



Journal of Geography, Politics and Society

2015, 5(1), 7-15

DOI 10.4467/24512249JG.15.001.5157

COORDINATION AS FUNCTION, METHOD AND FORM OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SUBJECTS UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF DECENTRALIZATION OF POWER

Tatyana Bezverkhnyuk (1) Oleksandra Kubrak (2)

(1) Department of Project Management, Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration, National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Genyez'ka 22, 65009 Odessa, Ukraine
e-mail: bezverkhnyuk@list.ru

(2) Department of Project Management, Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration, National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Genyez'ka 22, 65009 Odessa, Ukraine

Citation

Bezverkhnyuk T., Kubrak O., 2015, Coordination as function, method and form of cooperation between the public administration subjects under the conditions of decentralization of power, *Journal of Geography, Politics and Society*, 5(1), 7-15

Abstract

Research of modern thesaurus of "coordination" concept and generalization according to deductive analysis of different scientific views allowed us to conclude that coordination should be considered in the form in which it acts at the level of management practice. In a specific manifestation in public administration, coordination is vigorous activity of the subject that stipulated the disclosure of its essence through the managerial relations thesaurus and its related categories: managerial interrelations, managerial interaction, managerial communications. It is proved that for the public administration system the most appropriate classification is the division of managerial relations, depending on the way of achieving the end result of public authorities staying in relations: subordinated, coordinative, reordinated.

Key words

public administration subjects, managerial relations, subordination, coordination, interaction.

1. Introduction

Numerous challenges to the system of public administration, provoked by a political and socio-economic crisis against the backdrop of unfinished reforms is a precondition for reviewing of management approaches. In this situation, an important step to address the priorities of Ukraine's development strategy for 2020 is developing of comprehensive managerial decision-making mechanism that consists of clear, intelligible and effective harmoni-

zation, coordination of actions of responsible participants.

Practice of using of the "coordination" category indicates its use, usually when it is necessary to unite efforts of some institutions under the patronage of an institution, which is endowed with coordinating powers regarding them to achieve a certain goal. For example, the main task of the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Regional Development is the coordination and harmonization of activities of

central and local executive authorities whilst the formation and implementation of state regional policy.

An important component of effective coordination is establishing proper communication between the responsible participants of management relations. However, their formal character in practice has determined the existence of a number of problems: the lack of mutual access to databases and the availability of different information platforms and different timeframe of information flow that makes impossible the effective use of mentioned information for regulatory purposes; roles regulations in solving conflict situations with a clear giving of decision-making authority to one of the bodies in order to avoid ambiguity or controversy missing is lacking.

As of today three important trends in changing of the approach to coordination, are in evidence: reduction of rigidity of vertical relationships; expansion of horizontal relationships; departure from the hierarchy as the main principle of coordination, and as a consequence, the replacement of vertical mechanism of coordination by the horizontal one.

2. Modern thesaurus of "coordination" concept

Coordination is a difficult concept, which is exposed to various interpretations, causing views on the nature of coordination that are significantly different from each other. Various areas of focus of management theory, legal science, and economic theory have influenced their formation. Fragmentary consideration of types and manifestations of coordination causes advisability of disclosure of this category by the scientific method of deductive analysis from the abstract to the concrete. This method makes it possible on the basis of the most general ideas, to reach specific manifestations of coordination and study it as a manifestation of general. Coordination should be considered in the form in which it acts at the level of management practice but the correct definition of its problem and correct decisions are possible only if there is the general concept of the essence of coordination.

According to the Great Dictionary of Modern Ukrainian Language (Бусел (ed.), 2007, p. 572) coordination is a harmonization, bringing to accord, establishment of interrelations, contact in people's activities, between operations, concepts and so on. E. Kubko (Кубко, 2001) defines that coordination – is a harmonization, combination, bringing to a certain order or according to the objectives of components of something (concepts, actions, objects, etc.).

It is seen at once dual nature of the concept, which allows different ways to interpret it. On the one

hand, coordination can be considered as a concept that expresses a definite correlation between the elements of the system. Coordination – is a certain coherence, corresponding components of whole to each other, the very special nature of their interdependence, which ensures dynamic balance system. In this aspect, coordination appears as quality. Regardless of the fact that the interrelation between the elements is dynamic in nature, coordination is a condition that is characterized by its completeness and relative immutability, i.e. coordination in this aspect – is static concept.

On the other hand, coordination is considered as a process of action on the elements of the system to bring them into line with each other. Coordination of subsystems means such action into subsystems which forces them to act in a coherent manner. Coordination in this case serves as a dynamic activity of subject of management, to ensure consistency between parts of the whole system, which it manages. At that, coordination-correlation is the result of coordination-action.

Thus, coordination should be considered as a system and as a process. Coordination – is a process to ensure the circulation of information flows between subjects of interaction. The main function of the coordinator is establishing common principles of information flows circulation and ensuring compliance of general rules of their redistribution. Coordination - is a system of ordered and regulated interrelations between the subjects of management activities.

In the scientific literature on cybernetics and systems analysis coordination usually is interpreted (in order from the general to the specific definition) as:

- overcoming of excessive degrees of freedom of movable governing body, i.e. turning it into a system that can be managed (Бернштейн, 1935);
- the process of achieving unity of efforts of all subsystems (units) of organization to realize its tasks and targets (Васильев, 2008);
- managing activities that ensures the interrelation and consistency of subjects, objects and work processes in time and space (Гапоненко, 2003);
- management function in establishing of ties, organization of interaction and coordination of system components, operational dispatching of plans and tasks implementation (Погостинский, 2006b).

Thus, the theory of coordination is intended to identify the causes inconsistency and fragmentation of processes, weaknesses in governance. To coordinate means to harmonize, clarify, set transparency, restore order between something in the process of interaction.

Coordination is a function of social management, which harmonize, organize the different parts of the management system. Coordination in public administration – is one of the basic management functions, the content of which is to provide normalization of interrelations and interactions between participants of public administration process in order to coordinate actions and joint efforts to solve common problems (Кубко, 2001).

Authors expressed different points of view on the essence of coordination as management function; however, we can conclude the similarity of their positions. In particular, B. Lazarev (Лазарев, 1972, p. 35) regards coordination as the management function of “coordinating the actions of various entities, organizations and bodies in order to achieve any common goals”. According to V. Averianov (Авер’янов, 2004), establishing of coordination involves strengthening of opportunities for harmonization managerial actions between several bodies of one structural level to achieve common goal. This method is used primarily in the regulation of social relations, whose members are on the same organizational and legal level. Between these bodies there are no subordinate relations. E. Kubko (Кубко, 1998, p. 61) terms coordinating relations as organizational ones arising “at the level of interaction of subjects and objects of management”, while stressing several kinds of coordinating relations: coordination, subject-technological interaction, hierarchical or complex interaction.

The idea of coordination as a function of public administration would be incomplete without features that reflect the essence of coordination in public administration – to ensure unity and coherence of activities as subjects of management between themselves and subjects of law, whose activity takes place within specific areas of management. It appears insufficient to determine the scope of coordination only as activity as subjects of law in one or another field of management. The object of management (relations emerging in economic, environmental, social and cultural or administrative and political areas) requires not only concerted actions of subjects of management, but also concerted actions of numerous subjects of law by these subjects, which activities is in within this management object which is the part of management system. Such harmonization can be achieved not only by direct intervention, but also by indirect impact – coordination, as feature and function management.

In a specific manifestation, coordination is vigorous activity of the subject that allows us to disclose its essence through the management relations thesaurus and its related categories.

3. Management relations thesaurus and their classification

Managerial relations – are the kind of social relations that reflect the mode of existence of subjects of management. Management relations arise primarily as a result of comparing two or more subjects of management by the selected (or set) comparison criteria (feature). Thus managerial relations arise when comparing juxtaposed objects that are not within the same management system and do not interact while comparing. Consequently, managerial relations is the basis for managerial relations (Дерець, 2007).

Managerial relations – are stable relations that occur between the elements of one management system or between management systems. Managerial relations are the result of the transition from potential opportunity to enter into the relationship (managerial relations) to the actual managerial relations (Алексеев, 2012; Нижник, Олуйко, 2009).

Managerial interaction – influence of subjects of managerial interrelations at each other resulting from the establishment of managerial interrelations and forming a unified management system.

Managerial communications – are the manifestation of management relations in which the presence (absence) or changing of one subjects of management is a condition of presence (absence) or changing of other subjects of management (Єсипчук, 2004).

Management relations should be investigated using appropriate kinds of relations and communications. In the scientific literature, the problem of classification of managerial relations has been raised repeatedly. Arguably, the universal classification of administrative relations does not exist. Only a set of classifications can depict the content of managerial relations. In particular, Yu. Surmin (Сурмин, 2003) depicted quite accurately and vividly varieties relations in systems.

By the number of state authorities involved in the interaction there is a division between a bilateral and multilateral cooperation. In the bilateral interaction there are two authorities; multilateral cooperation three or more bodies combine their efforts in the direction of solving common tasks.

Depending on the object, seven basic types of interaction are proposed: informational (object – information); interfunctional (object – authority); program (object – the program); interindustry (object – the public administration); documentary (object – documents); personnel (object – staff).

Despite these classifications, in our opinion for a public administration system in terms of reform-

ing the most appropriate classification is the division of managerial relations, depending on the way of achieving the end result of public authorities staying in relations.

Totally agreeing with V. Deretsya's (Дерець, 2007) scientific position, we consider it appropriate to single out subordinated, coordinative, reordinated relations, because public administration finds its manifestation precisely in these relations. It should be mentioned that this classification covers most such mark of content of managerial relations in the system of state authority as the presence of authority in bodies, based on their analysis and the functions analysis carried out by bodies and also take into account their status.

The most powerful among managerial relations in the system of executive power is subordinated relations, because only in public administration based on power, using it, it is possible to perform public-administrative influence. B. Kurashvili (Курашвили, 1987, p. 35) defined subordination as "vertical" cooperation between the parties when one party is subject to another, as well as the powers available in top-level management system in relation to the lower level. Subordination also defined as relations which provide activity subordination of an individual to a single will of organization.

Excessive interference with daily operations, providing guidance is characteristic for subordination. The parties in relations of subordination act unequally, interact with each other basing on the "power-subordination" principle. Each higher level of management because of its competence and volume activities accumulates and expresses broader, more complex social needs and interests than lower level. Subordinate ties may provide higher exclusive competence for organizational and legal level body to body on the lower level; immediate, direct and linear subordination; functional and methodical subordination; right of project approval decision; controllability, accountability. The nature of subordinated managerial relations is manifested in the activities of bodies of executive power on authority implementation and revealed, primarily, with the "subordination" category.

However, subordinate relations do not exhaust the content of managerial relations. Subordination is closely related to coordination, moreover bodies of executive power can simultaneously be both in subordinated and in coordination relations. Currently an action of coordinative relations and mechanisms that they meet is expanding; a "crowding out" of imperative and legal ways of management is happening.

Coordination – is a type of social interaction where the parties stand as equal partners (Курашвили, 1987). Such relations are based on mutual interest of various parts of the public administration to coordinate their regulatory effect on the same object (when each part operates in its characteristic aspect) or various objects (when their activities should be linked between each other). Coordinated structural relations occur between parts of both one and different structural levels if these parts in terms of regulation of these social relations act as equal.

In public administration coordination is regarded as one of the basic management functions, the content of which is to provide normalization of interrelations and interactions between participants of public administration process in order to coordinate actions and joint efforts to solve common problems and is carried out at all management levels by the heads of relevant state bodies or special coordination units (Кубко, 2001).

We agree with the opinion that coordination can be a special function and special integrating form of organization management (Дерець, 2007). As a function it provides a certain dependence of some decisions (actions) from others in process of functioning of any organized system, but as a form of organization management - creates a special apparatus in achieving common goals by autonomous organizational systems, harmonize or links their activities to meet universally priorities (Дьяченко, 2003).

Coordinating relations in the system of public authorities can be defined as managerial relations in which state authorities act, so to speak, as members-partners, while one of them has authority on the other, and using them (relations) they reach common tasks which set before them and jointly fulfill their authorities (Максимюк, 2009).

In the system of functioning of bodies of executive power, there are three forms of coordinating interaction:

- forms of coordinating interaction of units or individual servants of bodies of executive power, which is the result of their direct official duties (request, meeting, agreement documents, traditional consultation, social network);
- forms of coordinating interaction based on specially formed interagency structures (permanent or temporary), participants of which may be various representatives of bodies of executive authorities (coordinating and advisory bodies according to field of concern);
- other forms of coordinating interaction (workshop, symposium, conference, specialists training).

The main aim of coordinating interaction is increasing of qualitative characteristics of decisions that are jointly developed and implemented by the authorities and aimed at achieving set results. In accordance with this goal, the coordinating interaction tasks are:

- identifying and discussing the range of urgent problems and their solutions;
- the establishment of a mutual information exchange between the authorities about changing the situation around common problem;
- the achievement of agreed fields of concerns;
- consideration and discussion of relevant draft laws and of proposals on amending the existing legislation;
- discussion of mechanisms for implementing measures in support of specific initiatives, and their method of financing;
- other specific tasks depending on emerging ties.

The influence of the state is carried out through public administration mechanisms that are the practical steps, tools, instruments, incentives, through which public authorities influence society, production, any social system to achieve their goals, and in the case of involvement of several state institutions in the management process, mechanisms of interaction between them are becoming important.

Considering coordination in public administration, one can define three basic types – an administrative, coordinated and uncoordinated.

1. Forced or administrative type: interdependence is observed in planning and logistics systems with vertical channels of communication and is associated with coordination based on principles of planning and logistics (hierarchical coordination).
2. The coordinated type: interdependence is observed in groups with "horizontal communication" and is connected with coordination based on the principles of mutual management. Effective coordination via horizontal networks is becoming increasingly crucial in the subjects understanding of their future than management hierarchy, which can be either invisible or inadmissible.
3. The uncoordinated type – the interdependence that exists between the agents of the market system, associated with coordination based on the principles of "standardization" and competition. By this market form is guessed, in which there are weak bonds between the participants and the essential elements of standardization in the organization (free coordination).

The strategic task of coordinating of activities of public administration subjects is working out

a mechanism of harmonization of common position of government in matters discussed and accepted by the main institutions in this area. The purpose of all coordination is to achieve understanding.

Undoubtedly, the basis of coordination system are ties (actions). In public administration among the potential links, there is a set of them that will ensure the best realization of objectives. The task of coordination – to create conditions for choosing and implementation precisely such links in each institution, which together constitute the "best set of links." The role of the coordinator is important exactly here – the person who decides and determines the best set of links on his opinion (operations, actions, interactions), using the two methods (Погостинский, 2006a):

- formation of limitations (standards, manuals) to prevent unacceptable acts;
- informing (communication events) to ensure permanent coordination of actions in real time.

3. The essence of coordination activity mechanism of public administration subjects

Passing directly to defining the essence of coordination activity mechanism one should emphasize several important methodological aspects.

First, we should note that coordination is not the main activity of its subjects and participants. In this aspect, one should pay attention to the relationship between the "coordination" and "interaction" concepts. Coordination, unlike the interaction is more general and is not connected by the boundaries of any particular action or process.

Secondly, coordinating activities – is a complex systemic legal phenomenon, that is why its studying needs the definition of certain types of coordination. The need for classification is stipulated by the fact that on the one hand, coordinating activities is carried out by different subjects, unequal by the legal nature, in volume of competencies, forms and methods of work, and on the other hand – it is implemented relatively to objects, which are also different in legal status and relations with the coordination subject.

The implementation of coordinating activities requires a relevant mechanisms as ways to achieve its goals. The ways of coordination are: sighting and other forms of mutual control; allocation of tasks in the hierarchy of management; creation of committees and commissions; meetings between departments; distribution of information; negotiations;

direct observation; developing rules, procedures, charts etc.

Thus, the mechanism of coordination activities of public administration subjects – is the creation of the very set of relationships between the subjects of making management decisions that will the coordination of common positions and understanding in the matters discussed and accepted by the main institutions in this area. The mechanism of coordination of activities is developed by the government, which must ensure the effectiveness of public policy on improving the political, social and economic situation in Ukraine.

The above analysis allows us to determine the following types of coordination activities of public administration subjects:

1. According to organizational interrelations of coordination subjects: corporate (coordination between departments of one authority, organization); inter-organizational (coordination activities of central, territorial and specialized units of one authority); external (coordination between not subordinated to each other in the organizational sense public authorities).
2. According to hierarchical position of coordination subjects of: vertical and horizontal. Vertical coordination has a clear legal basis and is implemented under competence of the relevant subjects of management. Horizontal coordination is quite difficult, due to the ability of subjects to formulate and implement their own goals, to lobby the recognized interests and needs realized through purposeful activity.

The target function of vertical coordination is direct control, reallocation of resources and activity standardization, horizontal function – is the formation of agreed solutions.

As of today three important trends in changing of the approach to coordination, are in evidence:

- reduction of rigidity of vertical relationships;
- expansion of horizontal relationships;
- departure from the hierarchy as the main principle of coordination, and as a consequence, the replacement of vertical mechanisms of coordination by the horizontal ones.

4. Coordination mechanisms of activities of public administration subjects under the conditions of decentralization of power

Forming coordination mechanism of activities of public administration subjects under the conditions of decentralization of power one should consider the following. The degree of interdependence of

subjects is directly related to a certain level of coordination. Depending on the number of degrees of submission and subordination and coordination, we can distinguish three levels of interdependence (Месарович, 1978):

- a high – exists in systems with two or more degrees of submission and subordination i.e. a subject that is on the fourth degree should coordinate its actions with the subjects of the third, second and first degree (three stages of approval), observing a certain sequence coordination;
- an average – is in systems with one degree of coordination, i.e. with one step of coordination, with that the information is transmitted at one degree and beyond it does not work;
- a weak – is incidental to independent subjects that do not coordinate their actions, with that the subject makes decisions independently and proceeds to the activity. The more levels of harmonization, the higher level of coordination, and the longer it takes to coordinate actions. It should be noticed that according to general features vertical coordination is identical to subordination, because of the direction of activities.

The most striking example of effective vertical coordination is the creation of the regional offices of reforms in April 2015. Offices of reforms on decentralization provide organizational, advisory, informational assistance in the implementation of reforms in local government, decentralization of authorities of bodies of executive power to strengthen the institutional, administrative and expert provision of reforms at local and regional level. Ministry for Regional Development, Building and Housing of Ukraine as the main coordinator performs the following functions: on the recommendation of the heads of Oblast State Administration, determines the nominees of experts to work in the office of reforms; provides organizational and methodological support; ensure cooperation between regional administrations and the Office of reforms; promotes taking into account the proposals of offices concerning development of perspective plans by state administrations, approving of perspective plans by oblast councils, submitting for examination and approving of perspective plans by The Cabinet of Ministers. An Expert group is also established at central level for the effective coordination (Central Office) for interaction with the regions, monitoring the results of the communication campaign, sociological research.

Mechanisms of horizontal coordination of activities of public administration subjects are quite difficult, due to the ability of subjects to formulate and implement their own goals, to lobby the recognized interests and needs realized through purposeful ac-

tivity. It should be noticed that current legislation does not clearly regulate forms of coordination activities of public administration subjects. Only some of them are envisaged by separate legal acts regarding such forms of interaction as the formation of joint consultative and advisory and expert bodies, councils, committees, groups and other subsidiary bodies.

To ensure the horizontal coordination of different subjects and improvement of the quality of decisions, it is appropriate to apply a mechanism of cross-sector partnerships and stakeholder engagement. We should emphasize that in the system of public administration, making coordinative decisions – is a process of realization of public interests. Correspondingly, one of the instruments of coordination should be holding public consultations with stakeholders in making decisions. At the level of key strategic documents and programs, Ukrainian legislation assumes necessity of consultation with the public on issues relating to the development and implementation of public policy.

Without a thorough analysis of needs, expectations, requirements, motives of stakeholders' behavior one cannot clearly formulate and detail a public issue that will be solved in the form of coordinative solution.

By European standards (Біла книга..., 2002), target groups are the subject of consultations. The body that consults reveals the entire required target groups before their conducting, actively distributes consultation documents among them, puts them questions, and collects their comments and suggestions. For example, conducting various seminars by regional offices of reforms aims at determining the positions of stakeholders about the current development problems and possible ways of solutions.

Between stakeholders, there are different interrelations and relations that can be formal and informal, but what is important is the mutual influence of the various parties to the process of making a coordination decision. It is important to emphasize that stakeholders during the consultation are not in subordinate relations, and their interaction is not hierarchical subordination. Relations between stakeholders in the consultation process form the construct network when public interests prevail over private ones.

The form of such many subjects coordination is network, as an informal non-hierarchical organized institution with a relatively permanent membership and informal relations between members in order to realize the set goals. In fact, the creation of network is a rejection of vertical hierarchy of bureaucratic organization, creating of independent working

groups instead of functional structures, transition to horizontal structure of the organization and the replacement in significant degree of administrative relations by contract ones.

5. Coordination as a specific type of public administration activities under the conditions of decentralization of power

The above proves that the coordination is a separate type of management activities on the organization of ensuring the interaction between the parties – the interrelation and consistency of subjects, objects and processes in time and space. Tactical coordination task is to create conditions for proportional and continuous functioning of management system by installing continuous links between the subjects activity.

The subjects of interaction in the process of realization of reform of decentralization of power are the significant number of governmental, public and nongovernmental institutions that are in the process of joint activities in achieving common goals, become objects of coordination. Should be emphasized that the joint activities of subjects of the process of reform realization takes various organizational and legal forms, depending on the target orientation of their actions. This allows to define coordination as a set of interrelated organizational forms of management relations:

- management relations between state regulators of reform process based on collaboration and communication to perform direct official duties and specific actions (subordinate and coordinate relations);
- coordinating the interaction between subjects of formulating target orientation of reform implementation (government, public and non-governmental institutions), based mainly on horizontal relations for the development and implementation of state policy in the relevant area;
- network connection between subjects of making the coordinative decisions (government, state regulators, state bodies, non-governmental institutions, NGOs), based on partnership relations to meet the public interest and the needs of stakeholders.

Accordingly, coordination, as a form of organization of interrelations between subjects of the process reform implementation, depends directly both on the authority and functional responsibilities of objects coordination and on the objectives of their communication and joint actions. In other words, a multi-channel, differently directed and ordered in a com-

plicated way system of management interrelations / communication and functional harmonization process of common position and understanding on issues discussed and adopted by key institutions in this area are being formed.

The main purpose of coordination, as separate type of public administration activity, is to improve the quality characteristics of decisions that are jointly developed and implemented by the authorities and aimed at achieving specified results. In accordance with this goal, the tasks of coordinative interaction of public administration subjects under the conditions of implementation of decentralization reform of power are:

- identifying and discussing the range of urgent problems and their solutions;
- the establishment of a mutual information exchange between the authorities about changing the situation around common problem;
- the achievement of agreed fields of concerns;
- consideration and discussion of relevant draft laws and of proposals on amending the existing legislation;
- discussion of mechanisms for implementing measures in support of specific initiatives, and their method of financing.

Considering the complexity of relations of subordination between subjects of interaction in the process of implementation of reform of decentralization of power, hierarchy of objectives and variety of functions of public and non-governmental institutions, only the establishment of leaders-coordinators institution can solve the problem of coordination process compliance to the system of objects of coordination. Thus, the main function of the Central Office of reforms on decentralization of power is the overall coordination of responsible participants' activities through the formation of a set of optimal links and the establishment of a particular mode of interaction through coordination centers – regional offices.

Mode of coordinating interaction is a form of regulatory regime and it has the following characteristics: it is set by the authorities and is provided by them; regulates the specific subject-subject relations; is a special procedure regulation, consisting of a set of economic and legal, organizational and administrative facilities; creates relevant measure of the receptivity or contrariety to meet the subjects' interests. In other words, the regime of coordination – is a stable regulation of interrelations of subjects of implementation of reform of decentralization of power, which consists of rules and procedures.

The mechanism of coordinating of activities subjects of implementation of reform of decentralization of power – is the regulation of communication

between subjects of interaction based on set common principles of the information flows circulation and standardization of performing of general rules of their reallocation. The regulation structure may have the following form:

1. Initiation of joint activities of subjects of implementation of reform of decentralization of power should begin with the carrying out on the carpet issues and formulating target orienting points of its solution. Initiation is held by the Central Office of reforms, which establishes the main participants, terms, forms (discussion, dialogue, expert judgment) of discussing the problem; forms the optimal set of ties and establishes the form of making a coordinative decision (some strategic program, tactical tasks etc.). Making a coordinative decision confirms the beginning of joint actions / interaction.
2. The institutionalization of interrelations is directed by Central office of reforms by signing agreements or memorandums on interaction and cooperation with clear indication of goals, tasks, resources, responsible persons and regulation of procedure of official registration of papers that require approval. Then the direction of information flows is set and communication model is determined based on the availability of the technological elements of the subsystem.
3. Integration of planning of coordination activities of the organizational structure of the coordination mechanism is carried out by the Central Office of reforms by identifying coordination centers – regional offices in implementing the planned joint activities and appointment of chief coordinator within the coordination processes of consolidating his authority regarding objects of coordination. According to the functional tasks of each regional office of reforms (coordination center) a structural plan and interagency coordination plan are developed, certain limitations (permissible actions) are set and the sources and amounts of resource provision of performing of the joint actions are identified.
4. Direct coordination is performed within the process of making the coordinative decisions according to legally established procedure based on a combination of appropriate methods of communication with using the available tools. The basis of direct communication is the single information portal, openness and availability of information.
5. The result of effective coordination is the new information that connects and binds target orientation of participants. This information is pro-

cessed by the Central Office of reforms and becomes the basis of new information flows.

6. Summary

The result of the presented study is the scientific substantiation of expediency of improving the mechanism of coordination of activities of the public administration subjects under the conditions of decentralization of power. It is proved that the basis of effective implementation of reform of decentralization of power is to become coordination of actions not only of government institutions but also of other public administration subjects that make decisions in this area. In order to get that done the transition from understanding the coordination as management function, according to which – one party organizes the relations and the other – only fulfills the conditions of relations to coordination as a form of organization of interaction by which all parties (participants) are obliged to organize the interrelation is to happen, because the reluctance of a participant ceases the existence of relations. To make this transition happen the structure of regulation of communication between subjects of interaction is proposed. The main coordinator must be defined as Central office of reforms, which within its authorities will provide public consultation with the maximum necessary number of stakeholders.

The basis of effective communication and coherence of activities of subjects of implementation of reform of decentralization of power in making the coordinative decisions has to become a single information portal, openness and availability of information. The basis of portal content has to become multidirectional communication on ensuring the exchange of information for different functional purposes. Information content of the portal should be done by creating temporary alliances in adjacent areas for making certain coordinative decisions (memorandum, protocol) on the target orientation of information provision of joint activities.

Thus, the coordination, as a separate type of public administration activities under the conditions of decentralization of power, has a dual nature:

- according to the functional purpose – provides a certain dependency of one actions from others within the organized system of communication flows;
- as a form of organization of management – creates a special organizational subsystem coordination to achieve the common goal of autonomous institutions.

References

- Авер'янов В., 2004, *Адміністративне право України*, Вид-во «Юридична думка», Київ.
- Алексеев В., 2012, *Суспільство та держава: управлінські взаємовідносини*, вид-во Технодрук, Чернівці.
- Бернштейн Н., 1935, Проблема взаимоотношений координации и локализации, *Архив биологических наук*, 38/1, 1-34.
- Біла книга «Європейська управлінська поведінка», 2001, Європейська Комісія. Брюссель.
- Бусел В. (ed.), 2007, *Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови*, видавництво «Перун», Київ.
- Васильев Ю., 2008, *Теория управления*, издательство Финансы и Статистика, Москва.
- Гапоненко А., 2003, *Теория управления*, издательство РАГС, Москва.
- Дерець В., 2007, *Органи виконавчої влади України та управлінські відносини*, вид-во Юридична думка, Київ.
- Дьяченко А., 2003, *Система органов исполнительной власти и принципы их построения*, [in:] *Административное право Украины*, издательство Право, Харьков, 71-75.
- Єсипчук Н., 2004, Взаємодія місцевих державних адміністрацій та органів місцевого самоврядування як умова ефективного функціонування механізму державного управління, *Вісник НАДУ*, 4, 326-332.
- Кубко Є., 1998, *Теорія організації і структури державного управління. Реформування державного управління в Україні: проблеми і перспективи*, вид-во Юрінком Інтер, Київ.
- Кубко Є., 2001, Координація, [in:] *Юридична енциклопедія*, Т. 3, видавництво «Українська енциклопедія», Київ, 235.
- Курашвили Б., 1987, *Очерк теории государственного управления*, издательство Наука, Москва.
- Лазарев Б., 1972, *Компетенция органов управления*, издательство Юридична література, Москва.
- Максимюк І., 2009, Класифікація координаційних зв'язків в мережі взаємодії органів виконавчої влади, *Теоретичні та прикладні питання державотворення*, 2, 117-121.
- Месарович М., 1978, *Общая теория систем*, Изд-во Мир, Москва.
- Нижник Н., Олуйко В. (eds.), 2009, *Громадські організації та органи державного управління: питання взаємовідносин*, Вид-во Чабаненко Ю., Черкаси.
- Погостинский Ю., 2006а, *Координационный механизм стратегического управления*, изд-во Питер, Санкт-Петербург.
- Погостинский Ю., 2006б, *Системный анализ функций стратегического управления*, издательство Нева, Санкт-Петербург.
- Сурмин Ю., 2003, *Теория систем и системный анализ*, вид-во МАУП, Київ.