

# DESIGNING PUBLIC POLICY IN UKRAINE AND IN POLAND IN CONDITIONS OF POLITICAL SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION

Olena Chaltseva

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University,  
Faculty of Information and Applied Technologies,  
Department of Political Science and Public Administration,  
21 600-Richchia Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, 21021  
o.chaltseva@donnu.edu.ua*

&

Tetyana Neprytska

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University,  
Faculty of Information and Applied Technologies,  
Department of Political Science and Public Administration,  
21 600-Richchia Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, 21021  
t.neprytska@donnu.edu.ua*

## **Abstract**

The article aims to prove that the state should moderate the process of designing “top-down” public policy. The authors analyse the “top-down” state design of public policies of Poland and Ukraine, define public policy development stages in conditions of political system transformation. The authors use comparative method to analyse global indicators, which show the development level of public policy institutions. The article concludes that unlike Ukraine, the key public policy actors of Poland managed to make the necessary decisions at the initial stage of its transformation and, according to the indicators and observation, Poland boasts a more developed public policy.

**Key words:** *Public Policy, Poland, Ukraine, Political System Transformation*

## INTRODUCTION

In the end of the 20th century, traditional model of state governance turned out to be non-responsive to the political reality of the post-industrial society, namely, to the evolution of globalization processes and global economic competitiveness, appearance of supra-national institutions and civil society development.

Institutional transformation led to moving away from the monopoly of the state in the governing process and involvement of various civil society actors in the process of forming the institutional structure. These institutional changes were conceptualized in such governing models as New Public Management (NPM), Good Governance (GG), Collaborative Governance (CG), E-government, Open Government Partnership (OGP); the sociocultural evolutionary institutional innovation is represented in the concept of “Institutional construction socialization” (Path dependence).

Such scientists as A. Dunsire, M. Goodwin, J. Painter, M. Bevir, P. Weller, M. Derthick, L. Pressman, A. Wildavsky, E. Bardach, W. Williams, R. Elmore, M. Hill, G. Bramley, P. Sabatier, D. Mazmanian, G. Majone, L. Smorhunov, M. Svirin, O. Chaltseva, V. Dz-iunziuk, V. Korzhenko, R. Szarfenberg, A. Zybała studied the issues of installation of new governance concepts in the public space.

In practice, the introduction of these concepts happened and is still happening according to different scenarios, depending on the ability of the state institution to adapt to external and internal determining factors. Integration of the aforementioned models into the system of state governance also requires the corresponding institutional context, which includes a complex of elements in the form of mature civil society, responsible stakeholders that, together with the state, are able to form active political networks of partnership and cooperation in the process of making governance-related decisions as well as a professional bureaucratic structure that would efficiently implement the adopted decisions. In addition to these factors, historical and cultural contexts play a special role as it takes into consideration the level of democratic tradition development within a certain society as well as the culture of political participation of this society.

Installation of new managerial models in conditions of transformation is associated with numerous difficulties, which, in turn, are caused by a varying degree of systems' readiness to reform the old ones and create new institutes, inclusion of the new model of governance into the traditional national governance model. The implementation of good governance principles in such systems happens in different ways and does not always have predictable outcomes, which makes it even more difficult for the scholars to determine the criteria of efficiency and effective governance in conditions of instability.

It should be noted that in the realm of public policy, institutionalized forms of political capital are part of both “state” as well as “non-governmental” sectors that have opposing vectors of influence (“top-down” and “bottom-up”) and use the feedback tools, which determine the nature and efficiency of public policy within the national system.

Feedback effects are ensured through interactions of public actors both vertically and horizontally in various spheres of social and political life and their effectiveness will determine the quality of public capital [Chaltseva 2017].

The state, as a key political institution, creates a framework structure for all the political-governing processes within the system and determines “the rules of the game” for all the participants, primarily facilitating the formal stage of public actors’ institutionalization.

According to the hypothesis of our study, on the example of Ukrainian and Polish cases, we aim to prove that the process of forming the “top-down” part of the national public policy models depends on the role the state plays in adapting the new concepts of governance. The state should moderate the process of designing “top-down” public policy and this is the main subject studied in our article.

### **1. STATE DESIGN OF PUBLIC POLICY IN UKRAINE**

A unique national public policy model is being formed in Ukraine. It has its own characteristic features, it turns towards a generalized deliberative normative model, and as it now undergoes a complex process of adaptation to Ukrainian realia, it is still not sufficiently developed and is controversial both in form and content. Positive and negative effects of public policy institutionalization in Ukraine form the content of the public capital within the state and determine its future from the political point of view.

Developing and evolving in conditions of permanent system crises, Ukraine “got stuck” in the time of institutional uncertainty, low level of power institutions legitimation, has passed a few stages of legal and socio-political transformations, which influences the construction of the national public policy design. The first stage (1991-2004) was the establishment stage; institutionalization mainly happened on the initiative of the state and the ruling elite, presenting a vertical “monologue” model of interaction between the state and the civil society, which usually was formal and imitational in its essence. The second stage (2004-2010) dealt with the development of public policy institutions in conditions of the domineering role of the state, adoption of laws, which would broaden the rights of public actors. This resulted in the activation and institutionalization of the non-governmental sector, which had been quite inefficient. The third stage (2010-2014) was the stage of formal institutionalization of interaction practices existing between the authorities and the civil society, inclusion of Ukraine into the global public space structures, implementation of new legal foundation of public policy. At the same time, vertical power structure is being strengthened as in 2010 there was a return to the 1996 version of the Constitutions, which signified deliberate narrowing the window of opportunity for public dialogue and limiting the non-governmental sector’s possibilities to influence the political process. For Ukraine, this stage was the period of public policy imitation, which was predetermined by the domination of key actor that used power institutions in their own interests. The fourth

stage (2014-2019) was the stage of fragmentary implementation of Good Governance concepts into state governance and of continuation of framing the non-governmental sector (especially, the volunteer movement) making it a full-scale participant of the public process. 2014 was a turbulent year for Ukraine, which after the Euromaidan (the Revolution of Dignity) got new opposition leadership and faced the aggression of the Russian Federation, which annexed the Crimea and started the war in Donbas. In conditions of a deep political crisis, new Ukrainian authorities once again introduced amendments to the Constitution of Ukraine, which concerned the return to the provisions of 2004, namely, the parliamentary-presidential form of governance. This stage was also associated with institutional renewal of traditional institutions and appearance of new institutions of the public space as well as of institutionalized practices of interaction between the authorities and the society. The fifth stage started in 2019 and became a new test of the Ukrainian political system, which received new populist leaders that form the new history of public-private relations.

One of the important indexes of the level of institutionalization of public policy actors is the level of legal order, which demonstrates the normative nature of relations between the participants of the political process within the public space. During the years of Ukraine's independence, its public policy legislation has been considerably updated and detailed. The implementation of international public policy norms in the national legislation made it possible for the new institutions to become legally defined subjects of the process and widened the legislative opportunities for public policy institutions in the course of reforming. The passed laws that regulate public policy in Ukraine may be united into three groups: 1) laws regulating the work of state institutions; 2) laws regulating the development of the non-governmental sector; 3) laws, regulating the information-communicative content of public policy.

The paradox of the situation lies in the fact that despite the numerous formally adopted laws and norms related to public policy, the level of the legal index remains continuously low. According to the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) monitoring results, the "Rule of Law" indicator in Ukraine remains almost unchanged (24.52 in 2016; 25.00 in 2017; 24.04 in 2018), which clearly shows that the issue of legal regulation has not been solved. In comparison, the same index for Poland is much higher – 74.04, 68.27 and 68.83 respectively (See Table 1).

Thus, we may consider that the positive result of broadening the legal component of the public policy field in Ukraine is that it allowed us to become closer to the normative democratic publicity model and create legal conditions for interaction of actors at various spatial levels. However, the Ukrainian legislation did not have enough time to register neither the whole spectrum of institutionalized interaction practices nor the statuses of the new and traditional actors of the public policy field in current conditions. In addition, in reality we faced the issue of incompatibility of the new legal institutions and the public institutions that were not yet prepared to public activity and were unable to ensure partnership, dialogue-based relations among the actors

and the implementation of the adopted laws. Another problem is the low level of legal consciousness and culture in the society in general as well as among the ruling elite in particular. As a result, we may observe institutional indecisiveness, which manifests itself in the institutional structure crisis, which in turn leads to legal uncertainty, which leads to the desire of every subject to set his/her own rules of the game and to selectively comply with or even totally ignore the existing legal norms.

State public policy directly depends on the quality of the system of governance, the ability of the state to be an efficient moderator, of the elite – to timely react to socio-political and economic challenges and of the civil society – to be a true and proper partner. Formal integration of the worldwide governance concepts, such as New Public Management, Good Governance, Collaborative Governance, E-government, Open Government Partnership into the Ukrainian political space facilitated the transition from a “monologue” vertical governance model to a “dialogue” model. This process encounters noticeable difficulties and problems in the national context, which manifests itself through slow and not always effective implementation of administrative reforms. This is confirmed by such indexes of The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI), as Regulatory Quality and Government Effectiveness from 2016 to 2018. Judging by the first indicator, Ukraine did not demonstrate signs of significant improvement tendencies, which demonstrates the continuous stagnation in the regulatory quality. According to the ‘Government Effectiveness’ sub-index, Ukraine demonstrates considerable index fluctuations, which signify complicated changes of the governance model during the transformation period (See Table 1).

According to international standards and norms adopted in the state, Ukraine has created new governing institutions as well as applied new managerial practices that use innovative methods. Thus, Ukraine joined the OGP Initiative (2011) and introduced the “Electronic Government”, confirming that it shares the main public governance principles, i.e. ensuring the transparency of state governance, proper citizen access to public information, fighting corruption, provision of high-quality administrative services, introduction of e-governance and e-democracy elements. Since then, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine has approved the Action Plan on Initiative Implementation, it was also stated on the official web-site of the President that Ukraine implements European standards of openness and transparency in the work of state power institutions.

One of the positive results of implementing the “Open Government” principles in Ukraine is that the citizens got the possibility to receive administrative services from the state. Thus, for example, in accordance with the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Services” a national “Transparent Office” service was created [CMU Decree 2013] and it started effectively operating at the regional and local levels. The State Portal of Administrative Services <https://poslugy.gov.ua/> was launched. With its help, citizens can receive state services at the national level interactively (online). The Ministry of Justice has launched a transparent automated system of service provision called

the “Online House of Justice” (2017).

Progress in the field of ICT and the spread of the Internet enabled the implementation of the concept of the service state, which uses ICT for communication and interaction with the public and business, as consumers of the services it (the state) provides. Ukraine implements the gov-2 program in practice, introducing interactive forms of communication and cooperation between the authorities and the society in practice. Gradually, effective communication platforms for public actors are being built, and the state institutions and organizations are being integrated in the space (official websites, pages on social media, participation in the blogosphere), the citizens are being involved into interactive communication with the authorities (e-petitions, online deliberation of various issues on the official government pages) etc. Thus, interactive technologies that are involved in the governing process, widen the actors’ possibilities for co-governance, facilitate the development of e-democracy. However, this is not a sustainable, continuous process in Ukraine, and as such it requires more attention of the state to this process. According to the UN Global E-Government Development Index, Ukraine occupied the 87th place in 2015, 62nd position in 2016 and in 2018 it rolled back to the 82nd place (See Table 1).

In order to overcome the imitational character of public policy, the political authorities of Ukraine that came to power after the Revolution of Dignity, within the framework of correspondence to the adopted political-governing models and the requirements of international structures, passed a number of laws, created additional institutions and tools for exercising public control over the authorities and for corruption prevention (National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine), an electronic public procurement system ProZorro, a system of citizen control over the procurements Dozorro, signed a global Partnership Memorandum on the Information Disclosure on Beneficial Ownership (2017). However, the corruption levels in Ukraine remain continuously high, demonstrating only slight changes – 135 in 2016, 134 in 2017, 123 in 2018 (See Table 1).

Among the positive effects of public capital development in Ukraine, we may note the appearance of new innovative institutionalized forms of network cooperation in various fields, namely, crowdsourcing, crowdfunding, crowdcasting activities, stakeholder projects, structures that include both the civil society organizations and state institutions (Public Councils, controlling and auditing organizations, volunteer organizations, public associations, analytical centres), online network practices of communication and interaction.

At the local level, we so far see the weakness of local authority institutions as public actors, because they are usually neither ready to create conditions for full-scale inclusion of the civil society in the process of co-governance based on dialogue and subsidiarity principle, nor to launch partnership mechanisms such as public initiative, social contract, direct participation, social design etc. One of the ways of solving this problem is the reform of power decentralization at the local and regional levels,

which can become the foundation for understanding the belongingness to the new system of relations between the government and the citizens, between the people and the centre.

Thus, the “top-down” state design of the public policy in Ukraine has some controversial tendencies that determine the specifics of the national model of public policy. The undoubtedly positive aspects of vertical institutionalization of the public capital include the start of legal framing of public institutions; we observe the establishment of the new ones and reformation of the traditional institutions using innovative resources; orientation towards the governing programs adopted in democratic systems as well as a two-way (dialogue) interaction with the civil society. The administrative service provision sector is gradually developing and e-technologies are being gradually integrated into the processes of communication, management and control.

It should be noted that the negative effects of the institutionalized political capital are also gradually piling up. They include institutional duality, institutional authority clash, legal uncertainty, low legitimacy level and together they have created conditions for establishment of stable imitational forms of interaction between the actors and did not facilitate the development of the dialogue-based and subsidiary model of social relations in Ukraine. Negative effects of the institutional public capital may be called institutional “traps”, which interfere with the public process and as a result put the system in the state of hysteresis. The behaviour of the system continues to be influenced by the schemes and stereotypes, which are the heritage of the past, while the external challenges are characterized by exceptional novelty. In such conditions, crisis manifestations and quality changes of a system’s elements are unavoidable.

## **2. THE “TOP-DOWN” STATE DESIGN OF PUBLIC POLICY IN POLAND**

Public policy of post-socialist Poland was based on deep comprehensive changes that took place at the end of the 1980-s beginning of the 1990-s. A deep political and economic crisis as well as an open conflict between the authorities and the overwhelming majority of the citizens led to the fall of the socialist regime and radical economic and political changes in the course of transformation. Systemic changes (transformation) aimed to achieve economic stability in the country, to introduce changes to the institutional and legal systems, to establish close cooperation with countries of western Europe. In order to implement such comprehensive changes, deregulation was introduced (limiting the ability of the state to directly interfere with the work of the market), deatation (the state was gradually removed from economic activity), liberalization (market mechanisms of economic activity regulation based on the principles of equality of all market participants were launched), privatization and communalization (increasing the role of local self-government) as well as re-structuration (in the field of property, capital, production and investments). Introduction of such broad systemic changes was associated with high risks and required considerable socio-economic expenditures as well as adoption of non-traditional political decisions

that seemed logical due to the significance of the expected results of these decisions. This was mainly because the shift of the socio-political system from socialism to capitalism was beyond the known algorithms and there wasn't a single tested scenario of its implementation. Transformation in Poland in the 1990-s was an unprecedented phenomenon, which had radically changed the whole system of state, political and economic structure, which had been built within the country since 1945 until the end of the 1980-s.

The next stage of public policy formation started with Poland's preparation to access the European Union (EU) and it lasts until now. The Association Agreement with the EU (1991) was the start of the new stage of reforms and systemic changes. This has also influenced the process of forming the national public policy model, which was manifested in the attempts to implement the methodology of its functioning within the framework of the EU structures. Before the successful completion of the process of Poland's accession into the EU on May 1, 2004, political and legal efforts had been aimed at harmonization of Polish public policy with the public policy of the EU countries. Supra-national normative social partnership documents, which served for Poland as guidelines to the public space construction, included the White Paper on State Governance in Europe (2001), White Paper on a European Communication Policy (2006) and Article 11 of the new addition of the Treaty on the European Union (2009). These documents outlined the key principles of dialogue-based interaction (openness, co-participation, accountability, effectiveness and coordination) between the civil society on the one hand and the national and local authorities on the other. These steps resulted in a number of positive achievements in the field of public policy development in Poland. The labour market policy, social policies and educational policy can be named as some of the most successful examples. Moreover, the Ministry of Regional Development is introducing effective measures aimed at reformatting the mechanism of drafting strategic development programs that are directly linked to the public policy of the state.

Introduction of innovative governing models (New Public Management, Good Governance, e-Governance, Open Government Partnership) in Poland facilitated the transition from implementation of the vertical public policy model to a dialogue-based one, even though such programs and "e-Poland" and "Polish Gate" have not been fully implemented.

Poland may serve as an example of successful use of public control in transformation systems, as public control has evolved and now has a systemic, multi-vector character (legal protection, monitoring, charity, social sector, elections). Internet technologies are being actively used for enhancement of public participation. For instance, an Organization collects official information about the people that are elected public officials and unloads it into the database on the <http://mamprawowiedziec.pl> website. Another example is the [www.sejsmometr.pl](http://www.sejsmometr.pl) portal where you can easily follow the work of the Sejm as well as changes in Polish legislation. In addition, there appeared



a very brief and very specifically targeted initiative on monitoring the process of selecting people to occupy the highest positions in the state, e.g. the Prosecutor General at <http://www.hfhrpol.waw.pl/prokurator/>, candidates for the position of judges of the Constitutional Tribunal at <http://inpris.yumistudio.pl/wazne/omx-monitoring/wybory-do-tk-omx-tk/>, Personal Data Inspector General at <http://www.panoptykon.org/content/zaczynamy-obywatelskimonitoring-wybor-w-giodo>. Candidates' biographies, their answers to the questions asked in the course of monitoring, information on public opinion on the nature of this position, the scope of responsibilities and the necessary competence level appear on various web-sites. In order to ensure the right of access to public information, there is a Non-governmental Centre of Access to Public Information (provided by the Leaders of Local Non-Governmental Groups Association), which deals with improving the publicity levels through ICT ([www.informacjapubliczna.org.pl](http://www.informacjapubliczna.org.pl)., <http://msps.su/files/2013/09/usppraktkontr.pdf>).

It should be noted that the initial stage of the transformation determined the peculiarities of the "top-down" public policy formation in Poland. Polish public policy considerably differs from the way it is understood in the countries of Western Europe. Due to the transformation period heritage, public policy of Poland relies significantly more than other countries on the field of public administration and administrative law. This manifests itself at least in three different ways: general, material (key legal acts related to the field of social policy) and procedural (Administrative Crimes Code as well as other procedural aspects, included in the texts of separate laws) [Szarfenberg 2013: 40]

In the 1990s, the term "public administration" substituted the notion of "state administration", which had been used until 1989, during the period of Polish People's Republic. He believes that "Such terminological change of the name from state administration to public manifested the radical change of the governing paradigm from state to public" [Kotovcka 2018]. The term "public" is undoubtedly closer and more acceptable to the society than "state", however, it still remains an "administration" denoting the hierarchic pyramid of governing bodies, which implement vertical policy. And, all this happens in conditions of a successful administrative-territorial reform of the 1990s, after which local self-government bodies became most responsible for public policy implementation and gmina became a key administrative unit. The link to the notion of "administrative law" also indicates a strong regulatory component and a specific feature of Polish public policy.

In his research conducted for the Institute of Public Affairs, Andrzej Zybała writes that some people claim that when speaking about Poland, it is hard to speak about state policies in their western European sense [Zybała 2012]. He substantiates this idea by stating that there is neither structured, rational process of planning public policy activities and their evaluation nor a systemic and comprehensive process of general problems' analysis as the basis for implementing some activities. In Poland, we mainly see accidental, non-systemic activities, based exclusively on intuitive, un-

substantiated ideas and visions of the decision-makers. Moreover, many public activities are implemented without the reference to the conducted surveys and without any feedback (documenting how the implemented decisions function), without the application of modern methods of public governance (for instance, without the consideration of the value of efficiency indicators), without any audit, evaluation and consultations with the stakeholders regarding the planned activities [Zybała 2012]. We may at least partially agree with the stated evaluation.

A Ukrainian researcher of public policies of the European Countries O. Kotovska also gives provides rather critical remarks regarding the Polish public policy. She believes that Polish traditions are based on a one-sided public policy model. “One-sidedness” is explained dominance of state institutions (public administration, the political elites in general) and the vertical decision-making process, preservation of controlling instruments. Low level of actors’ participation or use of expert recommendations in the decision-making process as well as no open contests for position substitution. The “actual” public policy in Poland is still vertical. The most significant controlling instruments are accumulated within the inefficient legal mechanisms, which increases the actual cost of public services that could have been provided at a higher level [Kotovska 2018].

The stated problems exist from the beginning of existence of Polish public policy and were naturally embedded in the 1990-s during the period of transformation due to the inconsistency between the existing resources and the scale of the set tasks – lack of time, experience, money etc.

In order to improve the situation, a considerable number of theoretical and practical studies are being conducted in order to determine the current situation with various public policies and, if necessary, to change it. They also aim to develop a set of analytical tools for a more efficient implementation of those policies by the state.

While looking at the key indicators of public policy development reflected in various global ratings, Poland shows much better results than Ukraine, but if we analyse the dynamic of the last years, we may observe that Poland rolled backwards by a number of indicators and now occupies lower positions in the ratings. According to Worldwide Press Freedom indicator during the period from 2016 to 2018 Poland dropped from the 54th to the 59th position in the rating. According to the e-participation index during the same period it dropped from the 14th to the 31st position. The Democracy Level Index showed the shift from the 52nd to the 54th place. And according to the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) it shifted from the 29th to the 36th place (See Table 1).

This has at least two explanations. Firstly, Poland lost the dynamics of changes that she had had during the period before the accession to the EU and right after gaining membership in the European Union. Secondly, the mono-party majority that now rules in Poland (the “Law and Justice” Party) that controls both chambers of the Parliament since 2015 and whose representative is now the President of the Republic

of Poland, in analytics opinion, facilitates the rollback of democracy and publicity of decision-making [Neprytskyi 2017].

Thus, we may state that in the course of political transformation and shift from the “state” to “public” policy, the public policy of Poland has demonstrated a considerable breakthrough. The effect was strengthened by the political, social and economic changes, which allowed Poland to root the new tendencies in the legislation and to introduce them into the administrative policy. However, even despite the successful administrative-territorial reform and the reform of local self-government, Poland still has the vertical, “top-down” public policy design, which creates a whole myriad of controversial tendencies and, most importantly, leaves room for a potential rollback, a rollback that Poland has been accused of during the last years of mono-party rule.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Therefore, the state, which remains the key public actor, starts adapting to the new realia as well as integrating into a new, multi-layer system of governance by changing its structure, functions, culture and values. It is a key moderator of forming public policy models within the national systems and determines the development vector of this process.

Ukraine’s and Poland’s public policy models are unique combinations of global universal publicity trends with national practices, based on the sociocultural matrix, transformation process and peculiarities of state governance.

The vertical, “top-down” public policy design in Ukraine and Poland took place in conditions of reformatting the governing systems and changing the functional and normative possibilities of many political institutions, including the state itself. However, the efficiency of this process in these two countries differs greatly. Thus, according to the Beterlsmann Transformation Index, Poland was 5th (9.2) in 2016 and 10th (8.6) in 2018 while Ukraine was 52nd (6.1) and 36th (6.5) respectively. (See Table 1). In Ukraine, we may characterize this process as multi-layered and controversial, where systemic instability and preservation of some elements of traditional governance face some difficulties when combined with new managerial tendencies and deliberative democracy principles. It should be noted that at every stage the process of public policy formation as well as the reform of the state governing system actually happened under the guidance of the “designers”, i.e. the ruling elite, on a unilateral basis. This violated the principle of getting feedback from the society; impulses that were sent from the bottom, were either not taken into consideration or were deliberately ignored. The “demands” were ignored “at the entrance”, that is why as a result, the system was inefficient with a clearly visible low level of public capital, a critically low level of institution legitimation and a high conflict potential.

Poland, despite the hierarchic nature of this process, has still gradually overcome many obstacles in the field of governance and socioeconomic life. Most of the changes took place during the period of its transformation and then later developed during the

adaptation of the political structure of the country to the European legal norms and institutions. The Polish public policy institutions were able to adapt to the new conditions and to new channels of interaction between the public policy actors. However, it should still be noted that Poles themselves are rather dissatisfied with the state of public policy in their country. Polish scholars and analysts characterize public policy of Poland as rather fragmentary, inconsistent and such that is rather based on intuition and not on actual study of current needs or analysis of the results.

**Table 1. Comparison of Public Policy Development Indicators**

Year	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
Country	Poland			Ukraine		
Index	Position in the rating (indicator)			Position in the rating (indicator)		
1. Worldwide Press Freedom Index	54 (26.47)	58 (26.59)	59 (28.89)	102 (33.19)	101 (31.16)	102 (32.46)
2. Global Innovation Index	39 (40.22)	38 (41.99)	38 (49.41)	56 (35.72)	50 (37.62)	75 (40.45)
3. The Global Competitiveness Index (GCI)	36 (4.56)	37 (68.2)	37 (68.9)	85 (4.00)	83 (57.0)	85 (57.0)
4. Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index (CSOSI)	(2.2)	(2.3)	(2.6)	(3.3)	(3.2)	(3.3)
5. Open Government Index	20 (0.67) (information available for 2015 only)	—	—	43 (0.56) (information available for 2015 only)	—	—
6. E-Participation Index	14 (0.8814)	—	31 (0.8933)	32 (0.7458)	—	75 (0.6854)
7. Networked Readiness Index	42 (4.5)	—	—	64 (4.2)	—	—
8. Democracy Level Index	52 (6.83)	53 (6.67)	54 (6.67)	86 (5.70)	83 (5.69)	84 (5.69)
9. The UN Global E-Government Development Index (EGDI)	36 (0.7211)	—	33 (0.7926)	62 (0.6076)	—	82 (0.6165)
10. ICT Development Index	50 (6.73)	49 (6.89)	—	78 (5.31)	79 (5.62)	—
11. Human Potential Development Index	34 (0.860)	33 (0.865)	33 (0.865)	90 (0.746)	88 (0.751)	88 (0.751)

12. Freedom Index of Freedom House	93 (1.0) Free	89 (1) Free	85 (1) Free	61 (3) Partly free	61 (3) Partly free	62 (3) Partly free
13. Social Progress Index	30 (79.76)	32 (79.65)	32 (81.21)	63 (66.43)	64 (68.35)	64 (69.30)
14. The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)	29 (62)	36 (60)	36 (60)	135 (29)	134 (30)	123 (32)
15. Bertelsmann Transformation Index	5 (9.2)	_____	10 (8.6)	52 (6.1)	_____	36 (6.5)
16. Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)	1. Voice and Accountability <b>(74.38)</b> 2. Political stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism <b>(63.33)</b> 3. Government Effectiveness <b>(73.56)</b> 4. Regulatory Quality <b>(79.81)</b> 5. Rule of law <b>(74.04)</b> 6. Control of Corruption <b>(75.96)</b>	1. Voice and Accountability <b>(72.91)</b> 2. Political stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism <b>(64.29)</b> 3. Government Effectiveness <b>(74.04)</b> 4. Regulatory Quality <b>(78.85)</b> 5. Rule of law <b>(68.27)</b> 6. Control of Corruption <b>(75.96)</b>	1. Voice and Accountability <b>(71.92)</b> 2. Political stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism <b>(65.71)</b> 3. Government Effectiveness <b>(75.00)</b> 4. Regulatory Quality <b>(78.37)</b> 5. Rule of law <b>(66.83)</b> 6. Control of Corruption <b>(74.52)</b>	1. Voice and Accountability <b>(47.29)</b> 2. Political stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism <b>(6.67)</b> 3. Government Effectiveness <b>(32.21)</b> 4. Regulatory Quality <b>(36.06)</b> 5. Rule of law <b>(24.52)</b> 6. Control of Corruption <b>(21.15)</b>	1. Voice and Accountability <b>(47.29)</b> 2. Political stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism <b>(6.67)</b> 3. Government Effectiveness <b>(35.10)</b> 4. Regulatory Quality <b>(40.38)</b> 5. Rule of law <b>(25.00)</b> 6. Control of Corruption <b>(22.12)</b>	1. Voice and Accountability <b>(44.83)</b> 2. Political stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism <b>(6.19)</b> 3. Government Effectiveness <b>(38.46)</b> 4. Regulatory Quality <b>(44.23)</b> 5. Rule of law <b>(24.04)</b> 6. Control of Corruption <b>(18.27)</b>

(The table is composed from the data taken from open Internet resources, namely

1. *Worldwide Press Freedom Index* was retrieved at <https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-press>
2. *Global Innovation Index (GII)* was retrieved at <https://www.globalinnovationindex.org/analysis-indicator>
3. *The Global Competitiveness Index (GCI)* was retrieved at <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2016-2018>
4. *Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index (CSOSI)* was retrieved at <https://www.fhi360.org/projects/civil-society-organization-sustainability-index-csosi>

5. *Open Government Index* was retrieved at <https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/wjp-rule-law-index/wjp-open-government-index-2015>*E-participation Index* was retrieved at [https://tcdata360.worldbank.org/indicators/entrp.sub.part?country=BRA&indicator=3469&viz=line\\_chart&years=2012,2016](https://tcdata360.worldbank.org/indicators/entrp.sub.part?country=BRA&indicator=3469&viz=line_chart&years=2012,2016)
6. *Networked Readiness Index* was retrieved at <http://reports.weforum.org/global-information-technology-report-2016/networked-readiness-index/>
7. *Democracy Index* was retrieved at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world>
8. *The UN Global E-Government Development Index (EGDI)* was retrieved at <https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/About/Overview/-E-Government-Development-Index>
9. *ICT Development Index* was retrieved at <https://www.itu.int/net4/ITU-D/idi/2017/index.html>
10. *UN Human Development Potential Index* was retrieved at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi>
11. *Freedom Index of Freedom House* was retrieved at <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2018>
12. *Social Progress Index* was retrieved at <https://www.socialprogress.org/index/global/results>
13. *The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)* was retrieved at <http://cpi.transparency.org/> *The Corruption Perceptions Index*
14. *Bertelsmann Transformation Index* was retrieved at <https://www.bti-project.org/en/home/>
15. *Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)* was retrieved at <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>

## REFERENCES

- Chaltseva O.M., (2017), *Publiczna polityka: teoretyczny wymiar i suchasna praktyka*, FOP Baranovska T.P., Vinnytsia
- Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine of 02.02.2013 No.118 “On Approval of a Sample Provision on the Centre for Provision of Administrative Services” retrieved at <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/118-2013-%D0%BF>
- Kotowska O., (2018), *Osoblyvosti polskoi tradytsii zdiisnennia publichnoi polityky in Derzhavne upravlinnia ta mistseve samovriaduvannia IV*, 27-36; retrieved at [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/dums\\_2018\\_4\\_7](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/dums_2018_4_7)
- Neprytskyi O., (2017), *Mizhnarodnyi imidzh Polshchi pislia prykhodu do vlady partii pravo i spravedlyvist u 2015 r. in Visnyk instytutu istorii, etnologii i prava XV*, 99-101
- Szarfenberg R., (2013) *Miejsce polityki społecznej w polityce publicznej*, Instytut Polityki Społecznej, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa
- Zybała A, (2012). *O lepszą jakość polityk publicznych in Analizy i Opinie nr 127*, Instytut Spraw Publicznych; retrieved at <http://niezniknelo.pl/OK2/arttykul/o-lepsza-jakosc-polityk-publicznych/index.html>