

UDC 33

DOI: 10.34670/AR.2022.85.11.010

State and municipal services in the context of public sector reform in the Russian Federation

Denis N. Zubarev

Purchasing Consultant, Master of Management,
Electron Center for Sports Training,
630110, 42a, Uchitel'skaya str., Novosibirsk, Russian Federation;
e-mail: denis-zubarev@yandex.ru

Abstract

Over the past decades, reforms of the public sector have been carried out in our country, sometimes with a weakened, or, on the contrary, with a strengthened role of the state. World practice is characterized by a gradual transition from the administrative model of the provision of state (municipal) services to a more decentralized one, in which the recipients of services have significant influence in organizing the process of providing such services and managing them. Of course, certain characteristics between countries should be taken into account in order to successfully implement such changes. To what extent the activities of institutions in Russia that provide state (municipal) services to the population correspond to the new paradigm, it is attempt to try to evaluate in this article. For this, using the methods of analysis, synthesis, observation and description, approaches to the provision of state (municipal) services in Russia and the world were analyzed, four stages of using the websites of organizations for interacting with stakeholders were proposed, the term of marketing in the public sector was clarified, a survey was conducted organizations. The results of research in this area can be used to prepare proposals for the further development of the activities of state (municipal) organizations in the Russian Federation, incl. to improve their competitiveness, efficiency and effectiveness. They will be useful to interested legislators, relevant authorities, founders, managers and specialists of organizations that provide state (municipal) services in the Russian Federation under Law No. 83-FZ.

For citation

Zubarev D.N. (2022) State and municipal services in the context of public sector reform in the Russian Federation. *Ekonomika: vchera, segodnya, zavtra* [Economics: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow], 12 (1A), pp. 81-88. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2022.85.11.010

Keywords

State (municipal) services, New Public Management, Post-New Public Management, state (municipal) task, management.

Introduction

As the President of the Russian Federation noted in his message to the Federal Assembly for 2020, often people know better what, why and how to change where they live and work. Indeed, if the state provides the population with those benefits that are not in demand, then the question arises about the advisability of this direction of spending budget funds. As you know, state policy, which is the process of state influence on various subsystems of society, is an integral part of the state's activities aimed at identifying and solving social problems, achieving certain goals, and implemented from macro to micro levels, including with the involvement of initiative groups citizens [Azarova, 2017]. That is, the latter have the opportunity to influence the authorities in certain ways.

The provision of services is also one of the functions of the state, singled out in the 80s of the last century with the emergence of an attitude towards the state as a business structure that provides services to the population and organizations [Pospelova, Kazakova, 2015, 7]. In accordance with article 6 of the Budget Code of the Russian Federation, a state (municipal) service (work) is such services or work that is provided (performed) by authorities, institutions and other legal entities. It means that both non-profit and commercial organizations are allowed to provide such services. Authorities in accordance with federal law No. 210 “On the organization of the provision of state and municipal services”, providing services through multifunctional centers or in electronic form, which are legally significant, implement their functions assigned to them. Institutions that provide services in accordance with Federal Law No. 83 “On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation in Connection with Improving the Legal Status of State (Municipal) Institutions” also resolve issues related to the powers of the respective founder, but their services are different. For example, it is educational services. In the first case, state (municipal) services are contained in a special register, and in the second – in the lists. To avoid confusion, keep in mind the differences between these two types of services in Russian Federation.

The powers of the state or municipal authorities of the Russian Federation in certain areas are implemented by the creation of autonomous, budgetary and state institutions that provide, respectively, state and municipal services with varying degrees of independence, and the latter have the right to perform state (municipal) functions. The organizational form in the form of a budgetary institution in Russia, apparently, is one of the most common, since it has no restrictions on the types of activities. The question arises as to how the recipients of such services are able to determine which services to provide to the institution and, accordingly, to most fully satisfy the demand.

The main part

There are several approaches to organizing the provision of public services: the integrated approach, the market approach, the coproduction approach, and the community approach [McCourt, 2008, 2].

1) The integrated approach assumes the presence of a hierarchical mechanism for the equal distribution of services and is inherent in the administrative paradigm and the idea of the state as a single system that vertically combines the development, planning, provision and evaluation of public services. In this case, the state has almost absolute priority in the provision of public services and consumers are assigned only an insignificant, passive role of their recipients and the ability to predetermine them. Apparently, in our country for a long time it was this approach to the state and the distribution of services that was dominant.

2) Market. Market, competition and contractual relationships are important tools in using the market approach. The state determines what results it expects to receive, and including other legal entities, not only state organizations, produce them. Some management technologies borrowed from the commercial sector are more preferable in the provision of public services in this case. To improve their efficiency and effectiveness, the measurement of performance indicators, assessment and control of results are used. The reform of the public sector in our country over the past 20 years is more likely to correspond to this very approach associated with the implementation of the concept of the so-called New Public Management (NPM), which is characterized by decentralization, the transfer of public services to outsourcing, result orientation, staff optimization, increasing the efficiency and accountability of managers' decisions [Kotler, 2008, 10]. This concept flourished in popularity from the late 1980s to the late 1990s. However, by the beginning of the 2000s, the understanding came that reality is more complex and more diverse than the NPM concept assumed. Scientists have highlighted the different directions of reforms at the national, regional and local levels, as well as the growing divergence in the goals of the public sector and the unpredictability of reforms. [Rybakova, 2015]. In the same years, the programs of the so-called "Washington Consensus" were implemented, later almost half of which were recognized as ineffective. It was typical for them to consider economic growth as the main goal of development, behind which everything else will develop. At the same time, it was proposed to focus on the private sector as the main driver of growth, since state organizations were perceived as insufficiently effective. These reforms were also implemented without due regard for the differences between rich and poor countries [What is Good Governance..., www, 168].

3) The approach to the provision of public services, which is called the coproduction approach and characterizes the Post-NPM period, is characterized by the idea that public services are organized in a completely different way from the way they are organized in non-governmental structures and is incorrect to apply the theories and practices used directly to the provision of public services in the private sector of the economy. Various participants in the coproduction approach with different perceptions, their own strategies and objectives are interdependent and through negotiations with each other jointly determine the goals and results of the provision of certain state services. The latter, in turn, are largely dependent on the quality of interaction between the authorities involved in the organization and provision of services, service providers, end users, experts and society. At the same time, the state is still assigned the role of a network leader who supports, encourages, motivates and activates the interaction of various participants in the process of providing services and is not an outside observer. Service recipients, in contrast to the integrated approach, have the opportunity, as already mentioned, to be co-producers or partners, which is believed to contribute to more active involvement of residents of settlements in the provision of the services they want and to increase satisfaction.

4) The community approach: the management of the provision of public services is carried out through the self-organization of citizens, which highlights the independence of society. Some authors equate public control with the highest level of participation in the implementation of public services [McCourt, 2008, 6]. The state is not seen as the best producer of public services compared to the consumers themselves. However, at the same time, it still remains the supplier of the most important resources necessary for production and through this it has the ability to still influence self-organized citizens. The role of the state in this process is characterized as a facilitator who helps to eliminate barriers that hinder the spread of the practice of self-organization, provides the required resources, incl. financial. Thus, horizontal interaction between authorities and residents in the production of services is important. The difference between this approach to organizing and providing services from the previous one is that in the latter case an active role in proactive self-organization is assigned to the state, while

in the first case – to residents who themselves initiate, plan, manage the process of providing services.

It is curious that the UN and international financial institutions use the concept of “Good Governance” to determine the correct organization of reforms, the appearance of which is attributed to the late 90s of the last century, combining the characteristics of both NPM and Post-NPM. It is also believed that these concepts are “umbrella” concepts that have absorbed various aspects of the reforms. Good Governance is characterized by participatory governance, commitment to compliance, accountability, transparency, responsibility, efficiency and effectiveness, rule of law [Klenk, 2019, 1].

These approaches to the provision of public services have both positive and negative characteristics. For example, approach № 1 is criticized for ignoring the individual nature of public services, for ineffective distribution of services due to hierarchy. Approach № 2 relieves the authorities of the responsibility to provide appropriate services, and in some cases hinders the sustainable development of public organizations. Approach № 3 highlights drawbacks in the form of lengthy negotiations with high subsequent implementation costs, which reduces the degree of citizen participation in the provision of public services. When ensuring the production of public services using approach № 4, the difficulty is that the self-organization of interested citizens in some cases does not last long and does not have enough resources and funds to ensure the process of supplying the population with services. Moreover, self-organized activity is threatened with termination due to the encountered restrictions and other obstacles. There are cases when the initiative of citizens to create a non-profit organization to solve some problems was criticized by the relevant authorities and the registration of a legal entity was not carried out.

As is known in Russia in recent decades, information technologies have been developing quite actively, including for the provision of state (municipal) services in electronic form. Several targeted Programs have been adopted. This is “Electronic Russia (2002-2010)”, the purpose of which was to improve the quality of relations between the state and society by expanding the ability of citizens to access information about the activities of state authorities, increasing the efficiency of providing state and municipal services, introducing uniform standards of public service, and “Information Society (2011-2020)”, created to improve the quality of life of citizens through the use of information and telecommunication technologies. Almost every institution today has its own functioning official website that informs consumers about the details of their activities, services, works, etc.

If we distinguish 4 levels of user use of institutions' websites:

1. Familiarization with the offered information;
2. Independent search for the desired information on the site;
3. Ability to send requests and receive responses;
4. Influence on the activities of the organization,

then considering the wishes of stakeholders in the activities of such organizations will, apparently, characterize the last 4th level. For example, at the 1st level, the site is small-page and contains a description of the organization, details and announcements. At the 2nd level, users get the opportunity, thanks to navigation through the site and the search form, to receive more detailed information about certain services. At the 3rd level, through the contact information or chat available on the site, the interaction between the site visitor and the organization is carried out in the form of a “question-answer”. And already the impact on the activity is provided by filling out a special form, which indicates the strong and weak aspects of the activity, suggestions, feedback, and all this goes to the relevant employees for consideration and at the end of a certain period, the accomplished is summarized in a report and posted in the public domain on the same website. Since institutions also produce, what is more or less requested by the consumer, it is advisable for them to use marketing and its tools to sell

the product even in the public sector]. So, in the general case, V. Kotler understands marketing as a type of human activity aimed at meeting needs and requirements through exchange [Kotler, 2008, 21]. According to the author, marketing in the public sector is preferred where it is significant to meet the needs of the population and in what is of value to it [Kotler, 2007, 20]. However, for the public sector in the Russian Federation, this definition should be clarified, since consumers do not always pay directly for the services received and as a means of exchange for received state or municipal services, depending on who owns the property of the institution, it is possible to indicate the satisfaction of the recipients of the services, the mass, achievement of certain goals, etc. In other words, sometimes such an exchange is intangible, and the benefits received by the manufacturer are derived from the satisfaction or success of receiving the service by the end user. Budgetary and autonomous institutions carry out their main activities according to the state (municipal) assignment, which is prepared by the founder, considering the types of activities of the institution that are referred to as the main ones in its charter. In accordance with the Procedure for the formation of the state task for the provision of public services (works), approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 640 of 26.06.2015, the state task is formed taking into account the proposals of the institution, based, among other things, on the need for appropriate services and works, which are estimated according to the forecast of the dynamics of the number of consumers of services and works, the level of satisfaction with the existing volume and quality of services and the results of work and opportunities Institutions. Thus, institutions also have the opportunity to use marketing tools to determine and even generate demand for certain services and, accordingly, offer the founder to change the parameters of the task for the next year. Even if it would require changes to the charter to bring the list of core activities into line.

Another help in the creation of decentralization of state (municipal) services in Russia is providing the consumer with the opportunity to select services for himself with the provision of financing for his choice [Baranov, www, 55]. The law "On state (municipal) social order for the provision of state (municipal) services in the social sphere" indicates that the methods of selecting service providers are to select a service provider from a special register using a social certificate, as well as competitive selection of service providers for the provision of state (municipal) services) services in the social sphere.

To what extent are institutions in the Russian Federation ready and using in practice the opportunities provided to form a set of services demanded by end users? For a preliminary answer to this question in 2019-2020, the author randomly selected 100 institutions in Russia on the bus.gov.ru website that have Internet sites and provide state (municipal) services in the field of physical culture and sports. According to the specified contact information, a question was sent out in a letter about whether it is possible for a client of this organization to offer a free service that they do not have in order to be considered. The emphasis was placed on the provision of services free of charge for the consumer, since this is how, with some exceptions, services for the population are provided at the expense of the state (municipal) assignment. 27 organizations responded to the question. Only 10 answered unequivocally in the affirmative. A fairly low percentage, about 30%, of total answers to an e-mail question may be due in part to not receiving an email due to the out-of-date email address on the site or the letter falling into the recipient's junk email folder. At the same time, disinterest, a low level of site administration or organization of interaction with visitors to the Internet resource are not excluded, which is not characteristic of the market approach implemented in our country, proposed by the concept of New Public Management (NPM).

Conclusions

The development of the concepts of administrative reforms in world practice is a transition from the administrative to the public model, when it is the citizens who have a decisive role in the selection and management of state (municipal) services that they also receive. Reforming the public sector in the Russian Federation also demonstrates a change in the administrative approach to more modern ones, involving a weakening of the role of the state, decentralization. In this regard, at the micro levels of the system of state (municipal) services in Russia, where the subjects of providing services offer them directly to recipients, it is necessary to change the usual way of their distribution, when the founder in most cases decides where and what will be implemented. The opportunities provided to institutions to influence the indicators of the state (municipal) task are not fully used by them, judging by the survey, which, of course, does not explain the totality of the objects of research. Do not forget that now the provision of such services is possible not only by institutions, but also by other organizations. In this regard, state (municipal) organizations should change the organization of activities, since otherwise, it is possible to redistribute budgets allocated for the provision of services in favor of more efficient organizations that will more fully satisfy the needs of consumers.

For a more accurate assessment of the extent to which institutions are ready to interact with end users to change the range of services, a more extensive study should be carried out using statistical methods, with new clarifying questions, as well as among a larger number of institutions in Russia.

References

1. Azarova S.P. (2017) Spetsifika marketingovoi deyatel'nosti v gosudarstvennom sektore [The specifics of marketing activities in the public sector]. *Vektor ekonomiki* [Vector of Economics], 4 (10), p. 10.
2. Baranov N.A. *Sushchnost' gosudarstvennoi politiki (lektsiya 4)* [The essence of public policy (lecture 4)]. URL: <https://nicbar.ru/politology/study/49-kurs-gosudarstvennaya-politika-i-upravlenie/494-lektsiya-4-gosudarstvennaya-politika>
3. *Byudzhetniye kodeks Rossiiskoi Federatsii ot 31 iyulya 1998 g. № 145-FZ (red. ot 12.07.2021)* [Budget Code of the Russian Federation dated July 31, 1998 No. 145-FZ (as amended on July 12, 2021)].
4. *Federal'naya tselevaya programma «Elektronnaya Rossiya (2002-2010 gody)»* [Federal target program Electronic Russia (2002-2010)"].
5. *Federal'nyi zakon «O gosudarstvennom (munitsipal'nom) sotsial'nom zakaze na okazanie gosudarstvennykh (munitsipal'nykh) uslug v sotsial'noi sfere» ot 13.07.2020 № 189-FZ* [Federal Law "On the state (municipal) social order for the provision of state (municipal) services in the social sphere" dated July 13, 2020 No. 189-FZ].
6. *Federal'nyi zakon ot 3 noyabrya 2006 g. № 174-FZ «Ob avtonomnykh uchrezhdeniyakh» (red. ot 2 iyulya 2021 g.)* [Federal Law of November 3, 2006 No. 174-FZ "On Autonomous Institutions" (as amended on July 2, 2021)].
7. *Gosudarstvennaya programma «Informatsionnoe obshchestvo (2011-2020 gody)»* [State program "Information Society (2011-2020)"].
8. Klenk T., Reiter R. (2019) Post-New Public Management: reform ideas and their application in the field of social services. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85, 1, p. 3.
9. Kotler F. (2008) *Marketing dlya gosudarstvennykh i obshchestvennykh organizatsii* [Marketing for state and public organizations]. St. Petersburg: Piter Publ.
10. Kotler, F. (2007) *Osnovy marketinga. Kratkii kurs* [Fundamentals of marketing. Short course]. Moscow: Vil'yams Publ.
11. McCourt W. (2008) Public Management in Developing Countries. *Public Management Review*, 10:4, p. 468. DOI 10.1080/14719030802263897
12. *«O Kommentariyakh (kompleksnykh rekomendatsiyakh) po voprosam, svyazannym s realizatsiei polozhenii Federal'nogo zakona ot 08.05.2010 № 83-FZ Gosudarstvennye (munitsipal'nye) uslugi (raboty)»* ["On Comments (comprehensive recommendations) on issues related to the implementation of the provisions of the Federal Law of 08.05.2010 No. 83-FZ State (municipal) services (works)"].
13. *Pis'mo Minfina Rossii ot 22.10.2013 № 12-08-06/44036* [Letter of the Ministry of Finance of Russia dated October 22, 2013 No. 12-08-06/44036].
14. *Poslanie Prezidenta RF V.V. Putina Federal'nomu Sobraniyu RF ot 15 yanvarya 2020 g.* [Message from the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation of January 15, 2020].

15. Pospelova E.A., Kazakova M.V. (2015) Prepyatstviya dlya vnedreniya printsipov New Public Management v gosudarstvennykh sistemakh razvivayushchikhsya stran [Obstacles to the implementation of New Public Management principles in government systems in developing countries]. *Finansovyi zhurnal* [Financial Journal], 1, p. 10.
16. Rybakova I.N. (2015) Institutsionalizatsiya sfery gosudarstvennykh uslug: problemy issledovaniya [Institutionalization of the sphere of public services: research problems]. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'no-gumanitarnye issledovaniya* [Economic and social-humanitarian studies], 1 (5), p. 135.
17. *What is Good Governance? Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*. Available at: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf> [Accessed 12/12/2021]
18. Yanwei Li, Shi Qiu (2020) More “Government”, less “Governance”: Chinese public employees’ preferences for governing public service delivery. *Policy Studies*, 1-21, pp. 1-6.
19. Zubarev D.N. (2018) Konkurentosposobnost' gosudarstvennykh, munitsipal'nykh byudzhetykh i avtonomnykh uchrezhdenii: osnovy formirovaniya institutsional'noi modeli otsenki [Competitiveness of state, municipal budgetary and autonomous institutions: basis of formation of institutional model of evaluation]. *Ekonomika: vchera, segodnya, zavtra* [Economics: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow], 8 (1A), pp. 54-67.

Государственная и муниципальная служба в контексте реформирования государственного сектора в Российской Федерации

Зубарев Денис Николаевич

Консультант по закупкам,
магистр менеджмента,
Центр спортивной подготовки «Электрон»,
630110, Российская Федерация, Новосибирск, ул. Учительская, 42а;
e-mail: denis-zubarev@yandex.ru

Аннотация

На протяжении последних десятилетий в нашей стране проводились реформы государственного сектора, иногда при ослаблении, а иногда, напротив, при усилении роли государства. Мировая практика характеризуется постепенным переходом от административной модели оказания государственных (муниципальных) услуг к более децентрализованной, при которой получатели услуг имеют значительное влияние на организацию процесса оказания таких услуг и управление ими. Конечно, для успешного осуществления таких изменений следует учитывать определенные особенности той или иной страны. Насколько деятельность учреждений в России, оказывающих государственные (муниципальные) услуги населению, соответствует новой парадигме, мы попытаемся оценить в данной статье. Для этого с помощью методов анализа, синтеза, наблюдения и описания были проанализированы подходы к оказанию государственных (муниципальных) услуг в России и мире, предложены четыре этапа использования сайтов организаций для взаимодействия с заинтересованными сторонами, было уточнено состояние маркетинга в государственном секторе, проведен опрос организаций. Результаты исследований в данной области могут быть использованы для подготовки предложений по дальнейшему развитию деятельности государственных (муниципальных) организаций в Российской Федерации, в т.ч. повысить их конкурентоспособность, эффективность и результативность. Они могут быть полезны законодателям, соответствующим органам, учредителям, руководителям и специалистам организаций, оказывающих государственные (муниципальные) услуги в Российской Федерации в соответствии с Законом № 83-ФЗ.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Зубарев Д.Н. State and municipal services in the context of public sector reform in the Russian Federation // Экономика: вчера, сегодня, завтра. 2022. Том 12. № 1А. С. 81-88. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2022.85.11.010

Ключевые слова

Государственные (муниципальные) услуги, новое государственное управление, постновое государственное управление, государственное (муниципальное) задание, менеджмент.

Библиография

1. Азарова С.П. Специфика маркетинговой деятельности в государственном секторе // Вектор экономики. 2017. № 4 (10). С. 10.
2. Баранов Н.А. Сущность государственной политики (лекция 4). URL: <https://nicbar.ru/politology/study/49-kurs-gosudarstvennaya-politika-i-upravlenie/494-lektsiya-4-gosudarstvennaya-politika>
3. Бюджетный кодекс Российской Федерации от 31 июля 1998 г. № 145-ФЗ (ред. от 12.07.2021).
4. Государственная программа «Информационное общество (2011-2020 годы)».
5. Зубарев Д.Н. Конкуренентоспособность государственных, муниципальных бюджетных и автономных учреждений: основы формирования институциональной модели оценки // Экономика: вчера, сегодня, завтра. 2018. Том 8. № 1А. С. 55.
6. Котлер Ф. Маркетинг для государственных и общественных организаций. СПб.: Питер, 2008. С. 20.
7. Котлер. Ф. Основы маркетинга. Краткий курс. М.: Вильямс, 2007. С. 21.
8. «О Комментариях (комплексных рекомендациях) по вопросам, связанным с реализацией положений Федерального закона от 08.05.2010 № 83-ФЗ Государственные (муниципальные) услуги (работы)».
9. Письмо Минфина России от 22.10.2013 № 12-08-06/44036.
10. Послание Президента РФ В.В. Путина Федеральному Собранию РФ от 15 января 2020 г.
11. Поспелова Е.А., Казакова М.В. Препятствия для внедрения принципов New Public Management в государственных системах развивающихся стран // Финансовый журнал. 2015. № 1. С. 10.
12. Рыбакова И.Н. Институционализация сферы государственных услуг: проблемы исследования // Экономические и социально-гуманитарные исследования. 2015. № 1 (5). С. 135.
13. Федеральная целевая программа «Электронная Россия (2002-2010 годы)».
14. Федеральный закон «О государственном (муниципальном) социальном заказе на оказание государственных (муниципальных) услуг в социальной сфере» от 13.07.2020 № 189-ФЗ.
15. Федеральный закон от 3 ноября 2006 г. № 174-ФЗ «Об автономных учреждениях» (ред. от 2 июля 2021 г.).
16. Klenk T., Reiter R. Post-New Public Management: reform ideas and their application in the field of social services // International Review of Administrative Sciences. 2019. Vol. 85. Is. 1. P. 3.
17. McCourt W. Public Management in Developing Countries // Public Management Review. 2008. 10:4. P. 468. DOI 10.1080/14719030802263897
18. What is Good Governance? Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. URL: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>
19. Yanwei Li, Shi Qiu. More “Government”, less “Governance”: Chinese public employees’ preferences for governing public service delivery // Policy Studies. 2020. 1-21. P. 1-6.