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The functioning of the administrative system at central level is a good opportunity to reflect on the way of organisation and operation of public services at the national level with all the deficiencies that these present.

Let’s remember for the beginning the way of organisation and operation of this system. As public authorities, the national administrative system has the Parliament as a deliberative authority and the Government as an executive authority, the difference being that taking into consideration the local administrative system, the Government can issue ordinances and emergency ordinances, thus taking over the role and the functions that the Parliament has.

If for the Parliament, the citizens have exercised their right to vote, investing it with the power to issue laws, the Government has the procedure of special appointment, the prime minister being appointed by the Romanian president, who is entrusted with the task of forming his government, made up of ministers and state ministers (vice prime ministers).

The government has the trusting vote given by the Parliament, based on the governance programme and later, by adjuring in front of the president, to obtain the public authority necessary to adopt decisions, ordinances and emergency ordinances according to the legal regulations in force.

It’s worth noticing the fact that both the Parliament as well as the Government acquire the public authority just like in the situation of the local administration system, on different ways: the Parliament through the vote of the citizens and subsequently through the adjuration of the parliament members, and the Government acquires the necessary public authority through its official investment and establishment, requiring two stages:

a. **to acquire the trusting vote** given by the Parliament, which is a “transfer of public authority” from one entity to a future entity;

b. **to adjure** in front of the Romanian President who is performing the quality of public authority of both each member of the Government as well as of his government taken as a whole.

Consequently, the government taken as a whole, is recognised as a power in the state and each member of the government is in the same time a public authority, too the proof being the fact that each minister or secretary of state can issue orders during exercising their power.

The decisional mechanism, at the national level, is very complex, due to the multitude of decisional variants – Parliament, Government and Ministers – (see the figure below):
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**Figure no 1 – The decisional mechanism at the central level**
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In this mechanism, the role of the Romanian President is one of “representation”, ensuring the good operation of the state institutions, the presidential ordinances even though they give finality to the decisional action of the Parliament, they do not have the power to change the content of the laws sanctioned by the Parliament.

It is worth underlining the fact that the mechanism ensures “the transformation” of the electoral programme (usually presented in the electoral campaigns) into a governmental programme containing usually the main coordinates of the economic-social development strategy at national level and based on it ordinances and emergency ordinances are going to be sanctioned in order to implement the programme. The electoral programme transformed into a governmental programme and then implemented through laws, provides essence to the decisional mechanism at national level.

It is also interesting the way in which the 27 government tasks are grouped (presented in the figure below):
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The financial tasks (to draw up the state budget and the social insurances budget) the organisational tasks (to coordinate the activity of the ministries), patrimonial tasks (to administrate the public property of the state), control tasks (to implement the juridical norms by the local authorities), as well as the representation tasks are defining for the place and role of the Government in the activity and the national administrative system.

A parallel between “the model” of public management at national level and “the model” of public management at local level emphasises the common traits and the differences between the two models:
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27Law no 90/2001 regarding the organisation and functioning of the Romanian Government and of the ministries, published in the Official Gazette of Romania no 164 of 2 April 2001
Both levels of administration require the existence of the two categories of **public authorities** (deliberative and executive) adding that while at the local level the **council and the mayor** are chosen through vote, at the central level the Romanian Parliament is chosen also through vote, and the Government after obtaining the trusting vote of the Parliament is invested with authority by adjuring in front of the President.

The difference between the two levels is determined by the **range** of public services provided, thus the national level services address **population generally speaking** while local level services are carried out for the local community.

The new management model at the local level has in view some objectives in the local public administration, as it follows:

a. the creation of the local managers team, **made up of 3-5 people**, varying with the complexity of the of the local governance programme conceived for 4 years, whose immediate purpose is to ensure the implementation of this programme, which has the trusting vote given by the local council;

b. the sanctioning, when the mayor and his local governance team are invested, the local governance programme, thus ensuring the transformation of the electoral programme (of the mayor’s) into a programme destined to the interests of the local community;

c. the functioning, in the relation with the central administration, based on the subsidiarity principle (of closeness of public services for the citizens), of the transfer of responsibilities regarding the services. Coping with this principle will make the central administration, after having created the legislative frame necessary to the functioning of local administrations, intervene to support the local communities only in crisis situations by allotting financial resources as equilibrium or the sums recouped from some revenues of the state budget, destined to cover the budgetary deficits;

d. coping with the **principle of real decentralisation** in the relation with the central administration – local administration, so that the decision margin at the local level register an increasing tendency. The false decentralisation determined by the raise of the in-house budgets, did not mean **concomitantly** a financial decentralisation or a decentralisation of public services because, often, the local communities “have transited” the financial resources through the budget without having any decisional competency (exp. the state pre-university education, health or social assistance and protection).

The decisional mechanism appropriate to the new suggested management model will have a structure in accordance with the figure below:
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**Figure no 4 – The decisional mechanism based on the new management model suggested for the local administration**

The elements of the **suggested management model** – the local governance team and the local governance programme – are a good opportunity to provide the **public manager** the theoretical-methodological instruments necessary to a more and more efficient management of resources and public services obtained.