

DOI: 10.15276/ETR.02.2022.9  
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7319812  
UDC: 35:338.24  
JEL: E22, G31

## EFFECTIVE PRACTICES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN THE CONDITIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REF

### ЕФЕКТИВНІ ПРАКТИКИ ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ: АНАЛІЗ МІЖНАРОДНОГО ДОСВІДУ В УМОВАХ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ РЕФОРМ ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ

Olena V. Nikoliuk, DEcon, Professor  
Odesa National Academy of Food Technologies, Odesa, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0002-1665-0361  
Email: alenavn11@gmail.com

Nataliia O. Briushkova, PhD in Economics, Associate Professor  
Odesa National Academy of Food Technologies, Odesa, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0002-5720-0623  
Email: natashabrju@ukr.net

Natalia A. Dobrianska, DEcon, Professor  
Odesa Polytechnic State University, Odesa, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0000-0002-0826-8840  
Email: semen-198@te.net.ua

Received 10.04.2022

*Ніколюк О.В., Брюшкова Н.О., Добрянська Н.А. Ефективні практики публічного управління: аналіз міжнародного досвіду в умовах реалізації реформ публічного управління. Оглядова стаття.*

У статті проведено оцінку закордонних систем публічного управління на прикладі країн-членів Європейського Союзу. На основі проведеного аналізу ефективності впровадження реформ публічного управління в країнах-членах ЄС нами систематизовано ключові напрями адаптації позитивних векторів в українські реалії: 1. Пошук політичної підтримки, надійного лідерства на всіх етапах реформи, розробка довгострокової та стратегічної дорожньої карти/плану змін і збереження масштабів цілеспрямованості реформ; 2. Створити сильну зовнішню підтримку зацікавлених сторін і внутрішню власність для досягнення цього шляхом поєднання принципів «зверху вниз» і «знизу вгору»; 3. Створити відповідні ресурси та системи (державної служби) для всіх рівнів та процесів; 4. Забезпечити заходи для моніторингу/вимірювання прогресу/результатів впроваджуваних реформ. Запропоновано стратегічні орієнтири підвищення ефективності системи публічного управління, враховуючи провідний світовий досвід: зосередження на підтемах, а не на комплексних і часто надто загальних заходах; вимірювання, які можна використовувати для цілей навчання менше, ніж для оцінювання (або суто з метою підзвітності); використання опитування працівників для збору порівняльних даних про державне управління; імплементація стратегії відкритих даних дозволяють аналітикам проводити академічні та неакадемічні дослідження спільноти для вивчення питань ефективності публічного управління.

*Ключові слова:* публічне управління, реформа, досвід, стратегія, ефективність

*Nikoliuk O.V., Briushkova N.O., Dobrianska N.A. Effective practices of public administration: analysis of international experience in the conditions of implementation of public administration ref. Review article.*

The article evaluates foreign public administration systems on the example of the member states of the European Union. Based on the analysis of the effectiveness of the implementation of public administration reforms in the EU member states, we have systematized the key areas of adaptation of positive vectors to Ukrainian realities: 1. Search for political support, reliable leadership at all stages of the reform, development of a long-term and strategic road map/plan for changes and preservation of scope goals of reforms; 2. Build strong external stakeholder support and internal ownership to achieve this through a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches; 3. Create appropriate resources and systems (civil service) for all levels and processes; 4. Provide measures for monitoring/measuring progress/results of implemented reforms. Strategic orientations for improving the efficiency of the public management system are proposed, taking into account the leading world experience: focusing on subtopics, rather than on complex and often too general measures; measurements that can be used for learning purposes less than for evaluation (or purely for accountability purposes); using employee surveys to collect comparative data on public administration; the implementation of the open data strategy allows analysts to conduct academic and non-academic community research to study issues of public management effectiveness.

*Keywords:* public administration, reform, experience, strategy, efficiency

It is undeniable that the key factor in the success of any state policy is the adoption and proper implementation of a science-based program of public administration. The importance of effective public management lies, in particular, in the fact that it allows you to establish subject relations with the public in order to significantly reduce or minimize possible losses and risks in your activities, thereby obtaining more benefits. Public relations entities have the opportunity to use the above process also to maximize their interests and protect the rights and freedoms of the country's citizens. At this stage of the development of public administration, the urgent importance of developing and implementing a modern program of effective public administration in various spheres of public life is emphasized. Special emphasis is placed on the need to support international cooperation in times of active globalization. The main goal of any manager in the public-private sector is to achieve maximum efficiency, reasonableness and effectiveness with minimal resources, time and effort. The main task facing a public manager is different from the task of a manager in the business sector. A public manager cares about how to rationally use public infrastructure to produce public goods and satisfy public interests. It is worth noting that most of the constitutional rights of citizens, foreigners, and stateless persons are exercised at the level of local self-government. At the same time, local self-government plays a special role in the mechanism of

public administration, it ensures the relationship between society, the individual and the state.

### Analysis of recent research and publications

Based on the socio-scientific relevance of issues related to the content of the topic of this article, it should be emphasized that the field of public administration was considered by many experts. Many qualified specialists from scientific fields related to public administration are engaged in the study of the fundamental regularities of this sphere, namely: O. Antonova, M. Blazhivska, E. Borodin, O. Bosak, G. Diana, R. Dzyaniy, H. Hurst, I. Khozhilo, A. Kolodiy, M. Kuybida, A. Lypentsev, N. Lipovska, M. Minenko, L. Prokopenko, S. Serokhin and others.

*The aim of the article is to identify proposals and recommendations to ensure the effective functioning of the public administration system in Ukraine. The main emphasis is on the study and analysis of foreign public administration systems in order to find the most effective one for Ukraine.*

### The main part

The general state structure, history and current politics and other cultural aspects of each EU member state remain decisive factors in the formation of commitment to reforms and certain types of administrative modernization. First, there is a constant high heterogeneity among EU member states, which has a significant impact on the results of public administration reforms. Second, valid comparative data for systematic evaluation of public administration and the results of public administration reforms are still lacking in many areas. Most of the conclusions in EU countries emphasize the lack of systematic evidence and assessments of the success of administrative reforms. In most countries, there is also no center for a mechanism for monitoring and reporting on the progress of reforms [1].

However, despite the different starting points, the analysis of the 28 EU member states shows interesting results and common characteristics. What is most striking is the continued high relevance and momentum of public administration reform in EU member states, even in countries that are performing relatively well. The trend of fairly high intensity of implementation of public administration reforms, which has been observed for many years since the 1980s [2], has also continued in the last decade and can be confirmed for all EU member states.

As for the content of the reform, despite all the differences between the countries, we see significant common features in the topics of public administration reform. Such features are becoming increasingly influenced by the European Commission's agenda and support mechanisms (e.g. Single Window, Regulatory Impact Assessment, Administrative Burden, Digitalization and Open Government), especially in Southern and Eastern Europe. Below are the most common reform trends observed in 28 EU member states, which are key components of the "European" approach to public administration reform [3-4]:

- open government initiatives and reforms to strengthen external transparency: legislation on freedom of information, open data, procurement reforms, creation of anti-corruption bodies;
- civil service reform with an emphasis on retrenchment measures to reduce the size and costs of civil servants, strengthen meritocracy, improve performance appraisals and introduce codes of conduct;
- e-government measures, such as the creation of portals and electronic signatures, the introduction of online services and the development of a single window in order to improve the provision of services;
- reforms to strengthen government coordination capacity and merger of agencies/independent bodies (mainly created during the reform period);
- performance management and reforms to increase productivity and strengthen results orientation;
- strengthening evidence-based policy development and better regulation experience with various tools such as regulatory impact assessment, factual assessment or stakeholder consultation;
- reduction of the administrative burden on enterprises and citizens.

Reforms in most countries were caused by a combination of changes in government (14 countries) and the pressure of European integration (18 countries). In a significant number of countries, budget pressures (15) and the financial crisis also became the main driving force behind the reform. The most important event that influenced the course of reforms was the independence of several countries, while all other factors, such as citizen, business or trade union pressure, played only a minor role in most EU member states [5].

It is difficult to determine general patterns, however, we can note that the reforms in 2/3 of the EU countries are rather incremental in nature, rather than on a significant scale. In all other EU countries, there is a clear approach to reforms based on the law. The most obvious observation about the nature of the reforms is undoubtedly the top-down approach. Most of the changes were mainly planned and implemented by executive politicians and senior civil servants. Thus, the reform of public administration in Europe is mainly in the hands of the political elite [6].

The responsibility for public administration reform in most EU member states is divided between different ministries or organizations, and we can find different approaches to coordinate administrative reform. Rather, in many countries we observe frequent structural changes in the bodies responsible for public administration, which indicates the complex role of such coordinating bodies.

The analysis and generalization of the experience of the EU countries is a convincing proof that, among the general public, the administrative reform over the last decade has been quite fast, with both positive and negative evidence regarding the overall success of the reform plans, as well as specific reform initiatives presented in the documents. The analysis also shows

that the results of public administration reforms are extremely difficult to determine, and cross-country reports consistently highlight the lack of systematic evidence and evaluations of the success of administrative reforms. Most countries also lack central mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on the progress and results of reforms.

Based on our systematic comparative analysis of public administration reform in EU countries, key indicators of the reform have been identified (1. Transparency and accountability. 2. System of public service and public administration. 3. Service provision and digitalization. 4. Government organization and management. 5. Policy formation, coordination and regulation) and frameworks for assessing the potential of public administration, its productivity.

In the field of state organization and management, the last decade has been characterized by both the continuation of decentralization and the reduction of the number of local self-government bodies. At the central government level, many EU Member States have also sought to improve horizontal coordination and strengthen the capacity of management centers to reduce the number of agencies but also improve management productivity and focus. Also, many EU countries have reformed their budget process to better link it with strategic planning and government activities.

A key trend in reforming the organization of central government in the EU states has been the reduction of the number of agencies, especially through mergers. Although we observe important diversity in terms of the number of agencies in the EU Member States. This is particularly true in Northern European countries such as Finland and Sweden, where agencies have traditionally been an important feature of central government even up to the 1990s, and in Central and Eastern European countries, where the number of agencies has increased well before EU accession [7].

In parallel with the reduction in the number of agencies, many EU Member States have sought to improve centralized management and coordination capacity, using approaches such as strengthening the Center of Public Organizations, strategic frameworks, performance measurement and management by objectives.

Within the dimension "Organization and management of the state", the aspect "capacity for strategic planning" is a good indicator of how well prepared the governments of a country are than others, since only holistic and integrated approaches to public administration can be put into practice if there are clear visions, specifically defined goals and political commitments.

According to this indicator, the three Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Finland, Sweden), in addition to Great Britain and the Baltic countries, Latvia and Lithuania, have the highest level of government capacity for strategic planning among all EU member states. Southeast countries such as Slovenia, Romania, Greece, and Cyprus, as well as Hungary, surprisingly,

Germany and Luxembourg have quite low scores for this indicator [5].

Strategic planning capacity must be complemented by "implementation capacity" enabling governments to implement their plans. The "Public Administration Reform Capacity Indicator" combines both qualitative and quantitative evaluation indicators based on 7 dimensions (1) government effectiveness, (2) compliance of ministers, (3) monitoring ministries, (4) monitoring agencies and bureaucracy, (5) task funding, (6) constitutional discretionary powers, and (7) national standards for assessing implementation capacity.

While there is a fairly strong correspondence between strategic and planning capabilities with this indicator, there are some interesting differences between countries. Sweden, Luxembourg, Poland, as well as France and Germany are clearly ranked higher in terms of "ability to implement reforms". On the contrary, Croatia is much stronger in strategic planning than in implementation [6].

Based on the analysis of the effectiveness of the implementation of public administration reforms in the EU member states, we have systematized the key areas of adaptation of positive vectors to Ukrainian realities.

1. Political support and consistency. Continuity of government activity and corresponding political commitment at the top is assessed by many experts as a key factor for successful public administration reforms. Political interest, support and consistency certainly contribute and can ensure a large-scale reform (at least three years or more). For example, a parliamentary majority can be crucial, as inter-ministerial rivalry (a political power game) often impedes or reverses reform efforts. It also includes the desire for persistence and the commitment of external factors, which means a combination of incentives and sanctions of specific reform programs.

In the same context, the success of the reform depends on how far the politicians want to go and how far they are not afraid of complex reforms. However, as a note and a certain limitation, if new parties with no experience come to power, they must first learn their trade and are not ready for major reforms. As governments often do not have enough capacity to tackle large-scale reforms, targeted reforms are more successful (eg the experience of Estonia).

Experience shows that small and gradual reforms work better. There is a clear need for a more strategic approach to the future government of some EU Member States, which are far-reaching and far-reaching in scope, such as Finland's Future Government Reports, which have been an integral part of the parliamentary cycle for over 20 years.

Finally, trust in reformers is very important. There is a lack of trust in various countries of Southeast Europe towards reformers, as reforms become tools for political games between different parties. Mechanisms of reforms must be depoliticized and the autonomy of reformers is necessary. Effective communication (many times reforms have failed due

to lack of adequate competence) and leadership, as well as engagement of opponents (it is better to integrate the opposition) and depoliticization of civil servants are imperative.

2. Build strong stakeholder support and internal ownership and achieve this through a combination of top-down management and bottom-up participation.

In public sector organizations, it is recommended to increase strategic flexibility based on processes that are more open, evidence-based and iterative. An innovation sector was established in cooperation with the European Commission, which created a new framework for the transformation system in the public sector, outlining a number of interrelated elements that must be taken into account by public administrations. Example:

- accommodation (time and resources to better understand and research the policy issue from different perspectives allows for a better definition of the purpose and objectives of the intended change. Connecting with a diverse set of internal and external stakeholders is also important to obtain valuable ideas. This also creates legitimacy for the change process and stronger support from stakeholders, allowing them to reflect on the problem without offering preconceived solutions);
- design and prototyping (it is necessary to choose a specific method according to the specific context, the design process should identify the elements of the proposed solution, as well as the actions that need to be performed to create the desired result. The design should also be tested to obtain additional evidence of the problem to be solved, and solution outcomes that ultimately improve the proposed solution);
- leadership (management refers to a form of flexible leadership or transformational leadership that directs and controls the implementation of a proposed project and adapts decisions in light of unexpected events and new information during the implementation phase. This requires allocating resources more efficiently between the design and implementation phases).

3. Designing a civil service management system:

3.1. There is broad consensus that reward for performance has positive consequences for the performance, motivation and integrity of civil servants, while politicization of the civil service is widely associated with negative consequences.

2. Civil service reformers and academic researchers lack adequate evidence on how to develop effective performance-based selection systems and how to overcome the politicization of the civil service in the first place.

3. There is limited knowledge of what works in other areas such as civil service management, such as pay management, performance management and career management, and how best to design civil service management structures for this context.

Evidence of the effectiveness of many functions of public service management is often unavailable or unreliable. Furthermore, the available evidence suggests that some practices may be generally

beneficial for public service quality, but in many cases the choice of public service design may be context-specific. Monitoring and evaluation tools that help identify strengths, weaknesses, and thus areas of public service management need improvement. In addition, they can be an effective management tool to engage people in public administration, get feedback and respond to problems.

4. Assessment and measurement of public administration performance. In recent decades, measuring the effectiveness of public administration has had continuous international, European, and sometimes national ambitions of governments. The drive to develop benchmarks has grown in recognition of the fundamental role of public administration in building prosperous societies. Successful measurement projects in other policy areas fueled interest in measurement in public administration. Health indicators, environmental indicators and the PISA project for educational effectiveness are positive examples of international comparative indicators that have been used in many program documents and discussions [7].

Issues of reliable confirmation of conceptual models of public administration productivity are gaining relevance. We offer several strategic guidelines for improving the efficiency of the public management system, taking into account the world's leading experience:

1. Focus on subtopics rather than complex and often overly general activities. Well-chosen sectoral topics, such as tax administration issues, provide useful information that also gives an indication of the system as a whole (e.g. EU integration, digital agenda) and call for action.

2. Measurements that can be used for learning purposes less than for evaluation (or purely for accountability purposes). This seems to be sorely lacking. It turns out that systems (and people) are looking for technically valid and reliable measurements that "tell the truth" and easily demonstrate cause and effect. However, this requires a mental approach to finding measurements that can indicate something in the area of result/impact. Things that can spark political debate.

3. Using employee surveys to collect comparative data on public administration. While the views of citizens, businesses and experts are often used now in indicator schemes, workers are left out of the equation. It is advisable to conduct pan-European regular surveys by developing, supporting and providing advice on this matter with the support of academic circles, trade unions of civil servants, etc.

4. The implementation of the open data strategy allows analysts to conduct academic and non-academic community research to study issues of public management effectiveness.

5. Apart from public finance statistics, public administration data are not included in the Eurostat system. Eurostat does have an experimental statistics program where they are developing new data sources. Public management may be suitable for experimental development into an established data stream. Relevant

services can collect, analyze and use such (sub-thematic) data in the field of public administration.

### Conclusions

Thus, the study found that public administration as a social phenomenon, its forms, methods, principles and specific mechanisms are determined by the existing needs of socio-economic development. European integration processes put forward new requirements for the system of functioning of the national system of public administration, which should become an effective and efficient means of

public administration, promote openness and transparency in the development of public relations, etc.

In turn, based on the study of the experience of foreign countries, it can be concluded that the development of public administration should be based on the simultaneous qualitative improvement of several aspects related to this field. First of all, it is about improving legislative regulation as the main condition for effectiveness. Changes in the assessment of the quality of managerial activity are also important.

### Abstract

The article evaluates foreign public administration systems on the example of the member states of the European Union. Identified and systematized the most common reform trends observed in EU member states, which are key components of the "European" approach to public administration reform: open government initiatives and reforms to strengthen external transparency: legislation on freedom of information, open data, procurement reforms, creation anti-corruption bodies; civil service reform with an emphasis on retrenchment measures to reduce the size and costs of civil servants, strengthen meritocracy, improve performance appraisals and introduce codes of conduct; e-government measures, such as the creation of portals and electronic signatures, the introduction of online services and the development of a single window to improve service delivery; reforms to strengthen government coordination capacity and merger of agencies/independent bodies (mostly created during the reform period); performance management and reforms to increase productivity and strengthen results orientation; strengthening evidence-based policy development and better regulation experience with various tools such as regulatory impact assessment, factual assessment or stakeholder consultation; reducing the administrative burden on enterprises and citizens. Based on the analysis of the effectiveness of the implementation of public administration reforms in the EU member states, we have systematized the key areas of adaptation of positive vectors to Ukrainian realities: 1. Search for political support, reliable leadership at all stages of the reform, development of a long-term and strategic road map/plan for changes and preservation of scope goals of reforms; 2. Build strong external stakeholder support and internal ownership to achieve this through a combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches; 3. Create appropriate resources and systems (civil service) for all levels and processes; 4. Provide measures for monitoring/measuring progress/results of implemented reforms. Strategic orientations for improving the efficiency of the public management system are proposed, taking into account the leading world experience: focusing on subtopics, rather than on complex and often too general measures; measurements that can be used for learning purposes less than for evaluation (or purely for accountability purposes); using employee surveys to collect comparative data on public administration; the implementation of the open data strategy allows analysts to conduct academic and non-academic community research to study issues of public management effectiveness.

### Список літератури:

1. For other EUPACK results see: A Comparative Overview of Public Administration Characteristics and Performance in EU28 at <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=8072>, as well as Public administration characteristics and performance in EU28. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://cutt.ly/nMx7ZzT>.
2. Community strategic guidelines on cohesion (2006/702/EC). [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32006D0702&from=EN>.
3. The European Semester. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index_en.htm).
4. Lapente, V., & Walle, S. Van de. The effects of new public management on the quality of public services. *Governance*, 2020. 33, 461-475. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/gove.12502>.
5. Bugaychuk, K.L. Public administration: theoretical basics and approaches to the definition. *Law and Safety*, 2018. 66(3), 38-44. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://pb.univd.edu.ua/index.php/PB/article/view/62>.
6. Abony, G., & Slyke, D.M. Van. Governing on the Edges: Globalization of Production and the Challenge to Public Administration in the Twenty-First Century. *Public Administration Review. Special Issue on the Future of Public Administration*, 2020. 70(1), 33-45. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02244.x>.
7. European Union (2017). *Quality of Public Administration: A Toolbox for Practitioners*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=3&langId=en&keywords=&langSel=&pubType=434>.

8. Dobrianska N.A. The current state of investments attraction into the regional economy / N.A. Dobrianska, L.A. Torishnya // *Економічний журнал Одеського політехнічного університету*. – 2019. – № 1 (7). – С. 5-12. – Режим доступу до журн.: <https://economics.opu.ua/ejopu/2019/No1/5.pdf>. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3405936.
9. Добрянська Н.А., Буковський Д.А. Реформа децентралізації як засіб формування ефективного самоврядування в Україні // *Економіка: реалії часу*. Науковий журнал. – 2020. – № 1 (47). – с. 57-67. – Режим доступу до журн.: <https://economics.opu.ua/ejopu/2020/No1/57.pdf>. DOI: 10.15276/ETR.01.2020.3. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3967330.
10. Balan O.S. Diagnosis of the state of activity of the united territorial communities of Odessa region and analysis of the development of their territories / O.S. Balan, N.A. Dobrianska, S.S. Serkal // *Економічний журнал Одеського політехнічного університету*. – 2021. – № 2 (16). – С. 5-16. – Режим доступу до журн.: <https://economics.opu.ua/ejopu/2021/No2/5.pdf>. DOI: 10.15276/EJ.02.2021.1. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4954234.

## References:

1. For other EUPACK results see: A Comparative Overview of Public Administration Characteristics and Performance in EU28 at <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=8072>, as well as Public administration characteristics and performance in EU28. Retrieved from: <https://cutt.ly/nMx7ZzT> [in English].
2. Community strategic guidelines on cohesion (2006/702/EC). Retrieved from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32006D0702&from=EN> [in English].
3. The European Semester. Retrieved from: [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index_en.htm) [in English].
4. Lapuente, V., & Walle, S. Van de. (2020). The effects of new public management on the quality of public services. *Governance*, 33, 461- 475. Retrieved from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/gove.12502> [in English].
5. Bugaychuk, K.L. (2018). Public administration: theoretical basics and approaches to the definition. *Law and Safety*, 66(3), 38-44. Retrieved from: <http://pb.univd.edu.ua/index.php/PB/article/view/62> [in English].
6. Abony, G., & Slyke, D.M. Van. (2020). Governing on the Edges: Globalization of Production and the Challenge to Public Administration in the Twenty-First Century. *Public Administration Review. Special Issue on the Future of Public Administration*, 70 (1), 33-45. Retrieved from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02244.x> [in English].
7. European Union (2017). *Quality of Public Administration: A Toolbox for Practitioners*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from: <https://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=3&langId=en&keywords=&langSel=&pubType=434> [in English].
8. Dobrianska, N.A., & Torishnya L.A. (2019). The current state of investments attraction into the regional economy. *Economic journal Odessa polytechnic university*, 1 (7), 5-12. Retrieved from: <https://economics.opu.ua/ejopu/2019/No1/5.pdf>. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3405936 [in English].
9. Dobrianska, N.A., & Bukovsky, D.A. (2020). Decentralization reform as a means of forming effective local self-government in Ukraine. *Economics: time realities. Scientific journal*, 1 (47), 20-26. Retrieved from: <https://economics.opu.ua/files/archive/2020/No1/20.pdf>. DOI: 10.15276/ETR.01.2020.3. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3967330 [in Ukrainian].
10. Balan, O.S., Dobrianska, N.A., & Serkal, S.S. (2021). Diagnosis of the state of activity of the united territorial communities of Odessa region and analysis of the development of their territories. *Economic journal Odessa polytechnic university*, 2 (16), 5-16. Retrieved from: <https://economics.opu.ua/ejopu/2021/No2/5.pdf>. DOI: 10.15276/EJ.02.2021.1. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4954234 [in English].

### Посилання на статтю:

Nikoliuk O.V. *Effective practices of public administration: analysis of international experience in the conditions of implementation of public administration ref / O.V. Nikoliuk, N.O. Briushkova, N.A. Dobrianska // Економіка: реалії часу*. Науковий журнал. – 2022. – № 2 (60). – С. 82-87. – Режим доступу до журн.: <https://economics.net.ua/files/archive/2022/No2/82.pdf>. DOI: 10.15276/ETR.02.2022.9. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7319812.

### Reference a Journal Article:

Nikoliuk O.V. *Effective practices of public administration: analysis of international experience in the conditions of implementation of public administration ref / O.V. Nikoliuk, N.O. Briushkova, N.A. Dobrianska // Economics: time realities. Scientific journal*. – 2022. – № 2 (60). – P. 82-87. – Retrieved from <https://economics.net.ua/files/archive/2022/No2/82.pdf>. DOI: 10.15276/ETR.02.2022.9 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7319812.

