

Několik poznámek k systémům hodnocení soudobé evropské veřejné správy

Several Remarks to Contemporary European Public Administration Systems Assessment

KAREL LACINA¹

Abstract

There are two principal systems of the public administration execution in the *European Administrative Space*: European continental and Anglo-Saxon conceptions. More than thirty European countries belong to the continental conception. These countries differ in the comparison among others what concerns their traditions as well as their historical development. Taking these facts into account the continental conception could be divided into three or four subsystems mentioned in this conception.

What concerns the European Administrative Space development the *Treaty of Rome* paragraphs about the European Economic Community since year 1957 represents its basis. Its performance was specified in the greater detail by several European Communities legal standards (*acquis communautaire*), first of all by the *Single European Act* since year 1987 and by the *Maastricht Treaty* valid since the 1st November 1993 on the basis of it the European Union was set up. Some legal aspects of the European Union activities are mentioned in this article.

Key Words

public administration execution, European Administrative Space, European continental conception, Anglo-Saxon conception, European Structural Funds, European Economic Community, European Communities, European Union, *acquis communautaire*, Treaty of Rome, Single European Act, Maastricht Treaty

Abstrakt

V Evropském správním prostoru existují dva základní systémy výkonu veřejné správy: evropsko-kontinentální a anglo-saský. Více než třicet evropských zemí náleží ke kontinentálnímu systému. Uvedené země se liší ve vzájemném srovnání co do jejich tradic a do celkového historického vývoje. Při vědomí daných skutečností lze výše uvedený systém členit do třech, respektive čtyř subsystémů, o nichž se stručně pojednává.

Pokud jde o Evropský správní prostor, ustanovení obsažená v Římské smlouvě o Evropském hospodářském společenství představují jeho základ. Jeho fungování bylo dále podrobněji specifikováno dalšími právními zásadami Evropských společenství a Evropské unie (*acquis communautaire*), především *Zákonem o jednotné Evropě* z roku 1987 a *Maastrichtskou smlouvou* platnou od 1. listopadu 1993, na jejímž základu byla vytvořena Evropská unie. Příspěvek pojednává o některých právních aspektech činnosti Evropské unie.

¹ prof. PhDr. Karel Lacina, CSc., Vysoká škola finanční a správní, Praha, e-mail: kar.lacina@seznam.cz

Klíčová slova

výkon veřejné správy, Evropský správní prostor, evropsko-kontinentální pojetí, anglosaské pojetí, evropské strukturální fondy, Evropské hospodářské společenství, Evropská společenství, Evropská unie, právo Evropských společenství, Římská smlouva, Zákon o jednotné Evropě, Maastrichtská smlouva

Introductory note

The aim of the article is to explain the essence and the activities inside the European Administrative space including some specific features of the public administration execution in countries which are involved into the so called continental and Anglo-Saxon conceptions as well as in other democratic countries.

My principal theoretical starting point is formulated on the basis of the *acquis communautaire* and the Czech Republic legislation principles including the Czech Republic strategic documents concerning the activities developed in the framework of the European Administrative Space. I have determined two following hypotheses:

1. The European Administrative Space was formed gradually since the beginning of the 1950s when the European Coal and Steel Community was established.
2. The European Administrative Space effective functioning requires the cooperation of transnational and national administration authorities and offices.

First of all I would like to remind the fact that some scholars characterizing the European public administration sometimes „refer to a „classis“ bureaucratic theory“² specified among other by the German sociologist Max Weber. U. S. scholar Ferrel Heady is stressing in this connection, for example, that „it is in the sense that the bureaucracies of France, Germany and a number of other continental European nations conform most closely to Weber’s description of bureaucracy that they are called here „clasic“ administrative systems. We centre an attention on contemporary France and Germany.“³

A consortium of the universities professors from the United States of America, the Netherlands and later from several other countries started to analyse the contemporary systems of public administration execution in the beginning of the 1990s. The intent was “to identify categories that will account for most, but not necessarily all, contemporary national systems. Five variables are used in the analysis: (1) relation of the civil service system to political regime; (2) socio-economic context of the system; (3) focus for personal management functions in the system; (4) qualification requirement for entering and performing a member of the system and (5) sense of mission held by members of the system.”⁴

2 HEADY, F. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. Boca Raton (USA): Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. 2001. ISBN 978-0-8247-8480-3, p. 192.

3 HEADY, F. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. Boca Raton (USA): Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. 2001. ISBN 978-0-8247-8480-3, p. 192.

4 HEADY, F. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. Boca Raton (USA): Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. 2001. ISBN 978-0-8247-8480-3, p. 84.

In the relationship to the political life and the administrative characteristics of democratic states the assessment was the following one:

1. *The system of governmental organization is highly differentiated and functionally specific.*
2. *Procedures for making political decisions are largely rational and secular...*
3. *The volume and range of political and administrative activity is extensive, permeating all major spheres of the life in the society, and the tendency is towards further extension.*
4. *There is a high correlation between political power and legitimacy.*
5. *Popular interest and involvement in the political system are widespread, but this does not necessarily mean active participation by the citizenry in general in political decision-making.*⁵

Coming from these theoretical positions it is possible to underline the fact that the public administration of the European Union member states is characterized - among others - by a serie of common or similar features confirming that its execution comes from the general legal, economic, political and social basis.⁶ In general there are two principal systems of the public administration execution in the European Administrative Space.⁷ The mentioned space is characterized by the „*administrative reliability, which is necessary for the rule of law, effective implantation of policy and economic development*“⁸. The vast majority of countries is belonging to the so-called *continental conception*. Its „*pivotal structural characteristics can be reduced to ... (1) hierarchy, (2) differentiation or specialization, and (3) qualification and competence. Here effort is probably the most important because it is so closely associated with effort to apply rationality to administrative tasks. Max Weber viewed this effort as explaining the origin of the bureaucratic form of organization. He refers to hierarchy as involving principles and levels of graded authority to ensure a firmly ordered system of super ordination and subordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones.*“⁹

This was characterized practically predominantly by the great concentration of powers in the state administration and inside it mainly in the central state administration authorities till the last third of the 20th century. The mentioned one hold a dominant position de facto since the Middle Ages till its reforms implemented since the 1970s. Sometimes it was characterised as a conception influenced by the so-called *command model of public administration execution* too. More than thirty European countries belong to the mentioned continental conception. These countries differ what concerns their traditions as well as their historical development. Taking these facts into account the continental conception could be divide into three or four following subsystems:

- a) *German-Franco subsystem;*
- b) *Scandinavian subsystem;*
- c) *Southern European subsystem.*

5 HEADY, F. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Boca Raton (USA): Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. 2001. ISBN 978-0-8247-8480-3, p. 190.

6 *Responsible Bureaucracy: A Study of the Swiss Civil Service*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.

7 LACINA, K., B. KUDRYCKA et al. *Adult Education on Quality Management and other Cross-Sectional Aspects of Public Administration*, Białystok. 2003. 213 p. ISBN 83-88463-25-X, p. 7.

8 OECD/SIGMA 1998:120f.

9 HEADY, F. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Boca Raton (USA): Taylor and Francis Group, LLC. 2001. ISBN 978-0-8247-8480-3, p. 76.

Most European states - with considerably different historical development - belong to the continental model. Nevertheless „*the territorial structure and powers of government institutions in European countries and in some cases even within these countries is very diverse.*“¹⁰

As it was indicated the continental system is often divided into the following three subsystems: *The greatest* one is represented predominantly by the *German and French systems* of the public administration execution. The Western and Central European as well as Baltic countries are component parts of this subsystem. That is why it is the subsystem which is very familiar to us in the Central Europe. The main features of this subsystem is possible to find in Bulgaria and Romania too.

In comparison with the German-Franco subsystem *the Swedish, Danish, Finnish and Norwegian public administration systems* are characterized by greater competences of the local government represented by a relatively smaller number but much larger municipalities. For example: there are 6 251 municipalities in the Czech Republic. In Sweden there are 278 municipalities, in Denmark 128, in Finland 432 and in Norway 435 municipalities. The Scandinavian municipalities have often several tens thousands of inhabitants paying here taxes. That is why three or four municipalities are able to settle a special agreement on the basis of it they are constructing, for example, one common school or some training centre.

Due to this countries geographical position the vast majority of Swedish, Danish, Finnish and Norwegian municipalities are situated in the southern and central parts of those countries. Moreover, the existence of the ombudsmans office is possible to consider as the contribution of the Scandinavian subsystem to the continental conception of the European public administration execution. The ombudsman office was established by Vikings approximately one thousand years ago. Nowadays we are witnesses of the ombudsmans office existence in the majority of European states.

Classical representatives of *Southern European subsystem* are public administrations in Greece, Spain and Portugal. In the comparison with German-Franco subsystem the state administration here a greater amount of competences. Although reforms of the public administration were implemented in these countries de facto since the beginning of the 1980s they were less consistent than in Western and Central European as well as in Scandinavian countries. The main reason of this situation is necessary to find mainly in their specific development till the half of the 1970s when strictly centralized regimes finished their existence here.

Sometimes there could be a discussion among theoreticians concerning the classification of *public administration systems in Croatia, Serbia, Bosna-Herzegovina, Macedonia* and in *Kosovo*. Those are states with a relatively great concentration of powers in the state administration. Reasons of the mentioned situation is necessary to find in their history too. Those countries - together with Greece - were the component parts of the Othoman empire for several centuries and they were liberated as late as during the 19th century.

¹⁰ HALÁSKOVÁ, M. *Veřejná správa v České republice a v zemích EU*. Ostrava: Vysoká škola báňská – TU Ostrava, 2006. 176 p. ISBN 80-248-1266-5, p. 27.

Anglo-saxon system exists in its classical form only in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Its main feature is represented by great competencies of the local government and a relatively limited competencies of the state administration. Reasons of this fact is necessary to find in the English and than British history since the 13th century.

The oldest level of the local government execution in the UK is represented by the *counties (shires)* which were formed in the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th centuries. Royal towns were practically founded in the same time (like in Central European countries). Districts were formed in the 19th century. What concerns the state administration execution its competences were limited mainly since the 1970s in the framework of the public administration reform implementation. One of the specific features of the relationship between the state administration and the local government is represented by the so called „*win-win negotiation*“.

1 Single european act contribution to european integration process development

The Treaty of Rome paragraphs were specified in the greater detail by several European Communities legal standards, first of all by the *Single Euroean Act* which simultaneously raised following *new priorities* of the common interest:

- *strengthening of cooperation in the sphere of economic and social policies;*
- *principle of economic and social cohesion;*
- *underlining the significance of EC common social policy;*
- *support of the research in the member states;*
- *orientation to the creation of the European Economic Area (EEA).*

Several new rules have been introduced in the European Communities by the Single European Act:

- *the principle of „qualified majority voting“ - especially for solving problems of social policy, management of affairs in the economic and social sphere, in the internal market, technological innovations and scientific research;*
- *the so called „cooperation procedure“ among the European Commission, the European parliament and the European Council has been more specified;*
- *the European Commission rights concerning the implementation of some decisions adopted by the European Council has been enlarged;*
- *the European Parliament competencies in the approval of the associate agreements, the approval of new members as well as the approval of the agreements of cooperation with non - member states have been enlarged;*
- *new competencies of European Communities in the sphere of the research and innovations, protection of environment as well as in the solution of social problems have been introduced;*
- *the principle of cooperation between the European Structural Funds and the European Investment Bank have been introduced;*
- *the First Instance Court has been established.*

The substantially greater attention was concentrated in the European Communities in the second half of the 1980s to the utilization of money earmarked to the activities financed through the so called Structural Funds. The discussions around the efficiency and effectiveness of those funds - taking into account the concrete economic situation in several EC countries - have continued and they resulted *into the reform of the European Structural Funds in year 1988*. The amount of money devoted to the support of the agricultural activities in member states provided through the *European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund* was reduced to 40 per cent of the EC budget. Such a situation de facto continues in the European Union till now.

Money saved by the reduction of the support of agriculture were invested into the strengthening the position of the *European Regional Development Fund* and the *European Social Fund*. It was predominantly due to the fact that some new tasks of the regional and social policy were determined by the Single European Act. It became typical first of all for the European Social Fund through which the principal long - term programs *Employment* and *Adapt* started to be financed since the 1st of January 1989.

2 European union foundation and its consolidation

The creation of the *European Economic Area* and its development accelerated ,among others, the process of the European integration not only in the economic life. As Chiara Bittici and Benoit Challand remind „*by a large, the history of the European Union (EU) is that of a functionalist integration process*“.¹¹ The second half of the 1980s represented the period of many discussions waged inside the European Communities highest authorities and its twelve member states. First of all the idea of the possible integration process development not only in the economic but also in the political and monetary spheres became more and more topical.

All mentioned discussions resulted into the *European Union Treaty* working out Its text was approved during the European Council session in December 1991 and then signed by the participants of the Maastricht Conference organized in February 1992. After its approval by parliaments of twelve member states the European Union as the political organization was created on the basis of the Maastricht Treaty.

The Treaty on European Union consolidated the European countries cooperation into *two new very significant areas*:

- *to the creation of the Economic and Monetary Union;*
- *to the political union formation and consolidation.*

Especially the Article 3 of the Treaty of Rome was enlarged from the legislative point of view. Simultaneously the following *new priorities were introduced*:

- *the process of economic and social cohesion strengthening;*

¹¹ BOTTICI, Ch. a B. CHALLAND. *Imagining Europe: Myth, Memory and Identity*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2013. 205 p. ISBN 978-1-107-01561-6, p. 15.

- *the greater attention devoted to the protection of environment on the basis of the principle of sustainable development implementation;*
- *the orientation towards the strengthening of member states competitiveness in the industry;*
- *the strengthening of measures in the sphere of energy;*
- *the support of the research and technological innovations;*
- *the orientation towards the improvement of the European transport and communications networks;*
- *the orientation towards the achievement of the high level of health services;*
- *the further development of the education and trainings;*
- *the strengthening of measures aimed at consumers protection;*
- *the introduction of measures in favour of the civil defence development;*
- *the support of the national and nationalities culture development;*
- *the introduction of measures in favour of the tourism industry development oriented predominantly into the enlarging of the awareness of the European national cultural heritage.*

The Maastricht Treaty¹² came into force in 1st November 1993. It was decided to organize - from time to time - the so called *intergovernmental conferences with the aim to review the strength and weaknesses of positions anchored by the Treaty*. The first of those conferences was organized in the period of more than one year (1996 and 1997). Was opened in the Italian town Turino (29th March 1996) and it was finished in Dutch town Amsterdam (18th June 1997) by the signature of the so called *Amsterdam Treaty*.

The major topic of this intergovernmental conference has been the approval of the so called *Agenda 2000* prepared by the European commission. The Agenda represented a set of tasks that had to be fulfilled till the beginning of the 21st century. The following goals have been stressed in the *Agenda 2000*:

- *to make some corrections in the European Union Treaty;*
- *to create decisive prerequisites for the European Monetary Union functioning;*
- *to prepare negotiations with the associated Central, Baltic and other European countries interested in the full membership in the European Union;*
- *to prepare the EU budget for period since the 1st January 2000 till 31st December 2006;*
- *to declare efforts aimed at the new European security architecture;*
- *to continue dialogue with Russia, Ukraine, Turkey, Malta and Cyprus;*
- *to implement programmes „Employment“ and „Adapt“ as one of the common European social policy basis.*

3 Remarks to principle legal aspects of european union activities

The performance of public administration in the so-called „*European 28*“ takes place in the so-called. The *European administrative area* in which the last third of the twentieth

12 BOTTICI, Ch. a B. CHALLAND. *Imagining Europe: Myth, Memory and Identity*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2013. 205 p. ISBN 978-1-107-01561-6, p. 16.

century was increasingly promoted the *concept of governance*¹³ (also *bonne Gouvernance*, resp. *good public governance*). Strengthening contacts among the Member States administrative authorities and institutions have contributed significantly to the formation of the aforementioned *European Administrative Space*¹⁴ (European Administrative Space, *Espace européen administratif*). The space derived from the application of the common and communitarian (shared) EU policies as well as standards and principles of the primary and secondary European Community law (*acquis communautaire*) is considered for it. The existence of the European Administrative Space requires the cooperation of transnational and national administration authorities and offices based on such a level of services providing which guarantees and will guarantee particularly a strict respect to the equality of rights of citizens principle in the framework of the European Union as a whole.

According to the opinion of the authors of the *Constitutional law of the European union* the „article 6 of the TEU notes that the European Union is not only based on the principles of liberty, democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely, the principles which are common to its member states. This article simultaneously confirms at the same time as general EU principles of the Community basic human rights, guaranteed by the „European convention for the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms“ approved in year 1950 and in such a way they result from the constitutional traditions common to the member states.“¹⁵

The well-known French theorist Denys Simon underlines the significance of the above mentioned approach by dressing the fact that „the Amsterdam treaty principles of freedom and democracy advances on the Union fundamental value (Art. 6, ex-article F of TEU)“¹⁶

He simultaneously reminds in the given context the fact that the *Amsterdam Treaty* at the same time recalls that candidate countries by their entry into the European community, respectively into the European union „have had to, accept completely the „*acquis communautaire*“, which means that all reservations in the sense of the international law contractual were excluded and that problems associated with adaptation had to be solved by introducing of transitional periods, not by the existing standards of the original or derivative rights change. On the other hand, the candidate countries were obliged to share common values on which European integration is based.“¹⁷

This is a fairly complex process leading to the fact that „a new federal elements system is built undoubtedly by the creation of common European Union authorities although the European Union is still permanently by its character the community of states, it means the

13 HENDRYCH, D. *Správní věda: teorie veřejné správy*. 3. aktualizované vydání. Praha: Wolters Kluwer, 2009. 231 s. ISBN 978-80-7357-458-1, p. 61.

14 LACINA, K. *Evropská veřejná správa*, Praha: Vysoká škola finanční a správní, o.p.s., 2004. ISBN 80-86754-10-3, p. 37.

15 BLAHOŽ, J., KLÍMA, K. a J. SKÁLA et al. *Ústavní právo Evropské unie. Dobrá voda*, 2003. 939 p. ISBN 80-86473-48-1, p. 64.

16 SIMON, D. *Komunitární právní řád*. Praha: ASPI. 2005. 818 p. ISBN 80-7357-114-5, p. 101.

17 SIMON, D. *Komunitární právní řád*. Praha: ASPI. 2005. 818 p. ISBN 80-7357-114-5, p. 60-61.

formation predominantly of the confederative type¹⁸. Prof. Vladimír Klokočka is reminding in this sense that „it is the disruption of the classic state sovereignty in both directions, both primary and secondary European law terms. The Member States of the European Community (European Union) are not already sovereign already in its true sense because some superior Community and then maybe the Union statehood is formed step by step on the of basis of agreements and mutual commitments spun yarn. The external sovereignty of individual states is relativized in such a way.¹⁹

One of the public administration characteristic features executed within the European Union is the requirement interpreted by the EU highest authorities stressing the the Member States obligation to secure particularly the effective implementation of regulations, directions and decisions;²⁰ the secondary European Communities legal standards issued by the European Council and the European Commission, possibly also by the European Parliament and the European Council - into the legal order of the Member States and ensuring the compliance of their “domestic policies” with EU policies which is characterized as the important tool for the harmonization of law achieving. Nowadays the called *European Administrative Space* is represented by the central EU institutions: the European Council, the Council of the European Union, the European Commission, the European Parliament, the European Court of Justice, Court of Auditors - and the national central authorities of the Member States.

It is possible to discuss about a number of links existing among mentioned public administration institutions.²¹ There is the principle that the European Commission is responsible for the principles of the so-called common EU policies (trade, agriculture, transport and monetary) implementation and the public administration of the Member States is responsible for carrying out the so-called *shared* or *community* policies, including monitoring methods of their implementation. The Member States public administration authorities are bound from the point of view of their activities quality achievement by respecting of the so called *mutual recognition rule*²² according to which a lower quality of the public administration execution in one country can have a negative impact on the performance of public administrations in other Member States - and at last on the quality of public administration execution in the European Union as a whole. This approach respects in the spirit of subsidiarity principle the right of each state to build and improve its own system of public administration answering to their specific needs but simultaneously it requires that national public administration authorities will implement effectively - on the relevant principles and the relevant standards - tasks which are adopted by the community as a whole and that they enable to achieve the planned outputs in such a way.

18 BLAHOŽ, J., KLÍMA, K. a J. SKÁLA et al. *Ústavní právo Evropské unie. Dobrá voda*, 2003. 939 p. ISBN 80-86473-48-1, p. 26.

19 KLOKOČKA, V. *Ústavní systémy evropských států*. Praha: Linde Praha. 2006. 423 p. ISBN 80-72-606-7, p. 243.

20 KLOKOČKA, V. *Ústavní systémy evropských států*. Praha: Linde Praha. 2006. 423 p. ISBN 80-72-606-7, p. 242.

21 LACINA, K. *Evropská veřejná správa*, Praha: Vysoká škola finanční a správní, o.p.s., 2005. ISBN 80-86754-10-3, p. 37.

22 LACINA, K. *Evropská veřejná správa*. Praha: Vysoká škola finanční a správní, o.p.s., 2005, p. 37.

As it is reported by M. Halásková „the European Administrative Space (ESP), incorporates a set of similar standards for the public administration operation which are contained in the law and that are asserted in practice by given procedures and mechanisms grounded on the responsibility. It was absolutely essential these principles to be taken over by individual countries because otherwise the enter to the EU would be closed to them. These principles are already included both in these countries constitutions and they are also enshrined in various public law acts.“²³

The idea of the European Administrative Space, which operates on common principles is therefore promoted not by the implementation of partial rules for the daily public administration functioning in this or that nation-state, but by the formulation and implementation of certain shared standards which come from shared values and joint principles based on them. According to the G. Wright and J. Nemeč position, „these principles ensue from the bases on which the administrative acts are built in most EU countries and from decisions adopted by the European Court of Justice. It concerns the role of law, openness and transparency, the legislative accountability, productivity and the efficiency in the public administration.“²⁴

The principle that the *European Commission* as the main executive body is responsible especially for the implementation of the so-called common EU policies including monitoring the ways of their implementation and that the administrative authorities of the Member States have the key responsibility for performance of shared policies is implemented in the general level. What concerns the shared politics implementation the European Commission is responsible for coordination of procedures associated with the implementation of these policies. This approach respects the right of each state to develop and to improve its own system of public administration, but simultaneously it also requires to ensure effectively tasks that are agreed by the community as a whole by the national administrations. The application of selected management approaches by individual countries in their public administration - in the last more than twenty years - assists to the effectively implementation of these tasks. That is why, for example, Chiara Bottici and Benoit Challand underline the fact that „the European project could, therefore, be considered legitimate simply because it contributes to the well-being of its citizens“.²⁵

At present the consistent respect the following principles is considered to be as especially topical:

- *The principle of direct effect and immediate applicability of law EU in the national laws and order;*
- *The principle delimited powers;*
- *The principle of subsidiarity;*
- *The principle of proportionality;*

23 HALÁSKOVÁ, M.. *Veřejná správa v České republice a v zemích EU*. Ostrava: Vysoká škola báňská – TU Ostrava, 2006. 176 p. ISBN 80-248-1266-5, p 61.

24 WRIGHT, G. a J. NEMEČ. *Management veřejné správy: Teorie a praxe*. Bratislava: NISPAcee, 2002. ISBN 80-86119-70-X, p. 158.

25 BOTTICI, Ch a B. CHALLAND. *Imagining Europe: Myth, Memory and Identity*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2013. 205 p. ISBN 978-1-107-01561-6, p. 87.

- The principle of principle of loyalty;
- The principle of flexibility;
- The principle of protecting the national identity of the Member States;
- The principle of openness;
- The principle of democracy;
- The principle of human rights and fundamental freedoms protection;
- The principle of institutional balance;
- The principle of free competition;
- The principle discrimination prohibition;
- The principle of liability.²⁶

The another significant feature is represented by the fact that predominantly since the end of the 1980s and 1990s the concept of *good governance* (also *bonne gouvernance* respectively)²⁷ was implemented step-by-step in the Member States public administration. That approach, „encourages a greater openness but also the responsibility for all who are involved“ among other things.²⁸ Accents are put especially on the necessity of significant interaction both between the state administration and local authorities and between regional and local municipal public administration, drafting and approving service standards of services provided by the public administration for citizens and also the focus on cohesion strengthening and of long-term goals a more precise specification.

Five following principles of the so-called „*good governance*“ implementation should assist to the mentioned goals implementation. They are the frankness of the public administration in the relation to citizens, achieving their broad participation in the agreed strategic objectives implementation, the accountability of public administration authorities for the consequences of decisions adopted by their representatives, the effectiveness of determined steps and the cohesion. The systematic attention to the quality and effectiveness of measures implemented by the public administration is considered to be very important. Those outlined approaches are further specified - among other things - with the utilization of management principles implementation.

Conclusion

The European Administrative Space plays a very significant role in the contemporary European public administration execution. That is why analyses of activities developed inside its framework represent a very important part of the administrative studies. I came to the conclusion that both hypotheses determined by me in the beginning of this essay were confirmed. Nowadays there are free significant spaces in the European continent: the European Economic Space, the European legal Space as well as the European Administration Space which activities are interconnected.

²⁶ BLAHOŽ, J., KLÍMA, K. a J. SKÁLA et al. *Ústavní právo Evropské unie. Dobrá voda*, 2003. 939 p. ISBN 80-86473-48-1, p. 91-100.

²⁷ HENDRYCH, D. *Správní věda: teorie veřejné správy. 3. aktualizované vydání*. Praha: Wolters Kluwer, 2009. 231 s. ISBN 978-80-7357-458-1, p. 61.

²⁸ COM (2001) 428 – Brussels, July 25, 2001, p. 4 (translation made by doc. JUDr. Olga Vidláková, CSc.).

Bibliography

- BLAHOŽ, J., KLÍMA, K. a J. SKÁLA et al. *Ústavní právo Evropské unie*. Dobrá voda, 2003. 939 p. ISBN 80-86473-48-1.
- BOTTICI, Ch. a B. CHALLAND. *Imagining Europe: Myth, Memory and Identity*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2013. 205 p. ISBN 978-1-107-01561-6.
- COM (2001) 428 – Brussels, July 25, 2001 (translation made by doc. JUDr. Olga Vidláková, CSc.).
- HALÁSKOVÁ, M. *Veřejná správa v České republice a v zemích EU*. Ostrava: Vysoká škola báňská – TU Ostrava, 2006. 176 p. ISBN 80-248-1266-5.
- HEADY, F. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Boca Raton (USA): Taylor and Francis Group, LLC, 2001. ISBN 978- 0-8247- 8480-3.
- HENDRYCH, D. *Správní věda: teorie veřejné správy*. 3. aktualizované vydání. Praha: Wolters Kluwer, 2009. 231 s. ISBN 978-80-7357-458-1.
- KLOKOČKA, V. *Ústavní systémy evropských států*. Praha: Linde Praha. 2006. 423 p. ISBN 80-72-606 -7.
- LACINA, K. *Evropská veřejná správa*, Praha: Vysoká škola finanční a správní, o.p.s., 2004. ISBN 80-86754-10-3.
- LACINA, K. a B. KUDRYCKA et al. *Adult Education on Quality Management and other Cross-Sectional Aspects of Public Administration*, Bialystok. 2003. 213 p. ISBN 83-88463-25-X.
- Responsible Bureaucracy: *A Study of the Swiss Civil Service*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. OECD/SIGMA 1998:120f.
- SIMON, D. *Komunitární právní řád*. Praha: ASPI. 2005. 818 p. ISBN 80-7357-114-5.
- WRIGHT, G. a J. NEMEC. *Management veřejné správy: Teorie a praxe*. Bratislava: NISPAcee, 2002. ISBN 80-86119-70-X.

Recenzenti:

doc. Ing. Martina Halásková, Ph.D., Vysoká škola báňská – TU Ostrava

e-mail: martina.halaskova@vsb.cz

prof. JUDr. Jozef Králík, CSc., MBA., Vysoká škola Danubis, Sládkovičovo

e-mail: prof.kralik@gmail.com