PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: FROM NATIONAL TO INTERNATIONAL COMPETENCY FRAMEWORKS

Maria RAMMATA

Hellenic Open University, Tzortz 4, Athens, Greece
m.rammata@gmail.com

Abstract
This paper analyzes the architecture of global governance by highlighting the fundamental role of public administrations when acting globally as well as the need to invest in the performance of public administrations when acting for international purposes. Adaptation of national administrations to International standards as a result of the globalization, entails State administrations becoming embedded in several kinds of international decision-making processes. Is highlighted the fundamental role of public administration in promoting the "International Administrative Space" and in improving the contributions of all administrations for global purposes. Decisions of International Organizations (IO) gain universal application and in this context of global architecture, public administrations are enforced to adjust their structures, procedures and human resources. The growing international activity of public administrations demands a capacity to manage the specific competencies required for this mission while using the methodology proposed by the Organizational structure theory and the Human Resources (HR) theories. For the maximization of results, an "International Capacity Model" is suggested for those public administrations that share the ambition to actively contribute to global governance.
Keywords: Global governance, public administration, administrative capacity, global administrative space, competency framework, human resources

1. INTRODUCTION

The ongoing increase in the level of internationalization of public administration missions has brought into sharp relief the need to develop a more in-depth understanding of the international functioning of public administration and of the role of "international" human resource management. At the same time, public administrations need to encapsulate reforms in a broad scope of fields such as: professionalism, leadership, demographic changes, skills shortage, people rotation, job sharing, promotion freeze, flexible working practices, devolvement of human resources practices, inclusion of ICT, etc. (Shim, 2001). Recent trends and dynamics of the public sector interfering in global management, as well as developments in the equilibrium between public (internal) and international organizations have given an impetus in the nature and study of public administrations and have spread a new overview of the national competencies and accomplishments needed to become a trailblazer in the international sphere. All the above, become more concrete, if we think of the high number of International Organizations that have an active role worldwide : 332 international intergovernmental organizations - i.e., formal organizations set up by more than two governments - out of which, 69 are global, in that they have at least one member state from each of the five continents ! The work of those organizations is overall formed by the International executives acting

as permanent staff of the IOs, by National executives that participate in temporary meetings of the institutions and third parties (socioeconomic partners, NGOs, etc.) that are attributed with an important role in the decision making process legitimizing the whole process by their intervention.

This paper is developed in three sections; in the first, there is an introductory analysis concerning the necessity for public administrations to actively take part in the global administration as it is organized by the global governmental organizations and where the question of legitimacy of international organizations to undertake decisions with universal application is highlighted. In the second section, is described the context of international institutional architecture (regional, international and global organizations, as well as EU, international meetings, Congresses, etc.) and how it enforces public administrations to adjust their structures and human resources towards it. In the third, an analysis concentrates on the administrative activity of public administration at a national and international level to conclude that the growing international activity of public administrations demands a capacity to manage the specific competencies required for this mission.

2. The context of international missions of public administrations

Public administrations globally face the same problems and challenges from fighting environmental pollution, cutback management, terrorism and telecommunications issues, to enhancing the delivery of high quality public products and services for all end users. The best access to these issues is associated with a holistic and effective methodology that will certify that the efforts of the one State will not be hindered, but sustained, by the efforts of some other. Decisions that affect the everyday life of citizens are carried many miles away from home through joint decision making that aims to discover novel approaches to the above mentioned persistent and controversial problems. For all these subjects, international organizations have managed to gain legitimacy to pass and adopt decisions in fields where by definition only states have the supreme legitimacy to undertake initiatives. As it is stated by Newland C. (2010) "Today, the grave message of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) is that current challenges require disavowal of unilateralism and separationist doctrines of Nation-States' sovereignty in favor of shared transnational professional expertise on a planetary level". This traditional national power, escapes from national authorities and is transferred, to institutions of international, global or regional, organizations, such as the European Union (EU), the NAFTA, etc., which are, becoming, responsible to make decisions even though the origins of their democratic legitimacy is still being questioned.

Indeed, scholars and Academics criticize this indirect power and legitimacy of IOs to act on behalf of member states for their own purposes. As it is quoted by Koppell : "To some, the emerging network of institutions responsible for global governance suffers from a "democratic deficit" (Koppell, 2007). Indeed, Koppell and other Academics (i.e.: Archibugi H. -K., 1999, Scharpf, F., 1999, in : Koppell) claim that IOs are deprived of the necessary political authority traditionally attributed to a national democratically elected government that is only indirectly represented

in IOs mostly by its designated bureaucratic agents. The IO's intergovernmental representatives acting on behalf of their governments struggle to adopt just decisions that will gain democratic approval through the institutional framework that they form and will be accountable by broadening the global partners and by applying deliberative procedures in all stages of decision making process (Bexel, M., Tallberg, J., Uhlin, A., 2010).

For sectorial policies, through the respective IOs, identical sectorial policies are applied almost uniformly to member States (e.g. the World health organization attempts to improve and harmonize the national regulation to access and control of sunbeds and ultraviolet radiation, given that research evidence has shown that it is associated with the increased number of health consequences, etc.). The above mentioned supplementary work that is added to the traditional rule-oriented role of administrative Weberian state (Hood and Lodge, 2004), creates burdens for administrations with striking disparities, and tests their degree of rigidity, responsiveness, bureaucracy and professionalism.

The *international institutional framework* is perceived thus, as a *driving force* that incites administrations to position themselves towards international challenges (regional and global) and to initiate for this cause a national discussion and research in order to elaborate, develop and finally approve their contribution that will be officially presented abroad. At the same time, the private sector in each state is encouraged to develop a more in depth analysis and to "lobby" for the promotion of its sectorial interests that could be represented abroad. As only giant socio-economic partners can be organized enough to have a say in the international arena, national NGOs and other partners try to influence the course of action of IO's at national level by organizing an open national dialogue and by trying to reinforce the participative aspect of decision making. In that way, an international (public) policy is generated, while authority is deprived by its pure national character and becomes "more informal and privatized" (Stone and Ladi, 2015). It can be argued that, the more the private sector, as well as other non public and profit organizations, interfere in the decision making process at an international organization, the more the decisions get legitimacy to direct the actions of member states. Nevertheless, this broad participation of private actors that can interfere in the decision making process is creating itself a deficit in the whole procedure as only "Big" super power states have an organized private sector capable to enable the international networking and to influence the course of action at an international level (koppell 2008). "If the most influential nations do grant a Global Governmental Organization authority, the less powerful face a stark choice" (Koppell 2008) when they face penalties if they do not obey to the rules made out of the work of IOs. P.e. "A nation out-of-compliance with International Civil Aviation Organization requirements for international air traffic, for example, would be effectively inaccessible to the world (including tourists and investors)".

3. The context of international institutional architecture and the active part of public administrations

Adaptation of national administrations to International standards as a result of the globalization entails State administrations becoming embedded in several kinds of international decision-making processes. This function of public administrations is demonstrated in various forms of the internationalization process such as:

Regional, international or global organizations: International organizations incite national representatives to work for global purposes in parallel with traditional national missions. Global organizations coexist with the fragmented presence of regional organizations and end by setting up, all together, the normative frame for various important areas that interest global and national governance. In areas where States are unable to act effectively independent from one another, the reinforcement of capacity building derives from regional or international cooperation that sets the pace for an organized approach to common challenges. Organizations such as the OECD Public Governance Committee (PGC), the European Union (seen as a *sui generis* form of international organization), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the United Nations, etc., have a significant impact on public administrations. States through this participation strive for balancing the various "Information Obligations" or other administrative burdens that derive from their membership to these enclaves. Even if these institutions appear as a response to the uneven distribution of power and resources globally (regional institutions that emerge in Asia around China, Brazil or India) in a way to demonstrate the need to reform the international order and/or to challenge the hegemonic role of big and strong states, and/or to better organize a collective response to common international or regional problems (e.g. environmental, health, terrorism, etc.) and/or even solving conflicts around the world, it still remains an important mission for member States to better honor their membership, to reset their role and to review this vertical interdependence in a more effective way**.** Some of the tools for enhancing administrative cooperation and introducing reciprocal amendments are: official documents such as meeting minutes, previous resolutions, concept papers that are circulated and discussed in various meetings, white papers in the case of the EU, etc..

Especially when it comes to consider regional organisations the EU is an example of elaborating European law at a medium hierarchical level that will thoroughly influence national procedures and will try out the *elasticity* of national administrations. *Europeanisation* develops a governance system in which national executives authorize European structures to undertake initiatives and generate European law that will deeply affect the course of national policies for the next years, if not decades to come (Ladrech, R., 1994, Rammata M. 2000). This fact results by the unanimously accepted transfer of national sovereignty to EU institutions that is regained through national delegations that are expected to actively participate in the European administrative process.

Specific consequences of the Europeanisation process are:

- The *structural adjustments of public administrations* seen as the highest level of influence by EU institutions (Matei and Matei, 2008). As a result, national administrations adjust their institutions, programmes, policies and people (3P's), in order to better follow the development of EU law and be administratively capable to implement it appropriately. At the same time, adjustments undergo the interest groups and other forms of consultative groups who have to reset their role, organize their network and a multiple national dialogue for the global agenda set by the IOs.

- Other *soft influences* concerning the *human resources* factor, through the development of an *emulation* procedure where civil servants need to contribute to the generation of EU policies by their intensive interaction with other national delegations (James, 1971).

International Congresses: During these meetings, administrative authorities, executives, experts and national counselors interact together in a more informal way. This pluralistic framework cultivates a culture of constructive dialogue on various issues, promotes research, illuminates possible paths for common understanding and disseminates actions towards a commonly accepted direction upon mutual challenges. The deliberations in this case do not result in a reinforced legislative corpus, but only prepare the ground for future agreements on similar issues. The positive side of this way of interacting is that delegations speak up more freely regarding common problems and prepare the ground for more official meetings in other instances.

When it comes to exploring and understanding the "more mature" stages of *internationalization of public administration,* three dimensional-processes take place:

Top-down: The international - (semi) ordered organizational structure influences the national, decentralized, regional and local administrations, leading thus to administrative global convergence. In fact, to be able to conduct an active share in global governance, public administrations had to adjust their institutions, policies, internal administrative procedures, human resources and working methodologies (Matei and Matei, 2008). Various tools are set out to promote the creation of a *Global Administrative Space* and a *Global Administrative Culture* such as the promotion of specific guides, rules and regulations adopted in the member states of IOs. The mere submission to the same administrative values by different states and the expanded participation in a dynamic procedure where administrative change is inevitable and innovative measures are indispensable, prepares the ground for an identical administrative osmosis in member states. Furthermore, organizations, such as the OECD or the World Bank, analyze and submit best practices, administrative tools that could lead to excellence in the performance of public administrations. Some of these recommendations include:

- Promotion of innovative new working methods, tools and prioritization criteria.

- Creation of accessible databases for the exchange of good practices - Comparative data and analysis.

- Benchmarking assessment tools that gain horizontal legitimacy.

- Introduction of "Toolboxes for public administration practitioners of the EU" (European Union, 2015).

- Promotion of common measurements and standards (e.g. International Labor Standards, etc.)

- Adoption of common action plans, etc..

- Preparatory reports for the submission of an official statement,

- Adoption of commonly accepted principles and norms that are, in most cases, applied identically in European states where the European Administrative space is already being formed (Ziller, 1993).

- Facilitation of transparency and peer review on strategic performance (Halachmi, 2002), administrative burdens.

- Regulatory reform, etc..

Among some of the most common objectives of OSCE member states and in the field of performance is the reforming of state by implementing the propositions included in the Al Gore report (Gore, 1993) to follow the example of a postmodern new public management reform that will generate: increased performance, accountability, better use of resources and tangible results to "reinvent a government" that works better and costs less.

At the same time, international sectorial policies set the targets in many brand new arenas in which a national State would not be efficient or it would not be advisable to legislate independently (aerospace, fighting international crime, etc.).

During this cognitive and normative procedure, States undergo the impact of international organizations that generate institutional values and norms which will be applied at their national framework. In this capacity, international enclaves create the propitious conditions for the regeneration of the forthcoming national policies.

Bottom-up: In that way the administration of international organizations acquires characteristics from all each counterpart national tradition and practices. States with a recognized efficient public administration and a strong influence are the ones that set the agendas and prioritize the fields in which action will be considered at a global level, giving serious consideration to the fields that interest their national perspective more. Smaller States with lower administrative capacity (often dubbed as "failed", "fragile" or "weak") abide by the rules and obey to the guidelines and norms set by the "Leading States" while preparing themselves for an active (at least) participation during international meetings. Overall, national administrations have a pertinent and complex influence upon the international organization's decision process as being important parts of all the decisional levels and involved in all the steps of the policy cycle.

A very important factor that increases the level of influence is when a specific State handles the Presidency of the organization and sets or can influence the working methodology applied to the elaboration-implementation of policies.

Horizontal: Administrations and forms of governance are converging, in order to harmoniously apply the same guidelines in the context of the respective international organization. The coexistence of national delegations, along with representatives from other corners of the world creates a new framework of decision making (Mayrhofer, W., Brewster, C., 1996, referring to the Perlmutter approach, 1969) in which multilateral negotiations and within them, the intercultural issues, play a key role. Further on, *common understanding* and *reconciliation* are very important and one State should bear this in mind while taking share in the multinational dialogue. As a result, it becomes obvious that the *human factor* turns to an important *facilitator for administering global problems* and without it, even the best prepared administrations would not arrive at the desired results. For the conduct of this multi dialogue, not only officials, politicians and civil servants, but also International Civil Servants (United Nations, 1994) of the respective organization, NGO representatives, stakeholders, social partners, lobby organizations are gathered together in regular reunions, in an integrated deliberative procedure that aims to produce the appropriate regulations in a specific area.

The working methodology includes both formal, informal contacts, strategies of coalition and networking outside the formally established organizational structures (with various lobbies, NGOs, etc.) that may take place even for more than a year until the final regulation is adopted. This decision making form is somewhat new for some administrations that have to learn to be efficient in a more participative way of the decision process.

In fact, when traditional public administration deals with international meetings, it has to be familiar with a novel mode of administrative action and to pass from abiding to formal modes of political steering -government approval documents, instructions and other strategies coupled to the system of accountability-, to the shape of an administrative action that comprises mostly informal meetings, negotiations at a medium hierarchical level, systematic coordination and approval methodologies with political authorities as well as communication's program to inform the public for all these actions. As it is stated by Mathiason (2007): "*Leaders in international organizations have a limited ability to give orders and must rely instead on their ability to convince governments and civil society actors to follow their guidance*".

This double operation of public administrations, for the goals of regional or international government bodies, as well as for national causes, turns over a fresh impulse to the missions of national administrative activities that encompass their traditionally limited role only to national purposes (Ktistaki, 2009). Even administrations that are not mature enough in terms of internationalization (or that cannot influence at a certain point the course of global affairs) have to rethink their active part in the never-ending challenges of global governance and embrace professionalism at all levels of activity.

How does the public administration react to those international assignments? How does it approach the top-down influence, the horizontal cooperation and the impact that it may have on the international procedures? Is it only the International Department of central or local administration that is affected or does the internationalization embrace the whole administration? To what extent do these International missions encumber administrations to an unprecedented scale?

4. Public administration's mission at the international level

National administrations have to perform the traditional national public governance and prepare themselves for an *added extra work for administering the global public domain*:

- The ***deep knowledge of all aspects*** of national guidance upon the negotiated issues abroad (technical, political, financial, diplomatic, etc.) that are usually *complex, fragmented and dispersed to various subnational administrations*. This prerequisite entails that national authorities will operate horizontally and will create the necessary procedures that permit the exchange of data, the interoperability, the incorporation of e-management techniques, and above all, the leadership that will show what is more important.

- The delivery of ***various parallel projects*** that demand the development of a coordinated set of activities, operations and processes that are designed to meet a pre-set objective. It comes as a great challenge for public administrations to exercise adequate control over the various assignments and to manage relationships among different levels of government that demand the appropriate alignment of resources and the exercise of accountability.

- ***Coordination capacity*** in terms of a multidimensional negotiation that usually engages representatives of national technical groups in the long run along with the politicians, executives, NGOs, stakeholders, etc. The official designated representatives have to prove to be effective in coordinating all representatives of units that share common competencies and assignments. At the same time, all the above mentioned important actors have to create a common accepted communication code that will permit them to pass important information from one level to the other. This is fundamental if we consider that all these different grades of personnel act on behalf of various layers of power and as such their differences are set apart.

- Appropriate preparation of ***human resources*** that play a pivotal role in demonstrating a solid national presence internationally: lack of human knowledge or operational methodology on international matters can be detrimental to the performance of delegations. States have to prepare their human capital for this demanding mission that will weigh high for their benefit. Moreover, for the human resources aspect, there has to be increased *capacity for diversity management*, *negotiation and mediation skills* at a multinational

level in search for alignment with the positions of other partners coming from heterogeneous socio-cultural backgrounds.

- The *transparency of the process*: national representatives acting on behalf of the executive have full authorization to speak up and analyze the national positions. Nevertheless, it is shown that usually subjects evolve as the discussions progressively pass to issues that were not initially in the national agenda[1] (Finnemore 1999). The way that control is exercised from the executive over the efficiency and effectiveness of the representatives within the working groups allows them to exceed their power. This might result in obligations being assumed that are not covered by the initial instructions and the whole result alters the indirect legitimacy of these resolutions. The output of the international work should be spread to the rest of the administrative environment and make the "Lessons learned" possible from this supranational working methodology that may lead to an institutional or legal adjustment.

As a result of all these challenges the question arises as to what would be the suggested concrete measures that state's administration would have to undertake in order to adequately fulfill their international duty and increase international performance. In that regard, each public administration has a concrete mission, to exploit inherent strengths and minimize potential weaknesses. The answer lies not only in relation to the institutions or the administrative procedures, but also in the qualified personnel of public administration that will be assigned to deal with the representation of the State's positions.

5. Managing competencies for a global public service

The international working environment has its own difficulties and challenges that are unique. As Mathiason (2007) explains: "Managing and working in an international secretariat is not like working in a national government or private business. The multinational culture, complex environment, and difficult tasks make international work a particular challenge. International organization managers cannot be judged by the same criteria used to appraise a CEO or a Prime Minister because the secretariats are not the same as other public organizations".

In this context, the Human Resources Management (HRM) represents one main strategic response to the challenges that are present in administering global governance (Pucik, 1997). Human resources are the most important components of good governance (Sparrow and Hiltrop, 1994) incarnating the standards and norms that one State puts forward applying the concept of the "model employer". Quality of global governance depends highly on the level and the quality of human resources dedicated to the international assignments (Shim, 2001). To that

---

[1] What actors want in a particular negotiation on an issue is something that is learnt through taking part in the process, and not something that is completely pre-negotiated. Therefore we come to the conclusion that policy development and national standpoints are prepared outside the national sphere for policy making and if the administration is not well prepared it will lose the possibility, not only to affect these policies, but also to apply the resolutions at a later stage.

end, the Human Resources Departments have to reinvent their role in an attempt to sustain their credibility and build up their prestige in a rapidly changing world of work with a global dimension.

"The professionalization of public administration and especially of its human resources is one response to the challenge of globalization" as said by Farazmand, (1999) :

> *"Professionalization brings both institutional and moral and ethical standards to public service at the global level, exposing the fallacies of globalizing transnational elites while learning from their organizational and technical skills…A professionally sound public administration should be ready for future action".*

Multinational interactions of public administrations create the perfect environment where agents are exposed and their administrative culture, responsiveness and capacity to present a solid and coordinated action is tested under the strictest standards set out by the most progressive public administrations in correlation with the ones set by the administration of the IO. If it has passed as normal, that big and recognized as powerful states get the stake of these international meetings, "smaller" or "weaker" states should prepare themselves and try to present the best performance in each subject on the agenda.

In this context, and especially for those "smaller" states, the organizational chart, or the job analysis (Lawler, 1993) can serve only as a basis to be further evolved through the competencies. Job analysis provides an objective picture of the job, and as such, gives information to support all subsequent and related HR activities, such as recruitment, training, development, performance management and succession planning. When the human factor has to deal with complex issues such as cross-functional problems, uncertainty and ambiguity that characterize international working environments, the elaboration of competency frameworks is essential in order to increase capacity. As it is stated by Horton (2000) "The major difference between competency and traditional approaches to people management is that the former stresses inputs, including behavioral characteristics of staff, and the latter outputs and performance on the job". The competency based management and with that, the competency framework (CF) (European Union, 2015) for each job grade (group competencies) and for all staff (core competencies) of the public administration could be one complement to the more traditional aspects of personnel management and could increase public administration performance at an international level.

The international competency model (ICM) is a useful tool for improving the mediocre employees and for distinguishing good from bad employees, but moreover, it is a "guide" for the development and execution of an appropriate HR system of selection, development, performance management, management of career and planning employee succession jobs with an international dimension. The Model outlines an inventory of expected skills and behaviors that lead to excellence on the job, while it recognizes the core personnel requirements for the tasks of global organization and puts value to the international assignees that act for both internal and international missions (Hood and Lodge 2004). The competency framework must integrate the competencies that should be globally

cultivated (Tim, 2017). As it is highlighted by Rodsutti, & Swierczek, (2002): "The ability to be effective in a multicultural environment is directly linked to the individual's level of cultural awareness". With the growing prevalence of multinational assignments (Morley and Heraty, 2004), there is a recognized need for information that can help improve leadership effectiveness (Rodsutti & Swierczek, 2002) as well as people's skills to participate in international activities fruitfully.

For the best preparation of public administrations for international assignments, some critical success factors are:

1) Definition of the ***Competency Model* (CM) *or International Competency Model (ICM)*** for public agents that are designated by the executive as formal national representatives. While the concept of "Global – expatriate-Manager" and its related competencies has been an object of analysis in the private sector for long term missions abroad (Baruch, 2002, and Dollwet, M., & Reichard, R. 2014), it has been underestimated for civil servants who temporarily work abroad and face similar challenges as the ones that face leaders of Multinational Companies (MNC).

The CM/ICM[2] helps in building a pool of talents that can more effectively meet the public administration's strategic goals:

a) It promotes an organizational culture where there is a shared understanding of what effective performance means with regard to take part in international meetings as an official representative.

b) It provides a transparent focus for selection procedures and performance management processes. By both these tools the responsible HR agents in public administrations are elevating the importance of identifying the best selected by the Public administration to represent the country's interests who will afterwards be assessed for their performance by using the appropriate criteria.

c) It establishes clear and shared expectations required for each value and competency related to global missions as it provides a quick checklist of critical job qualities in which the international facet should be underlined.

d) It provides a baseline for evaluating performance of international civil servants.

e) It gives insights into the training needs of a position.

f) It is supposed to raise the performance of the personnel in use as long as it is crystal-clear for the jobholder what is expected of him/her and why.

---

[2] A thorough research at applying the CM in the British civil service proved the difficulties and opportunities for the personnel and the organization itself by applying the CM (Horton, 2000).

In relation to the representatives of international and short-term assignments a clear set of competencies that are required should be developed in order for representatives to have the job well done and to be honored as national delegates. Some of these competencies that are explored should be:

- Deep technical knowledge of the subject in question.

- Flexibility.

- Intercultural awareness (Hofstede, 1980, 2001, 2002);

- Communication skills.

- Diplomatic skills.

- Negotiation skills.

- Mediation skills especially when the active role is being a President or the coordinator of meetings.

- Conflict resolution management.

- Cooperation and coordination skills.

For Matveev and Mitler the skills for international assignments that are underscored (Matveev, & Mitler, 2004) are: Cultural awareness, establishing rapport, effective communication and coordination, ensuring transparency and accountability, effective team development and selecting an appropriate conflict management strategy.

2) The formulation of a *multidiscipline national delegation* from all the relevant administrative units that will succeed in acting as one strong team. This assignment is one of the most significant, as fragmentation of the work of international administrations obliges to undertake the multidisciplinary factor as one of the most important in order to gain administrative effectiveness. These personnel will be dedicated to defending the *designed policy* and all its technical expertise will be very valuable for the work of international organizations without disregard for the significance of international organization's permanent staff.

3) The streamlining of a *selection procedure* for recruiting the best representatives from each sector of the administration that have the mastery of the project and merit the approval of political authorities. The implementation of an *appropriate selection procedure for the recruitment of the personnel's "elite"* (Androniceanu, 2014) should take into account the above mentioned competency framework and the ability of the dedicated personnel to tackle the complex tasks which administering global governance encompasses. These personnel, apart from the high-level technical skills, should conduct themselves at the highest personal and professional level and show commitment to the public values such as: common good, ethical behavior, impartiality, accountability, discretion, integrity and objectivity (Renninger, 1987).

4) The design and delivery of the appropriate *training* for national delegations in order to foster a solid team capable to support all national strategic aspects of the subject. The intricacies of international negotiations should put in value and be interpreted so as to lead the actions of the representatives. One other important aim of this training should be to upgrade the professionalism for global missions, cultivate objectivity, integrity, impartiality, tolerance for ambiguity and intercultural management. The trained staff should create a legacy for the rest of the administration when closing with the negotiations.

5) The *continuity of the process* and the elimination of the risk that stems from changing frequently the representatives "from reunion to reunion", as this practice would damage the continuity of the process and the formulation of a team spirit with colleagues from abroad.

Since most writers have distinguished the competency model for the leaders (Dalton, 2002), the international literature on the subject is limited to the models of higher civil servants that take part in those missions, whereas *the success or failure of a public representation to these missions lies mostly in the work of the middle layers managers* who will negotiate until late at night and prepare the details of reports to be adopted by the higher layers of hierarchy at a later stage.

Auluck and Levin (2009) refer to 13 competencies for international leaders in the public sector and those are :

1) Commitment to the principles of global public good.

2) Designing and delivering citizen-centered services.

3) Commitment to equality, inclusivity, diversity and the principles of empowerment.

4) Problem analysis and problem solving.

5) Commitment to sustainable development.

6) Managing crises and managing in crisis.

7) Institutional development and capacity building.

8) Collaborative working; cross-cultural co-operation.

9) Negotiation/listening skills/capacity to influence.

10) Cultural sensitivity.

11) Emotional intelligence/pragmatism.

12) Psycho-social stability.

13) Specific technical expertise.

In the light of the above analysis, there is an urgent need for public administrations to acquire a corps of professional public managers that will be equipped with skills adapted to the international administrative working environment. In an attempt to formulate an International Competency Framework for global managers and middle level representatives of member States, we could mention the following characteristics:

1) *Deep knowledge and mastery* on specific technical aspects of the subjects in the agenda.

2) High level *project management skills* and working with short time frames while respecting strict qualitative criteria.

3) Capability to *interact and coordinate effectively with politicians* blurring, thus, the division between politics and administration.

4) Ability to *form, lead and take an active part in multinational networks and to cultivate openness* of the administration itself. The practice of the intercultural management is a fundamental asset that should be on the top of all competencies for candidates.

5) *Familiarization with earlier agreements* and statements and in this way creation of an institutional memory of the topic with the relevant specialized staff.

6) *Negotiation and mediation skills*, specialized on international negotiations. Making a clear distinction about the intricacies of international compared to national negotiations and debates.

7) *Conflict resolution skills* so as to be capable to smoothly overcome any controversial matter that may affect the collegial work.

8) *Decision making skills:*

   a) At a national level so as to be successfully transmitted to the international decision-making centers,

   b) At an international level, where the questions are more complex and demand a thorough analysis that would be up to the expectations of all participants.

9) *Be acquainted with flexible working methods that are more informal than the formal steering of the administration back home and have the capacity to continuously follow the procedures and submit reports on the developments while asking for approval and guidance.*

10) *Respect and apply ethical standards and professionalism that are embedded in an international working environment (inclusiveness, impartiality, loyalty, discretion, common good, etc.. See, e.g. The United Nations staff rules, 2014 ST/SGB/2014/1).*

11) *Manage diversity skills: coping with ambiguity, intercultural management, working effectively in a multinational team, etc..*

If the above mentioned competencies are taken into account for the selection procedure of national representatives to the international negotiations there would be significant positive repercussions for, not only the national performance and the overall conduct of the international negotiations, but also the institutional memory and the continuity of the national performance would benefit as well. Empirical evidence proved that *ad hoc* representatives that do not have the authority or the expertise to represent an administration, result to poor performance when it comes to managing the overall technical and other detailed aspects of the project in question that only permanent civil servants have the deep knowledge and experience through time.

Raising professional standards for all civil servants and other representatives that handle international files whatever the subject might be is a very crucial point for all civil services that wish to upgrade their involvement in international subjects as well as to be more efficient when it comes to public expenditures on participating in international missions. To that extent there is a common goal for all public administrations to better work out ifferences and accommodate different perspectives.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, M.H. (ed) (2001). *International HRM: Managing diversity in the workplace*, Oxford: Blackwell

Androniceanu, A. (2014). Particularities of the human resources policies in an international organization, *Administration and public management,* vol. 22

Archibugi, H. K., (1999). *Global Governance and Public Accountability*

Baruch, Y. (2002). *No such thing as a global manager*, Business Horizons, January-February

Bexell, M., Tallberg, J., Uhlin, A. (2010) Democracy in Global Governance : The Promises and Pitfalls of Transnational Actors, *Global Governance*, 16 : 81-101

Charbit, C. (2011). Governance of Public Policies in Decentralised Contexts: The Multi-level Approach, *OECD Regional Development Working Papers*, 2011/04, OECD Publishing, Paris

Dalton, M., Ernst, C., Deal, J. and Leslie, J. (2002) *Success for the New Global Manager,* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Dowling, P., & Welch, D. (2004). *International Human Resource Management: Managing People in a Multinational Context*, London: Thomson

Dollwet, M., & Reichard, R. (2014) Assessing cross-cultural skills: validation of a new measure of cross-cultural psychological capital, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25:12, 1669-1696

Edwards, T., & Rees, C. (2006). *International Human Resource Management: globalisation, national systems and multinational companies*, Harlow: FT Prentice Hall

European Commission, Regulation no 31 (EEC). 11 (EAEC). *Laying down the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community,* (OJ 45, 14.6.1962)

European Union (2015). *Quality of Public Administration*, *A toolbox for practitioners*, Abridged version, © European Union

Farazmand, A., (1999). Globalization and Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University, *Public Administration Review*, November/December, Vol. 59, No. 6

Finnemore, M. (1996). *National Interests in International Society*, New York: Cornell University Press

Gore, A. (1993). *The Gore Report on Reinventing Government: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less*, Paperback

Halachmi, A. (2002). Performance measurement and government productivity, *Work Study*, Vol. 51 Issue: 2, pp.63-73

Harris, H. et al. (2003). *International Human Resource Management,* London: CIPD.

Harzing, A.-W., & Ruysseveldt, J.V. (2004). *International Human Resource Management,* London: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2002). Review: Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). *Australian Journal of Management,* Jun 2002, 27, 1.

Hood, C., Lodge, M. (2004) Competency, Bureaucracy, and Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis, *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, Vol. 17, No. 3, July 2004, pp. 313–333.

Horton, S. (2000) Competency management in the British civil service, *The International Journal of Public Sector Management* 13(4): 354–368.

Jackson, T. (2002). *International Human Resource Management: A Cross-Cultural Approach*, London: Sage.

James, R. (1971). *The evolving concept of the International civil service*, in Jordan R., *International Administration: Its evolution and Contemporary Applications,* Oxford University Press, New York.

Koppell, J. (2007) Global Governance Organizations:Legitimacy and Authority in Conflict. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18 (2): 177 – 203.

Ktistaki, S. (2009). *Introduction to the administrative science,* Sakkoulas, Athens.

Lawler, E.E. (1993). From Job-based to Competency-based Organisations. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 15, 13-15.

Ladrech, R. (1994) Europeanization of domestic politics and institutions: The case of France, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 32(1).

Matei, A., Matei L. (2008). Globalization and Europeanization. A Projection on a European Model of Public Administration, *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 33-52, April 2008.

Mathiason, J. (2007) *Invisible Governance*. Bloomfield CT: Kumarian Press.

Matveev, A. V., & Mitler, R. G. (2004). The value of intercultural competence for performance of multicultural teams, *Team Performance Management*, 10(5/6). 104.

Mayrhofer, W., Brewster, C. (1996). In praise of Ethnocentricity : Expatriate policies in European multinationals, *The International Executive*, Nov/Dec 1996, N. 38.

Morley, M., Heraty, N. (2004). International Assignments and Global Careers, *Thunderbird International Business Review,* Vol. 46 (6).

Newland, C. (2010) International Institute of Administrative Sciences : The Past 80 Years and the Global Future of Public Administration, Public Administration Review, July-August.

Perlmutter, MV. (1969). The tortuous evolution of multinational corporation, *Columbia Journal of World Business*, January-February 9-18.

Pucik, V. (1997). Human resources in the future: an obstacle or a champion of globalization?, *Human Resource Management (1986-1998).* Spring 1997, 36.

Rammata, M. (2001*). Le travail gouvernemental et l'Union Européenne France et en Grèce : La formulation des politiques européennes*, Phd Thesis, Paris I, Panthéon-Sorbonne.

Rammata, M. (2011). *Contemporary Greek public Administration : Between bureaucracy and management*, Kritiki, Athens.

Renninger, J. (1987). The International civil service commission and the development of a common personnel policy in the United Nations system, *Public Administration & Development,* 7, 2.

Rodsutti, M. C., & Swierczek, F. W. (2002). Leadership and organizational effectiveness in multinational enterprises in southeast Asia *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(5/6). 250-259.

Scharpf, F., (1999). *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shim, D.-S. (2001). Recent human resources developments in OECD member countries, *Public, Personnel Management,* 30 (3). 323-347.

Sparrow, P., Hiltrop, J.-M.(1994). *European Human Resources in Transition*, Prentice Hall.

Stone, D., Ladi S. (2015). Global public policy and transnational administration, *Public Administration*, Vol. 93, No. 4.

Tim, M. (2017). Leadership competencies for a global public service, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(1) 3–22.

United Nations, *Staff Rules and Staff Regulations of the United Nations Secretary-General's bulletin,* January 2014 ST/SGB/2014/1.

Wolfgang, M., Brewster, C. (1996). In praise of Ethocentricity: Expatriate policies in European Multinationals, *The International Executive*, 38, 6.

Ziller, J. (1993). *Administrations comparées. Les systèmes politico-administratifs de l'Europe des Douz*e, Ed. Montchrestien.