on the "internal dynamics of structure and on functions mainly addressed to central office operations" as well as non-recognition of the participation of the client system thus exposing reorganization to "political interference reminiscent of the patronage system." He further says that the bureaucracy should veer away from inward-looking organizational measures and adopt outward-looking strategies which involve other sectors of society in the delivery of services.

Moreover, Uphoff (1995) contends that the ratio of input to output or the use of the "mechanistic model" cannot simply measure

bureaucracy's productivity (efficiency) and performance (effectivity). While not completely discarding the traditional approach in gauging productivity, he opines that the determinants of administrative productivity have their own limitations as causal factors. Consequently, there is a need to turn to other factors, usually less material and less measurable than to inputs considered in input-output models of administration. Uphoff, believes that the design systems of production – economic, political, social, and administrative – contribute heavily to productivity.

Besides, the control policies are often developed into stringent procedural safeguards, which, when interpreted from the standpoint of enforcing agencies become ends in themselves regardless of the terminal values for which these safeguards have been formulated. In other words, the overemphasis on the compliance to rules and procedures consequently sacrifices the goals and objectives of the agency concerned. Bureaucrats are enamoured with their respective unit's individualized program of control without appreciation of the overall objectives of control. Thus, leading to the failure of social service delivery system.

When control measures are instituted without considering the entire spectrum of government work, administrative dysfunctions are bound to occur directly or otherwise. Manifestly, control devices are carved not because of a diligent and perspicacious appraisal of their need, but as spontaneous exaggerated reaction to remedy a certain transient public problem. They are iatrogenic in the sense that they do not completely solve problems but recreate additional ones. It is in this light that bureaucracy faces the challenge of recasting its orientation from a rigid and strict rules and regulations to values of responsiveness towards client needs and demands.

Apart from administrative inefficiency, the prevalence of political patronage impedes the positive development and institutionalization of the culture of merit in Philippine bureaucracy.<sup>3</sup> Despite the

technological inputs to management processes, often resulting in more controls imposed on and by the bureaucratic system, patronage continues to flourish. Patronage de-motivates when it is utilized in the recruitment of public personnel. It becomes worse when it becomes the deciding factor in cases of promotion inasmuch as civil service personnel look at promotion as an important aspect in career advancement in government. More often than not, political interference is the major and critical single factor identified as interfering with promotion, hence, career progression.

Civil service employees, especially the rank and file, have accepted the reality that the lack of required educational qualifications and paucity of training and educational opportunities are not impediments to enter government service. Apparently, a combination of poor or low educational preparation and unclear career paths has constrained the professionalization of public organizations. On the other hand, for the professional and technical categories, a definite route towards getting a career in government is through performance with patronage. The common practice of political intervention is abetted by the regularity of changes in the political leadership. This means that after each election, political debts have to be paid. Given the principles of political neutrality and security of tenure, the bureaucracy in due time will be dominated by misfits and undesirables.

In pursuit of merit, competence, and performance, the CSC raised the passing grade in examinations for entry to the government service. However, shortly after implementing the policy, Republic Act 6850 was passed in February 1990 which provides government employees under temporary appointment status with at least seven (7) years of efficient service is given not only the civil service eligibility but permanency as well. Obviously, this does not enhance merit recruitment but a reinforcement of patronage. It is unfair to the civil service eligible employees who had to prove themselves qualified by examination and not by length of service.

“**HOLISTIC GOVERNANCE RESOLVES THE PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE INEFFICIENCY AND POLITICAL PATRONAGE AND SPOILS SYSTEM. IT PROMOTES A CULTURE OF MERIT AND RELIES ON POLITICAL CHAMPIONS IN TRANSFORMING PHILIPPINE BUREAUCRACY AT EVERY LEVEL.**”

## AN AGENDA IN FOSTERING HOLISTIC GOVERNANCE: ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

The bureaucracy remains beset with a long list of complex administrative dysfunctions, from graft and corruption, red tape, incompetence, inefficiency, and centralization to political patronage and spoils system to bureaucratic size. The dysfunctionality of the Philippine system of government is much related to politics as the condition of the permanent bureaucracy. Furthermore, the absence of a comprehensive and detailed framework by which administrative problems are to be prioritized and analyzed whereby reforms can be put in place more systematically and consistently contribute to the continuing malaise in the bureaucracy (Reyes 1994).

As discussed earlier, holistic governance conceptually tackles the fragmentation of public service provision. It endeavours to remedy service fragmentation that comes from departmentalism. It carries out the strategy of coordination, integration and increasing closeness and mutual involvement in the level of procedures. Departmentalism exists at the central as well as at the regional and local government levels.

In the Philippines, almost all departments under the executive branch of government are basically functional divisions. Although the sectoral grouping of departments augments specialization and knowledge base of the department, it ignores the cross boundaries issues and concerns. Worst, it entails the risk of problems and individuals being “dumped” by one department onto another (6, 1997, p. 31).

Engaging towards holistic governance may not be easy and will take time given the several decades of bureaucratic impairment. Nonetheless, it is better to start work on the reforms on the bureaucracy as soon as possible under the next administration and beyond to be able to achieve better delivery of public services and goods to the people. This part of the paper succinctly deliberates

on the three fundamental bureaucratic proposals in accordance with holistic governance, namely on: outcome-based departments; integration of budget; and information systems.

### OUTCOME-BASED DEPARTMENTS

In as much as there are only 13 core functional departments – home or interior affairs, foreign affairs, finance, economic affairs, defense, education, justice, transportation, labor, agriculture, culture, environment, and social security – the country has 23 Departments (see note 2 below). It is therefore suggested to shift from governing by functions to outcome-focused departments. For example, in a poverty alleviation program, power and responsibility of the Department of Labour and Employment may be increased while other Departments’ power related to the former is reduced or recalibrated to operate the whole range of functions in support of housing, family policy, public health, public information, cultural policy, crime and so on. In line with holistic governance, public management is built largely around the notion of performance and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public institutions.

While outcome-based departments would not resolve all problems of inconsistency and coordination it would be a major achievement in improving the efficient utilization of financial, administrative, and technological resources by focusing on key national or local problems. This will moreover alter the culture of government away from the culture of the “departmental silo” toward one of genuine partnership.

On government negotiated contracts either internally or externally, to be delivered to the public, have to be specifically defined in outcome terms, allowing providers more flexibility to define the service activities to achieve this. Exceptions, however may be made for some contracts which are forged for experimental purposes or

pilot projects. These type of trial contracts may have a very long-time scale and outcomes would be impossible to quantify and results are uncertain. In this case, outcome contracts will not be appropriate.

### INTEGRATION OF BUDGET

Similarly, budgets need to be organised not by functions but around outcomes and geographical areas, right down to the level of the LGUs to enable that services can be designed in the most effective manner, closely focusing on key social groups in each area, especially targeting vulnerable groups – elderly, children, women, minorities, and persons with disabilities either physically or psychologically challenged or both.

Holistic budgeting by geographical area will decentralise much of bringing together important information and intelligence and give much greater financial scope to local purchasing agencies to design and strategize services as they see suitable for local development. In this situation, it will be possible to establish more downward accountability and transparency to citizens and service users. On the part of the national government, central systems of oversight, audit and policy review will then be its fundamental concern, i.e., concentrating on monitoring and evaluation, identifying lessons on effectiveness and value for money and disseminating best practice from local innovation.

Finally, resources from these holistic budgets for outcome-based contracts should be much more open to competition between departments and other tiers of government such as local government, consortia, partnerships and the private sector.

Integrating budgets can be done in multiple ways. Schemes have been developed for instance which will overcome the division between health service and social security for elderly people (Leat



and 6 1997). These examples can be built on in fields such as homelessness to overcome the divisions between different benefits and housing budgets.

### INFORMATION SYSTEMS

It becomes imperative to integrate the “front-end” of government or the parts of government that deal with the citizens for a holistic governance to be realized. In as much as “one-stop shops” (OSSs) have stemmed within certain tiers of government, at LGU level or field offices of central government, it is essential now that they have to go much further.

One-stop shops or offices that offer multiple public services or good should become the foremost means by which the public deals with government, both physically and electronically, through a common interface. This does not only simplify the process of dealing with government as well as for governments’ customers but also provide convenience and efficiency to citizens. To make systems more comprehensible and extensive, OSSs are to be organised around life events which trigger people’s need for services like certificates of birth, marriage, or death, funeral service, becoming unemployed, losing a home, legal adoption, annulment of marriage, or life and non-life insurance, etc.

This could be done online or by using a computer system that would bring to citizens’ attention all the services available and those that they might help them. Eventually, the functions and services that make up today’s public sector will become “back offices” and “content providers” for these one-stop shops. Over time, they will operate and be managed in more and more integrated ways. Because these systems will handle very large volumes of personal information about individuals, they will be subject to confidentiality





codes on the handling of personal information to safeguard and protect identities of individuals and uphold their rights to privacy.

### CIVIL SERVANTS' VALUE SYSTEM

The Philippine state machine is said to be slow-moving and cumbersome, afflicted by chronic “bureaucratic cancer.” Many civil servants cared little about delivering reforms and lack serious thinking about how to improve the delivery of public service, while politicians proved to be weak with little experience of running complex organisations. The bureaucracy remains fused to the public choice doctrines of New Public Management (NPM) which emphasizes that public servants are motivated by self-interest such as pay-for-performance, and clear performance targets assessed by performance evaluations rather than altruism (Horton 2006).

Under holistic governance, an improved breed of civil servants is developed. They are subjected to rigid performance audit, inspection, and scrutiny. These professionals are trained not only in identifying which target to meet but also how to go about meeting them through detailed prescription of professional practice, i.e., how public services are delivered using allocated resources. A new civil service development plan has to be designed to shape a better mindset of civil servants who have a firm commitment to public service. Note that the failure of the bureaucracy to carry out its tasks and respond to urgent challenges erode the political legitimacy of government.

### ANTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE

Governance which is inclined to making decisions to anticipate possible outcomes works within the realm of holistic governance.

It employs foresight and predictions to create future plans, execute relevant actions, decrease risk, and develop efficient and effective methods to resolve early conception of “damaging” events to society and prevent them from happening.

Anticipatory governance is a subset of holistic governance which envisions governance on the long-term. In the case of the Philippines, it is to be considered that its political system reinforces not long, but chronic short-termism. Government's policy direction, plans, and programs are aligned almost with the electoral cycle. Departments under the executive branch concentrate on rendering public services that are tremendously “curative,” fixated on intervening after the event. Unfortunately, this is contrary to holistic governance's precept which is driven by “preventive” measures or confronting problems before they become worst and turn acute. The reactive rather than proactive response of the Philippine government at the height of the COVID-19 outbreak in the country manifests the short-sightedness of political leaders.

Given such situation, government at all levels have to deepen its capacity for “upstream” thinking. Focus on managing risk is essential especially in the aftermath of every crisis and disaster, either man-made or by nature. Preventative measures, functions, and responsibilities in public services have to be fortified by refining existing structure of pay and enriching rewards and status.

In the course of the aforesaid actionable proposals, it is crucial to re-centralise some tasks, such as overall goal-setting, gauging and measuring outcomes and agreeing on budgets. Others will need to be decentralised, such as information and data gathering, initiative and innovation in programme design and local project output delivery, and local democratic accountability to users and the public.

“ UNDER HOLISTIC GOVERNANCE, AN IMPROVED BREED OF CIVIL SERVANTS IS DEVELOPED. THEY ARE SUBJECTED TO RIGID PERFORMANCE AUDIT, INSPECTION, AND SCRUTINY. THESE PROFESSIONALS ARE TRAINED NOT ONLY IN IDENTIFYING WHICH TARGET TO MEET BUT ALSO HOW TO GO ABOUT MEETING THEM THROUGH DETAILED PRESCRIPTION OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE, HOW PUBLIC SERVICES ARE DELIVERED USING ALLOCATED RESOURCES. ”



## CONCLUSION

As the new administration moves in to lead the country in the next six (6) years, governance is a crucial issue. The opportunity to shift governance from extensive fragmentation and functional focus to integration has never before so great. Holistic governance intends to accomplish the necessary integration among government's various hierarchies and departments as well as that among public-private departments to form the network structure of service-oriented government. It constructs a three-dimensional integration model through the integration of governance hierarchy, the integration of governance functions and the integration between public and private departments (Tang R. and Zhao G. 2012).

The new agenda for government for the next six years and beyond is clear. At the heart of holistic governance is the efficient and effective delivery of public goods and services through a better bureaucratic structure and system. It takes the solution of peoples' livelihood as the core. While upholding the value of efficiency, it underscores the values of justice, fairness and responsibility, civil rights, popular sovereignty and public interest to fully demonstrate the publicity of public administration.

Akin to other advocacies and movements, holistic governance needs political champions at every level – national, regional, and local government. Turning around the Philippine bureaucracy into the direction of public service that embraces cultures of holism, culture change and outcome-orientation is indeed challenging. Throughout

the civil service, agencies, local government, as well as from the public sector professions, leaders are needed to carry forward the program of holistic governance.

If bureaucratic transformation is to be realized, politicians, policymakers, and bureaucrats have to learn to participate actively in the process of integration, to give up some political and organizational interests, and to provide and mobilize more resources to appropriate departments, agencies, and offices. Only when these are fulfilled can reformers, campaigners, and champions talk seriously of a government that “works.”



ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Perri 6 is a British social scientist. He changed his name from David Ashworth to Perri 6 in 1983.

<sup>2</sup> These departments are headed by either Cabinet Secretaries or Cabinet-level Secretaries. These are the Department of: (1) Agrarian Reform; (2) Agriculture; (3) Budget and Management; (4) Education, Culture and Sports; (5) Energy; (6) Environment and Natural Resources; (7) Finance; (8) Foreign Affairs; (9) Health; (10) Human Settlements and Urban Development; (11) Information and Communication Technology; (12) Interior and Local Government; (13) Justice; (14) Labor and Employment; (15) Migrant Workers; (16) National Defense; (17) Public Works and Highways; (18) Science and Technology; (19) Social Welfare and Development; (20) Tourism; (21) Trade and Industry; (22) Transportation and Communications; (23) Presidential Communications and Operations Office; and (24) National Economic and Development Authority.

<sup>3</sup> For a historical background on the roots of political patronage and the spoils system in the civil service see Endriga 1985.

Picture Credits:

<sup>1</sup> Cover page: [goodnewspilipinas.com/ph-climbs-10-ranks-world-happiness-index/.jpg](http://goodnewspilipinas.com/ph-climbs-10-ranks-world-happiness-index/.jpg)

<sup>2</sup> Page 2: [blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/what-the-filipino-youth-want-beyond-the-may-2016-elections](http://blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/what-the-filipino-youth-want-beyond-the-may-2016-elections)

<sup>3</sup> Page 8: [gulfnews.com/world/asia/philippines/25-paid-by-filipino-expat-workers-how-far-does-it-go-1.1592997968947](http://gulfnews.com/world/asia/philippines/25-paid-by-filipino-expat-workers-how-far-does-it-go-1.1592997968947)

REFERENCES

6 Perri. (1997). *Holistic Government*. London: Demos.

6 Perri, Leat, D. Seltzer, K. & Stoker, G. (2002). *Towards Holistic Governance: The New Reform Agenda*. New York: Palgrave.

Arndt, C. & Oman, C. (2006). *Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicator*, OECD Development Center Studies. Paris: OECD.

Boivard, T. & Löffler, E. (2003). Evaluating the quality of public governance: indicators, models and methodologies, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 69, pp. 313-328.

Buendia, R.G. (2022). Lessons and prospects in Philippine political governance: cutting across regimes from Marcos to Duterte. Unpublished, April. Makati: Stratbase Alberto del Rosario Institute (ADRI).

Denhardt, J.V. & Denhardt, R.B. (2003). *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*. London: M.E. Sharpe.

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2011). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22 (1). 11–29.

Endriga, J.N. (1985) Stability and change: civil service in the Philippines, *Philippine Journal of Public Administration* 29 (2), 132-154.

Farland, T. (2004). A question of balance: reflections on the public sector management of whole of government issues, *Public Administration Today* 1, pp. 41-48.

Felix, R., Rauschnabel, & P.A., Hinsch, C. (2017) Elements of strategic social media marketing: A holistic framework. *Journal of Business Research* 70, 118–126.

Flinders, M.V. & Smith M.J. (1999). *Quangos, Accountability and Reform: The Politics of Quasi-Government*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Gao, X.; Song, Y.; Zhu, X. Integration and coordination: Advancing China's fragmented e-government to holistic governance. *Government Information Quarterly* 30 (2). 2013. 173–181.

Gawthrop, L.C (1998). *Public Service and Democracy: Ethical Imperatives for the 21st Century* London: Chatham House Publications.

Grönlund, Å. (2002). *Electronic Government: Design, Applications & Management*. London: Idea Group Publishing.

Hardi, P. and Buti, K. (2012). Corporate governance variables: Lessons from a holistic approach to Central-Eastern European practice. *Corporate Governance. International Journal of Business in Society* 12 (1) 101–117.

Hood, C., Beeston, C., & Dixon, R. (2007). Rating the rankings: assessing international ranking of public service performance, *International Public Management Journal*, 11 (3) pp.298-328).

Horton, S. (2006). New public management: its impact on public servant's identity: An introduction to this symposium, *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 19 (6). pp. 533-542. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550610685970>

Kernaghan, K., Marson, B., & Borins, S. (2000). *The New Public Organization*. Toronto: The Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC).

Knack, S., Kugler, M. & Manning, N. (2003). Second-generation governance indicators, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 69, pp. 354-364.

Leat, D. and 6 P. (1997). *Holding Back the Years: How Britain Can Grow Old Better in the Twenty First Century*, Demos, London.

Light, P.C. (2000). *The New Public Service*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Mulgan, G. (2005). *Joined-up government: past, present, and future*. British Academy Scholarship Online. Available <https://britishacademy.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.5871/bacad/9780197263334.001.0001/upso-9780197263334-chapter-8> DOI:10.5871/bacad/9780197263334.003.0008

Peng, T.C-P. (u.d.). Strategies to build up holistic governance. Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica. Available from < <https://www.ea.sinica.edu.tw/file/Image/Strategies%20to%20Build%20Up%20Holistic%20Governance.pdf>>

Republic of the Philippines (1990). Republic Act 6890. An Act to Grant Civil Service Eligibility Under Certain Conditions to Government Employees Appointed Under Provisional or Temporary Status who have Rendered a Total of Seven (7) Years of Efficient Service, and for other purposes.

Republic of the Philippines, Civil Service Commission (CSC) Available from < <http://www.csc.gov.ph/>>

Reyes, D.R. (1993). Tensions in the troubled bureaucracy: reform initiatives in public organizations and service delivery systems, *Philippine Journal of Public Administration* 37, 3. Philippines: University of the Philippines-National College of Public Administration and Governance (UP-NCPAG) Press.

Reyes, D.R. (1994). Reinventing government and bureaucracy in the Philippines: old themes and a new image, *Philippine Journal of Public Administration* 38 ( 2). Philippines: UP-NCPAG.

Richard, D. & Kavanagh, D. (2000). Can Joined-Up Government Be A Reality? A Case Study of the British Labour Government 1997-2000. Paper presented in Australian Political Studies Association 2000 Conference, October 4-6. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Tang, R. and Zhao, G. (2012). The Structural Logic of the Holistic Governance and Its Respond to Political Fragmentation. *Proceedings of the 2012 International Conference on Public Management (ICPM 2012)*. Available from < <https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icpm-12/2897>>

U.K. Cabinet Office. (1999). *Modernising Government*. London: Stationery Office.

Uphoff, N. (1995). Productivity in public administration: some post-newtonian observations in Carino, L.V. (ed.) *Conquering Politico-Administrative Frontiers: Essays in Honor of Raul P. de Guzman*. Philippines: UP-CPA.





## ABOUT

**Rizal Buendia, Ph.D**

is a non-resident Fellow of Stratbase Albert del Rosario Institute. He is an independent consultant and researcher in Southeast Asian Politics and International Development, Wales, UK and a former Teaching Fellow at the Politics and International Studies Department and the Department of Development Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. He is also a former Chair of the Political Science Department, De La Salle University in Manila, Philippines.

**STRATBASE ADR INSTITUTE**

is an independent international and strategic research organization with the principal goal of addressing the issues affecting the Philippines and East Asia

The Financial Tower  
6794 Ayala Avenue, Makati City  
Philippines 1226

V 8892.1751  
F 8892.1754

[www.stratbase.ph](http://www.stratbase.ph)

