

Government at a Glance 2009

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264075061-en>

ISBN 978-92-64-06164-4 (print)

ISBN 978-92-64-06165-1(PDF)

© OECD 2009

Corrigenda

22 November 2010

Page 3:

In the third line of the third paragraph, Lee Mizell should be included after Nikolai Malyshev.

Page 37:

Figure 2. Number of departments or ministries and ministers at the central level of government (2009)

This figure has been replaced, due to data changes for Mexico (Number of ministers: 18), Netherlands (Number of departments or ministries: 13 and number of ministers: 16), Portugal (Number of departments or ministries: 15 and number of ministers: 16), Spain (Number of departments or ministries: 17) and Turkey (Number of departments or ministries: 15 and number of ministers: 26).

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/723240588421>

Page 66:

Notes

The first note has been revised. Changes are indicated in red.

Data for Austria do not include non-profit institutions financed by government or social security (1995), and public corporations data are partial and only include universities that have been reclassified. Data for France exclude some public establishments. **Data for Portugal refer to 1996 instead of 1995, and do not include the Madeira Autonomous Region.** Data for Belgium, France, **Korea** and Poland are for 2004. Data for Austria and Finland are a mix of 2004 and 2005. Data for Mexico are for 2000. Data for Greece are for 2006 and include staff under private law. Data are not available for Denmark, Iceland, Luxembourg and New Zealand.

Page 67:

Figure 9.1 Employment in general government as a percentage of the labour force (1995 and 2005).

The data for the UK have been revised. The percentage of the labour force employed in the general government in 2005 was 19.1%

Figure 9.2. Employment in general government and public corporations as a percentage of the labour force (1995 and 2005).

The data for the UK have been revised. The percentage of the labour force employed in public corporations and the general government in 2005 were 1.3 % and 19.1% respectively.

Page 68:*Notes*

The notes have been revised. Changes are indicated in red.

10.1: Data are not available for Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Switzerland. **Data for Korea refer to 2004.**

10.2: Data are not available for the Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, the Slovak Republic, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States. Data for France, Hungary and Norway are for 2000 and 2005. In Austria, public hospital employees were reclassified from government to public corporations (not depicted in graph) between 1995 and 2005. **Data for Korea refer to 2004. Data for Portugal refer to 1996. In Portugal, employment data for the Madeira Autonomous Region are included in the figure for the sub-central level of government in 2005 but not in 1996.**

Page 71:

Figure 11.2 Percentage of employees who are female in the central government compared to total labour force (2005)

The data for Spain have been revised. The percentage of female employees in the central government in 2005 is 49.5%.

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/723642841533>

Page 73:

Figure 12.1 Percentage of central government workers 50 years or older (1995 and 2005)

The data for Portugal have been revised. The percentage of central government workers 50 years or older in 2005 is 34.3%.

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/723656070327>

Figure 12.2 Percentage of workers 50 years or older in central government and the total labour force (2005)

This figure has been replaced. The data for Portugal have been revised (percentage of central government workers 50 years or older in 2005: 34.3%). There are also data changes for the share of the labour force 50 years or older in 2005 for Canada (24.3%), France (22.7%), Japan (37.2%), Korea (25.7%), Portugal (26.8%) and Spain (19.4%).

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/723656070327>

Page 78:

Figure 14.1 Type of recruitment system used in central government (2005)

The data for Korea have been revised. The correct figure for Korea is 0.392.

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/723668744361>

Figure 14.2 Relationship between type of recruitment system and delegation in HRM in central government (2005)

The data for Korea have been revised. The correct figure for Korea is 0.392 and the diamond representing Korea should be located in the fourth quadrant.

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/723668744361>

Page 82:

Figure 16.1 Use of separate HRM practices for senior civil servants (SCS) (2005)

Korea introduced a separate group of senior civil servants (SCS) in July 2006. As the data in Figure 16.1 refer to 2005, Korea should indicate a “no” response in the column “Existence of separate group of SCS”. In addition, the following note should be added to clarify the Korean response in the “Appointment contract is for a specified term” and

“Appointment depends on renewal of contract” columns: In approximately 20% of senior civil servant positions in Korea, the appointment contract is for a specific term and/or appointment depends on the renewal of the contract.

Page 89:

Figure 18.2 Elements included in budget documents presented to the legislature at the central level of government (2007)

The United Kingdom publishes a medium-term perspective on total revenue and expenditure in its budget documents presented to the central government Parliament. It should indicate “yes” in the column “Medium-term perspective on total revenue and expenditure”.

Pages 100 – 101:

23.1 Characteristics of central government programmes to reduce administrative burdens (1998, 2005 and 2008)

The graph has been updated for 1998 and 2005 as the data for Portugal have been revised at the time.

Please see also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/724058851054>

23.2 Extent of programmes for reducing administrative burdens at the central level of government (1998, 2005 and 2008)

Data for Portugal have been revised for 1998 and 2005.

Please see also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/724058851054>

Notes

The notes section has been revised. Changes are indicated in red.

23.1: Data for 1998 are not available for the European Union, Luxembourg, Poland and the Slovak Republic. Thus, the figures are based on data for 27 countries in 1998 and for 30 countries and the EU in 2005/08. No data are available for the “removal of obligations” strategy prior to 2008. No data are available for the “modification and streamlining strategy” prior to 2005. **No data are available for Portugal for the “explicit programme to reduce administrative burdens” strategy for 1998 and 2005, as no such programme existed in Portugal at the time.**

23.2: No data are available for Portugal for the “explicit programme to reduce administrative burdens” strategy for 1998 and 2005, as no such programme existed in Portugal at the time.

Page 107

Figure 25.1 Percentage of countries that require decision makers in the central government to formally disclose potential conflicts of interest (2000 and 2009)

This figure has been replaced, due to data changes for 2009 for Finland and Korea.

The percentage of countries in 2009 that require decision makers in the central government to formally disclose potential conflicts of interest on previous/future employment has been revised from 46.4% to 50.0%. The percentage of countries in 2009 that require decision makers in the central government to formally disclose sources and level of income has been revised from 78.6% to 82.1%.

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/724123642681>

Figure 25.2 Public availability of private interest disclosures by decision makers in the central government (2009)

This figure has been revised. Germany should be in the “Not available to the public” category. Finland and Korea should be in the “Fully available to the public” category.

See also: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/724123642681>

Page 131:

Table D.1. How countries communicate core values to central government public officials (2009)

For the entry for Italy, a solid white dot, indicating “method not used” should be entered in the columns “provided in new position” and “other measures used.”

Page 132:

Table D.2. Types of information decision makers are required to formally disclose, and level of transparency (2009)

Information has been revised for Finland, Germany and Korea:

In Finland, the Prime Minister and Ministers are required to disclose and make publicly available information on income and loans. Members of the legislature are not required to disclose information on assets and liabilities, loans, income, outside positions, gifts or previous employment.

In Germany, members of the Bundesrat are not required to disclose private interests.

In Korea, the President, Prime Minister, Ministers and Legislators are required to disclose and make publicly available information on previous employment.

Page 146:

Mexico The number of ministers is 18.

Netherlands The number of ministers is 16. The number of departments or ministries is 13.

Page 148:

Portugal The number of ministers is 16. The number of departments or ministries is 15.

Page 149:

Spain The number of departments or ministries is 17. The entry for the “State structure” should read: Spain is a strongly decentralised state with 17 Autonomous Communities and 2 Autonomous Cities.

Page 151:

Turkey The number of ministers is 26. The number of departments or ministries is 15.

Page 156:

Productivity

The glossary entry for “productivity” has been revised. Changes are indicated in red.

Productivity is commonly defined as a ration of a volume measure of output to a volume measure of input use (OECD Statistical Glossary). Economists distinguish between total productivity, namely total output divided by **total** (weighted) input(s) and marginal productivity, namely change in output divided by change in (weighted) input(s) (Coeli et al., 1999).