



An Editorial Note by Michiel S. De Vries and Juraj Nemec

This is the second issue of the e-journal of the IIAS, the IASIA and the Regional Groups of the IIAS. This journal aims at expanding knowledge about developments in the public administration and public sector in countries and regions not extensively covered in the major journals in public administration. We would like to have papers that describe, try to explain or evaluate recent developments in governance, public administration or public policies in one or a couple of such countries. The only restriction is that the paper be relevant for the practice of public administration research and training, for the discipline of public administration and/or for the practice of public administration.

One aim of the journal is to provide a publication platform for high quality papers submitted by authors from any country by the general publication procedures - we encourage papers written from the perspective of trainees and students and/or written in such a way as to be supportive for enabling discussion among students and trainees about the merits of the developments and trends as described in the paper. The journal is also the publication forum for papers presented at a conference of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) and International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA) and the conferences of its regional groups.

This second issue consists of five articles, representing the combination of IIAS bodies conference papers and of papers submitted via the general line. Four papers are standard academic papers; the fifth one is specific piece of ideas, provoking further discussions.

The first paper written by Rasim Alguliyev and Farhad Yusifov explores the views on the transformation of public administration and the formation of e-democracy in Azerbaijan. Direction of development of e-democracy mechanisms are specified in the paper – it shows that large-scale economic reforms implemented by Azerbaijan during the past five years have resulted in notable progress to improve regulatory efficiency and encourage massive changes in the use of ICT in public administration.

The second paper written by Liezel Lues is based on the fact that any democracy requires leaders who demonstrate skills that will strengthen the dispensation, set an example and gain respect, nationally and internationally. The paper analyses leadership practices in the period since 1994, when South Africa has had three presidents, each responsible for shaping the country according to his own unique approach. Their leadership has played a crucial role in determining the future of the country over the past 23 years, some areas have been strengthened, but unfortunately others have become weaker than before. It seems that President Nelson Mandela focused on reconciliation. The approach of Thabo Mbeki, his successor, was strategically different in that it focused on the realization of the importance of economic development and wealth creation. During the consequent Zuma era, the concept of leadership was transformed to focus on charisma and populism.

The third paper written by L.D. Naidoo, M.S. Bayat and B. B. Naidoo analyses the development of good governance guidelines in South Africa – so called King reports and their impact. In July 1993, the Institute of Directors in South Africa approached retired Supreme Court Judge King to chair a committee on corporate governance. King Report I was issued in 1994 (King I), King Report II in 2002 (King II), and King Report III in 2009 (King III). These reports had attempted to give guidance to South African organisations on good governance practices. Unfortunately, they had failed to do so. The draft King Report (King IV) has just been released and its context is in depth examined, with focus on ethical leadership and an efficacy in promoting ethical leadership.

The fourth paper is written in French by Peter Ngala Ntumba Kabashadi and deals with decentralisation reforms in the Democratic Republic Congo. As the reform is not sufficiently successful in delivering expected results, the author proposes to organise a “National Forum” on the question, to reset the reform.

The fifth paper written by Glen Wright – as already indicated – has specific character. Its main aim is to provoke discussion about how to manage fiscal decentralisation processes. This paper reviews the issue of how well fiscal

decentralization has been implemented and how successful these projects have been in achieving a new level of local government financial capacity and service delivery. Overall, the levels of success have not been encouraging with fiscal decentralization having a positive impact. Many of rules proposed by Bahl (1999) have found been the guiding principles for implementing fiscal decentralization. This paper addresses the deficiencies in these rules based on the experiences over the past decades and formulates new rules for implementing fiscal decentralization.