

Input paper for the October 2004 Conference of the European Schools and National Institutes for Public Administration:

‘Public Leadership in Multi-Level Governance: Towards a Common Competence Frame’

I. Introduction

Context

The European National Schools and Institutes for Public Administration meet twice a year to exchange views and to share experiences. The bi-annual meetings of the directors of European National Schools and Institutes for Public Administration increasingly pay attention to competence development of civil servants and other professionals in the public sector.

At the most recent meeting in Ashford Castle Cong in Ireland, an Agenda for the Future is agreed upon, defining that the focus of the conferences will be on a central theme related to leadership and effective governance in the EU of 25.

The central theme of the Dutch Presidency is: ‘Public Leadership and Professionalism in Multi-Level Governance: Towards a Common Competence Frame’. The focus will be on leaders and senior professionals in the civil service, who are operating at a national level and dealing with the European Union. The main question is: ‘What does a civil servant in a leading position need to know, do and show to act successfully in the European arena?’. The common competence frame can also serve as a step towards common standards for the European Institutes and Schools of Public Administration, as referred to Guideline 89/48/EEC (dated December 21, 1988).

Methodology

To explore the answers to this question, the Dutch Institute for Public Administration, in co-operation with the Dutch Ministry of Interior, has conducted a survey, sending out questionnaires to all European partner institutes and schools for Public Administration. (Please, find an overview of participating institutes in the Annex.)

The objective of the survey has been twofold:

1. to investigate whether there is a system of competencies developed for public leaders (and senior civil servants), and whether there are special core competencies formulated for public leaders dealing with Brussels;
2. to identify what public leaders (and senior civil servants) should be like to be effective in Brussels, in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Desk research made clear that there didn't exist some sort of an International Competence Frame nor some Common European Standard at all. This made the survey above all exploring in its approach, more than defining and concluding.

In the survey, competence is defined as 'the ability to act successfully'. Competencies have been subdivided into: knowledge (K), skills (Sk) and attitudes (A).

The questionnaire consisted of both open and closed items. Listings of competencies have been developed to be able to compare the priorities in the different member states. The listings of general and specific core competencies have been based on various sources. Among others: the European Training Foundation (EFT), the Dutch Senior Public Service (ABD), and a consultancy firm specialised in competencies (GITP).

The target group in this survey are public leaders and senior professionals in civil service, operating at a national level and dealing with Brussels. This target group is subdivided into three types of public leaders:

- public leaders, who are dealing on a daily base with Brussels and who's main task is co-ordinating between national level and European level (Gold);
- public leaders, who are dealing frequently with Brussels and who are providing on a regular base inputs to various policy and legal issues from the national to the European level (Silver);
- public leaders, who are rarely dealing with Brussels and who's main tasks are on a national level (Bronze).

Please, note that the typology of leaders refers solely to the intensity of the interaction with Brussels (as for example Ireland mentioned explicitly), and has nothing to do with the level nor the status of the different types of leaders. Sweden indicated to have problems with the terminology, as their understanding of the terminology was such as that it would imply a ranking.

The analysis of the response to the questionnaire serves as an input to the working sessions at the conference. Based on the outcomes of the conference, a publication of the Centre for Public Leadership of the Dutch Institute for Public Administration will be written.

A first step

It can not be emphasised enough, that the process has only just begun and that the development of a Common Competence Frame is, and will probably ever be, a *work in progress*. The frame is intended to be indicative, not definite.

The survey aims to be helpful in the training and selection processes of successful public leadership for an effective Europe. As such the notion of Life-Long Learning, as promoted by EPSU, requires a flexible and dynamic approach as well. The survey is nothing, but a first step in identifying whether there are, and if so, which are common key qualifications of public leaders, who are operating at a national level and are dealing with Brussels.

The analysis starts with two concurrent proposed Common Competence Frames and subsequently summarises the main outcomes for each item of the questionnaire. In the Annex to the analysis, the outcomes are specified in more detail.

II. Analysis of response to the questionnaire

The response

1. Response rate has been very good: 21 out of 25 (84%). An overview of the responding countries is to be found in the Annex. Please, note that the response of Austria was only received on October 4, 2004 and could therefore not be taken into consideration in this analysis anymore. In the final analysis, the response of Austria will be included.
2. Given the small group, the non-response still gives reason for caution in drawing general conclusions.
3. Although attempts have been undertaken to get a response from representatives of the departments of HR in the member countries – the survey has been presented and the questionnaire distributed to the members of the Group Statute meeting on July 9, 2004 - there has been no response from this group. (In The Netherlands, additional response has been obtained from the Senior Civil Service Department ABD and from the Personnel department of the Ministry of Exterior HDPO.)

Terminology

1. It should be kept in mind that differences exist in the terminology (definitions) and understanding of competencies between the different European member countries.

For example: United Kingdom defined competencies as skills, although knowledge and attitude underlie these skills. The Senior Civil Service in The Netherlands defines competence as: a behaviour criterion. Competencies are used to define skills and qualities of human resources in terms of *perceptible* behaviour.

2. Differences exist as well in the experience with a competence-based system. Some member countries have a long-standing experience with competencies, for example: Ireland, Portugal, UK and The Netherlands. Latvia developed an annual evaluation form for civil servants, based on six competencies. Other member countries are planning to introduce a competence-based system in their HR-policy, for example: Spain and several of the new member countries. Three out of twenty member countries indicate to have no experience at all with competencies.

3. In Germany, specific competencies for Europe have been defined as the ability of the staff to perform its tasks involving the European Union. Competencies for Europe are about the 'Ability and willingness to compromise'. The three European based competencies are: 'Language skills', 'Expert knowledge' and 'Negotiating skills and ability to communicate across cultures'. Sweden

works with different systems based on competencies for different sectors: one system is established in the Foreign Service, an other in EU-affairs.

4. In answering to the questionnaire, different interpretations of the gold-silver-bronze typology were made. Ireland understood public leaders to mean non-elected officials only. In Cyprus only a small number of Civil Servants is involved in EU-issues, doing all types of tasks (Gold, Silver and Bronze). Filling up the questionnaire and taking into account its own national system of European affairs co-ordination, Lithuania drew an own specification to each of the three types of leaders, including both representatives of the political level and various groups of civil servants.

Towards a Common Competence Frame

1. Based on the response to the questionnaire, the original frame of 32 core competencies as presented in the questionnaire at Chapter VI can be adjusted. After adding several items and adjusting others, the total amount of competencies summed up to 41. Please, refer to the Annex for the details.

2. Looking at the frequency that the different competencies have been mentioned by the respondents, a Frame of 23 core competencies could be proposed:

A Proposed frame of core competencies, based on frequency of response

Explanation: “number”, “name of competency”, (K/Sk/A), : incidence of the number in III and VI \geq 15.

1. Cross cultural communication (Sk): 29	13. Team builder (Sk): 18
2. Judgement (Sk/A): 15	14. Acquainted with social networks dealing with Europe (K): 15
3. Information processing skills (Sk): 25	15. Familiar EU policy and legislation (K): 17
4. Flexibility (A): 17	16. Innovative (A): 16
5. Open minded (A): 46	17. Strategic perspective (Sk): 46
6. Honesty/integrity (A): 28	18. Familiar with (in)formal relations EU and member states (K): 17
7. Familiar with responsibilities of the European institutions (K): 51	19. Result driven (A/Sk): 21
8. Negotiating skills (Sk): 85	20. Organisation skills/Planning and evaluation (Sk): 33
9. Social skills/Communicator (Sk): 45	21. Familiar domestic sector policy (K): 19
10. Networking skills (Sk): 44	22. Knowledge of own national system and priorities (K): 19
11. Familiar with procedures in Brussels (K): 69	23. Knowledge of national backgrounds and interests of (representatives of) other member countries (K): 15
12. Consensus building skills (Sk): 21	

3. Looking at the different core competencies in terms of clusters, could result in a proposed frame of core competencies based on clustering. The numbers refer to incidence at III and VI.

A Proposed frame of core competencies, based on clustering

Attitude	Skills	Knowledge
<u>Ai/open minded: 81</u> Open minded: 46 Flexibility: 17 Learning ability: 9 Diversity: 9	<u>Ski/social skills: 87</u> Social skills: 45 Ability to listen: 13 Cross cultural: 29	<u>Ki/European level: 147</u> Familiar with responsibilities of the European institutions, incl. committees: 51+10 Familiar with procedures in Brussels: 69 Familiar EU policy and legislation: 17
<u>Aii/innovative: 36</u> Initiative/pro-active: 12 Innovative: 16 Creativity: 6 Courage: 2	<u>Skii/info processing skills: 58</u> Information processing skills: 25 Judgement: 15 Decisiveness: 11 Presentation skills: 7	<u>Kii/national level: 52</u> Familiar with domestic sector policy: 19 Knowledge own national system and priorities: 19 Knowledge of other member countries: 15
<u>Aiii/integrity: 39</u> Honesty/integrity: 28 Transparent/accountable: 5 Committed/sense responsibility: 6	<u>Skiii/negotiating skills: 145</u> Negotiating skills (Sk): 85 Strategic perspective: 46 Persuasiveness/keeping own position clear: 14	<u>Kii/relations: 32</u> Acquainted with social networks dealing with Europe: 15 Familiar with (in)formal relations EU and member states: 17
	<u>Skiiii/networking skills: 72</u> Networking skills (Sk): 44 Lobbying skills (Sk): 7 Consensus building skills (Sk): 21	
	<u>Skiiii/organisation skills: 94</u> Organisation skills/Planning and evaluation (Sk): 33 HRM (Sk): 6 Delegation (Sk): 4 Team builder (Sk): 18 Result driven: 21 Problem solving: 12	

4. Please note that both proposed frames of common competencies are *nothing but one step further* towards a ‘Common Competence Frame’. The proposed frames are to be used as an input for our working sessions at the October Conference.

Common competencies

1. Based on the response, common competencies can be distinguished for public leaders who are operating at a national level and dealing with Brussels. These common competencies are mentioned for all types of public leaders and for all the different groups of countries.
2. According to the respondents to the questionnaire is ‘Negotiating skills’ the key competence to be effective in Brussels.
3. Being ‘Open minded’ is the most important common attitude, for all types of leaders and all groups of countries. ‘Integrity’ is the second common attitude, followed by: ‘Being a ‘Mediator’.
4. Common key skills are, besides ‘Negotiating skills’: ‘Social skills’ and ‘Networking skills’.
5. Common competencies in terms of knowledge are: ‘Knowledge of the institutions’ and ‘Familiar with the procedures’.
6. In summing up these eight core competencies, about 45% of the total response is covered.

Typical Gold, Silver and Bronze Competencies

1. The response indicates that different categories of competencies are prioritised for different types of leaders:
 - For the Gold typed leader, attitudes and skills are considered equally important, and much more important than knowledge.
 - Skills are considered of key importance for the Silver typed leader.
 - Compared to the other typed of leaders, Knowledge is considered especially useful for the Bronze typed leader. Whereas for the Bronze typed leader, all three categories of competencies are considered equally important.
2. Some specific core competencies seem to apply especially for one of the types of public leaders:
 - The Gold typed public leader scores in particular very high at: ‘Strategic perspective’. An other typical ‘Gold’ Competence seems to be: ‘Being a mediator/looking for consensus’.
 - Gold and Silver typed leaders score both significantly higher than their Bronze typed colleagues at: ‘Negotiating skills’ and ‘Networking skills’.
 - The Bronze typed leader scores remarkably higher than the Gold and Silver typed leaders at: ‘ Organisation skills’.

3. The response points out that an other distinction between the types of public leaders could be made in terms of the intensity of a certain required competence. Ireland for example requires ‘profound knowledge’ and ‘excellent skills’ for the Gold typed leader and ‘fair knowledge’ and ‘basic skills’ for the Bronze typed leader.

4. However, based upon the response to the questionnaire, we tend to conclude that the differences between the three types of public leaders do not out-weight their common features in terms of required core competencies. Especially the mentioned competencies for Gold and Silver typed leaders are quite similar. Bronze typed leaders are considered to concentrate more on knowledge issues and organisation skills, whereas Gold and Silver typed leaders are to concentrate upon strategy, negotiating and networking.

Competencies for public leaders of Old versus New member states

1. The scope of the questionnaire does not allow for general conclusions in terms of differences between Old member states (EU-15) and the 10 New member states. However, some observations are made based on ranking the response to the questionnaire.

2. The respondents from the Old member states mention ‘Knowledge of the committees’ (esp. for Gold typed leader) significantly more times than the respondents from the New member states. Whereas the New member states consider ‘Knowledge of the institutions’, ‘Familiar with the procedures’ and ‘Knowledge of national priorities’ more important than the Old member states.

3. New member states score higher on ‘Presentation skills’ and the competence ‘Commitment / sense of responsibility’ has been added to the Competence Frame based upon suggestions by various New member states. Old member states score higher on ‘Social skills (communicator, networking skills)’ than the New members.

Competencies for public leaders of Northern versus Southern member states

1. Based on the response to the questionnaire, no common denominators are observed between Northern member states on the one hand and Southern member states on the other hand.

2. In the literature, it is suggested that a difference in culture (organisational values) and methodology exists. In depth research on this issue is however beyond the scope of this survey.

Competencies of Bigger versus Smaller member states

1. The scope of the questionnaire does not allow for general conclusions in terms of differences between bigger member states and smaller member states. However, based on ranking the scores in the response to the questionnaire, some observations can be made.

2. ‘Persuasiveness’, ‘Drive for Results’ and ‘Negotiating skills’ are mentioned more often by the Bigger member states, whereas ‘Networking skills’ and ‘Knowledge of the interests of the

other member countries' are mentioned more often by the Smaller member states. This issue might be explored further in the working sessions at the October Conference.

Linguistic skills

1. In the questionnaire, one Chapter dealt with 'Linguistic skills'.
2. The respondents indicated that they consider English to be by far the most important language for all public leaders, who are dealing with Brussels. French and German are considered particularly useful for public leaders, who are dealing with Brussels on a daily basis (Gold).
3. However, here seems to be room for different interpretations. One respondent indicated that languages are of more importance as the frequency of contacts is less. Leaving a good impression and getting to clear understanding is more needed, as the opportunities of contact are limited. Having a day-to-day working relationship allows for making mistakes and correcting them, was his analysis.

Annex: Detailed Analysis of response to questionnaire

The response:

Returned questionnaires: 21	Awaited questionnaires: 4
Austria (AUS)	Belgium (BE)
Cyprus (CYP)	Denmark (DEN)
Czech Republic (CR)	France (FR)
Estonia (EST)	Slovak Republic (SR)
Finland (FIN)	
Germany (GER)	
Greece (GR)	
Hungary (HU)	
Ireland (IRE)	
Italy (IT)	
Latvia (LAT)	
Lithuania (LIT)	
Luxemburg (LUX)	
Malta (MT)	
The Netherlands (NL)	
Poland (PL)	
Portugal (POR)	
Slovenia (SL)	
Spain (SP)	
Sweden (SW)	
United Kingdom (UK)	

Please, note that the response of Austria was only received on October 4, 2004 and could therefore not be taken into consideration in this analysis anymore. In the final analysis, the response of Austria will be included.

To analyse the response, three different categories of member countries are distinguished:

- “Old” member countries: member of EU before 2004 (O);
“New” member countries: member of EU since 05/2004 (Ne).
- “Northern” countries (No) ; “Southern” countries (So).
- “Big” countries: population more than 30.000.000 Inhabitants (B) (Noot: source: EC);
“Small” countries: less than 30.000.000 Inhabitants (Sm).

Index of categories of member countries:

O/No (Old/Northern) BE / DEN / FIN / GER / IRE / LUX / NL / UK / SW	N/No (New/Northern): EST / LAT / LIT / PL
O/So (Old/Southern): AUS / FR / GR / IT / POR / SP	N/So (New/Southern): CYP / CR / HU / MT / SL / SR

B (Bigger): GER / FR / IT / PL / SP / UK	Sm (Smaller): BE / AUS / CYP / CR / DEN / EST / FIN / GR / MT / HU / IRE / LAT / LIT / LUX / NL / POR / SL / SR / SW
--	---

I. Introduction

I.1. Are you familiar with a system based on competencies?

Yes: 17 No: 3 (CR, HU, LUX)

I.2. Is in the system of competencies referred to in I.1. a distinction made for national based competencies and European based competencies?

Yes: 3 (GER, NL(?), SW) No / N.A.: 17

I.3. Would you suggest to use your country case as a best practice on competence based methodology?

Yes: 4 (IRE, NL, POR, UK) No / N.A.: 16

II Linguistic skills

II.1. To what extent are linguistic skills considered to be a necessary pre-condition for public leaders to be effective in Brussels

(Weighting 0 to 5: 0 is not relevant at all, 5 is very relevant)

	Gold	Silver	Bronze
English	5,0 = $(20 \times 5) / 20$	4,8 = $((20 \times 5) - 3) / 20$	4,5 = $((20 \times 5) - 11) / 20$
French	4,6 = $((20 \times 5) - 7) / 20$	3,6 = $((19 \times 4) - 8) / 20$	1,9 = $38 / 20$
German	2,2 = $44 / 20$	1,7 = $33 / 20$	0,8 = $16 / 20$
Other language, namely SP	0,7 = $13 / 20$	0,3 = $6 / 20$	0,3 = $5 / 20$
Other language, namely IT	0,4 = $8 / 20$	0,3 = $5 / 20$	0,0 = $1 / 20$

Remark:

1. A "non score" (-) is considered to be equal to zero (0).
2. German has score 5 for all types of leaders in Germany.
3. Ireland indicated that Silver typed public leaders need be fluent (score 5) in one language only.
4. UK indicated that knowledge of other languages is desirable, but not compulsory. Training in French is offered to those planning to live in Brussels to undertake EU work.

IV General Core Competencies

Please note, that the (numbers) refer to the numbers in the frame in section VI of the questionnaire

Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes
K.1. (10)	S.1. (14, 1,15)	A.1. (7)
K.2. (16)	S.2. (27, 13)	A.2. (9)
K.3. (28)	S.3. (32)	A.3. (38)
K.4. (22)	S.4. (3)	A.4. (26)

IV.1. Added competencies: see: VI.1.

IV.2, 3, 4

Remark:

Response: 11 (Cyp/Estonia/Ger/Fin/Gr/Ire/It/Lat/Lit/Nl/Port)

Non-response due to unclear answer: 9 (Hu/Lux/Mt/Po/Slov/Sp/CR/UK/Sw)

Knowledge

(weighting 1 to 4: 1 is most important, 4 is less important)

	1	2	3	4
Gold	K1 (10) (5*1; 3*2;1*3;2*4)	K3 (28) (1*1; 3*2; 5*3; 2*4)	K2 / K3 (16/28) (1*1; 4*2; 4*3;2*4)	K4 (22) (4*1; 1*2;1*3;5*4)
Silver	K2 (16)	K1 (10)	K3 (28)	K4 (22)
Bronze	K3 (28)	K2 (16)	K2/K3/K4 (16/28/22)	K4 (22)

Concluding: With respect to knowledge, the response indicates that a significant distinction can be made between Gold typed leaders, Silver and Bronze.

Skills

(weighting 1 to 4: 1 is most important, 4 is less important)

	1	2	3	4
Gold	Sk2 (27-13)	Sk1 (1-14-15)	Sk3 (32)	Sk4 (3)
Silver	Sk2 (27-13)	Sk1 (1-14-15)	Sk3 (32)	Sk4 (3)
Bronze	Sk4 (3)	Sk2 (27-13)	Sk1 (1-14-15)	Sk3/Sk1/Sk4 (32/1-14-15/3)

Concluding: With respect to skills, the response indicates a significant distinction between Bronze typed leaders on the one hand and Gold and Silver typed leaders on the other hand. No difference is indicated between Gold and Silver typed leaders.

Attitude

(weighting 1 to 4: 1 is most important, 4 is less important)

	1	2	3	4
Gold	A2 (9)	A3 (38)	A1 (7)	A4 (26)
Silver	A2 (9)	A3 (38)	A1 (7)	A4 (26)
Bronze	A2 (9)	A1 (7)	A4 (26)	A3 (38)

Concluding: With respect to attitudes, the response indicates a distinction between Bronze typed leaders on the one hand and Gold and Silver typed leaders on the other hand. No difference is indicated between Gold and Silver typed leaders.

V Knowledge, skills and attitude

V. 1. For each type of public leader, *one* of the three groups of competencies (knowledge, skills or attitude) has been marked:

Response rate: 17; non response due to unclear answer: 3 (CR, LIT, PL).

	Knowledge	Skills	Attitudes
Gold	3	7	7
Silver	2	12	3
Bronze	6	6	5

Remark: This is the scheme of the scores filled out by all 20 countries. Different schemes could be added, distinguishing the scores by different groups of countries.

VI and III Frame of specific Core Competencies

Original frame of specific core competencies

1. Cross cultural communication	17. Initiative / pro-active
2. Judgement	18. Decisiveness
3. Information processing skills	19. Team builder
4. Familiar with the committees in Brussels	20. Creativity
5. Courage	21. Diversity
6. Flexibility	22. Acquainted with social networks dealing with Europe
7. Open attitude / easy accessible	23. Diversity
8. Ability to listen	24. Persuasiveness
9. Honesty	25. Problem solving
10. Familiar with responsibilities of the European institutions	26. Innovative
11. Staff development	27. Strategic perspective
12. Transparent	28. Staff development
13. Negotiating skills	29. Result driven
14. Communicator	30. Delegation
15. Networking skills	31. Learning ability
16. Familiar with procedures in Brussels	32. Progress evaluation

VI. 1. (and IV.1.) Changes in the frame based on the response to the questionnaire:

To change:

- 7. (to change) open minded
- 9. (to add) / integrity
- 11. (to add) / coaching / HRM
- 12. (to add) / accountability
- 14. (to add) social skills /
- 23 (nieuw!) familiar with EU policy / legislation / acquis communautaire (K)
- 24. (to add) / keeping one's own position clear
- 28 (nieuw!) familiar with formal and informal relations between EU and member states (K)
- 32. (to add) organisational skills / (Sk)

To add:

- 33. familiar with domestic sector policy (K)
- 34. knowledge of national system of PA and national priorities (K)
- 35. knowledge of national backgrounds and interests of (representatives of) the other member countries (K)
- 36. project management skills / change management skills (Sk)
- 37. effective meeting skills/chairing of meetings (Sk)
- 38. consensus building skills (Sk)
- 39. speaking in public / report writing / presentation skills (Sk)
- 40. workaholic / sense of responsibility / commitment to the job (A)
- 41. Lobbying skills

Adjusted frame of specific core competencies

1. Presentation is as follows: “number”, “name of competency”, (Knowledge/Skill/Attitude): incidence of the number in III and VI.
2. In the added numbers (33 and further), a bias exists in the incidence indicated in answering the questions of section VI, as most countries filled in the prescribed numbers 1 – 32, instead of their own proposed additional competencies. The response to section III shows no bias as in this section, the additional competencies are equally taken into account.

1. Cross cultural communication (Sk): 29	17. Initiative / pro-active (Sk/A): 12
2. Judgement (Sk/A): 15	18. Decisiveness (Sk): 11
3. Information processing skills (Sk): 25	19. Team builder (Sk): 18
4. Familiar with the committees in Brussels (K): 10	20. Creativity (A): 6
5. Courage (A): 2	21. Diversity (Sk/A): 9
6. Flexibility (A): 17	22. Acquainted with social networks dealing with Europe (K): 15
7. Open minded (A): 46	23. Familiar EU policy and legislation (K): 17

8. Ability to listen (Sk/A): 13	24. Persuasiveness/keeping own position clear (Sk/A): 14
9. Honesty/integrity (A): 28	25. Problem solving (Sk): 12
10. Familiar with responsibilities of the European institutions (K): 51	26. Innovative (A): 16
11. Staff development/coaching/HRM (Sk): 6	27. Strategic perspective (Sk/A): 46
12. Transparent/accountability (A): 5	28. Familiar with (in)formal relations EU and member states (K): 17
13. Negotiating skills (Sk): 85	29. Result driven (A/Sk): 21
14. Social skills/Communicator (Sk): 45	30. Delegation (Sk): 4
15. Networking skills (Sk): 44	31. Learning ability (Sk): 9
16. Familiar with procedures in Brussels (K): 69	32. Organisation skills/Planning and evaluation (Sk): 33
33. Familiar domestic policy (K): 19	38. Consensus building skills (Sk): 21
34. Knowledge of national system and priorities (K): 19	39. Presentation skills (incl. reporting and speaking in public) (Sk): 7
35. Knowledge of national backgrounds and interests of (representatives of) other member countries (K): 14	40. Committed (workaholic/ sense of responsibility) (A): 6
36. Project management skills (Sk): 0	41. Lobbying skills (Sk): 7
37. Effective meeting skills (Sk): 0	

VI.6. Please, indicate *the one most important* competence from the list for all public leaders dealing with Brussels:

O-No (GER): 29//	Ne-No (EST): 27//
O-No (FIN): 13//	Ne-No (LAT): 16//
O-No (IRE): 13//	Ne-No (LIT): 16//
O-No (LUX): 27//	Ne-No (PL): 31//
O-No (NL): 14//	
O-No (UK): 14//	
O-No (SW): 13//	
O-So (GR): -//	Ne-So (CYP): 31//
O-So (IT): 10//	Ne-So (CR): 19//
O-So (POR): 10//	Ne-So (HU): 7//
O-So (SP): 13//	Ne-So (MT): 15//
	Ne-So (SL): 16//

VI.5. Please, indicate the 3 most important competencies from the list for *all types of public leaders dealing with Brussels*:

O-No (GER): 29/24/13// O-No (FIN): 3/5/31// O-No (IRE): 15/13/3// O-No (LUX): 27/4/32// O-No (NL): 19/27/14// O-No (UK): 29/..14// O-No (SW): 1/13/35//	Ne-No (EST): 27/29/13// Ne-No (LAT): 16/13/27// Ne-No (LIT): 16/3/13// Ne-No (PL): 9/13/31//
O-So (GR): 6/13/24// O-So (IT): 10/13/15// O-So (POR): 10/13-27/9// O-So (SP): 13/18/17//	Ne-So (CYP): 27/29/14// Ne-So (CR): 13/14/3// Ne-So (HU): 27/18/19// Ne-So (MT): 13/15/2// Ne-So (SL): 1/13/16//

VI. 2. Who would you like to be selected to represent you in Brussels as a public leader who deals on a daily base with Brussels (Gold)?

O-No (GER) : 29/24/13// O-No (FIN) : 7/1/10// O-No (IRE): 4/13/15// O-No (LUX): 27/4/24// O-No (NL): 15/4/13// O-No (UK): 29/..14// O-No (SW): 13/1/19//	Ne-No (EST): -/-// Ne-No (LAT): 10/16/27// Ne-No (LIT): 16/13/15// Ne-No (PL): 1/9/10//
O -So (GR): 18/24/13// O-So (IT): 27/17/4// O-So (POR): 10/13/9// O-So (SP): 17/27/9//	Ne-So (CYP) :22/7/14// Ne-So (CR): 13/27/19// Ne-So (HU): 16/22/15// Ne-So (MT): 13/15/2// Ne-So (SL): 7/16/27//

III.1.1-3 What does your ideal public leader look like, who is dealing on a daily base with Brussels (Gold)? (K) // (Sk) // (A) (vgl. met VI)

O-No (GER) : (K) 10/16/28// (Sk) 15/13/32// (A) 7/38/26// (VI: 29/24/13)//
 O-No (FIN) : (K) 16/..27// (Sk) 13/..39// (A) 7/8/..19 of 38// (VI: 7/1/10)//
 O-No (IRE): (K) 33/4-16-10/23// (Sk) 14-8/13/39// (A) 21/..7/6// (VI: 4/13/15)//
 O-No (LUX): (K) 10-23/33/28// (Sk) 14/13-27/3// (A) 7/21/26-38// (VI: 27/4/24)//
 O-No (NL): (K) 4/22/16// (Sk) 15/27/13// (A)14/7/9// (VI: 15/4/13)//
 O-No (UK): (K) ../..// (Sk) 29-17-32pl/18-2-25/14-8-21-11-15// (A) ../..// (VI: 29/..14)//
 O-No (Sw): (K) 10/28/22// (Sk) 13-15/32org-32eval/19// (A) 7/27/38// (VI: 13/1/19)//

O-So (GR): (K) 10/16/28// (Sk) 14-1-15/27-13/32org-32eval// (A) 7/38/9// (VI: 18/24/13)//
 O-So (IT): (K) 10/23/35// (Sk) 1/13/15// (A) 27/26/6// (VI: 27/17/4)//
 O-So (POR): (K) 10/16/22/ (Sk) 27-13/14-15-1/32/ (A) 38/9/7// (VI: 10/13/9)//
 O-So (SP): (K) 23-10-16/23/32org-27/ (Sk) ..2/13/..?/ (A) 9/6/7// (VI: 17/27/9)//

Ne-No (EST) : (K) 23/23/16// (Sk) 13/39/1// (A) ../7/26// (VI: -/-/-)//
 Ne-No (LAT): (K) 16-23/35/34// (Sk) 27/..39/14-15-43// (A) 9/5/40// (VI: 10/16/27)//
 Ne-No (LIT): (K) 16/23/34// (Sk) 27/32org/3// (A) 7/38/19// (VI: 16/13/15)//
 Ne-No (PL): (K) 10/16/34// (Sk) 13/17/24// (A) 7/9/12acc// (VI: 1/9/10)//

Ne-So (CYP) : (K) 34/35/22// (Sk) 41/38/..// (A) 14/7/6// (VI:22/7/14)//
 Ne-So (CR): (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 14-13/6/27-19/ (A) 38/9/7-12// (VI: 13/27/19)//
 Ne-So (HU): (K) 16-10/33/35// (Sk) 27/14/3// (A) 38/..19 of 38/40// (VI: 16/22/15)//
 Ne-So (MT): // (K) 10/35/34/ (Sk) 13/2/9/ (A) 6/..24/38// (VI: 13/15/2)//
 Ne-So (SL): (K) 10/28/16/ (Sk) 27/13-43/1-15/ (A) 7/38/26// (VI: 7/16/27)//

VI.3. Who would you like to be selected to represent you in Brussels as a public leader who deals on a regular base with Brussels (Silver)?

O-No (GER): 29/24/13// O-No (FIN) : 13/25/1// O-No (IRE): 4/13/15// O-No (LUX): 27/32/17// O-No (NL): 13/15/22// O-No (UK): 29/34/14// O-No (SW): 27/35/1//	Ne-No (EST): -/-/-// Ne-No (LAT): 16/13/29// Ne-No (LIT): 16/13/3// Ne-No (PL): 1/9/7//
O-So (GR): 18/2/13// O-So (IT): 4/15/18// O-So (POR): 10/13/9// O-So (SP): 3/15/25//	Ne-So (CYP) : 13/16/15// Ne-So (CR): 6/16/20// Ne-So (HU): 10/27/14// Ne-So (MT): 13/15/2// Ne-So (SL): 7/16/13//

III.2. 1-3 What does your ideal public leader look like, who is dealing on a regular base with Brussels (Silver)? (K)/ (Sk)/ (A)// (vgl. met VI)

O-No (GER) : (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 1-14-15/13-27/32/ (A) 7/38/26// (VI: 29/24/13)//
 O-No (FIN) : (K) 10/35/16/ (Sk) 14/..39/39/ (A)7/21/..14-8// (VI: 13/25/1)//
 O-No (IRE): (K) 33/10-16/23/ (Sk) 14-8/13/39/ (A) ..1-21/..2-7/6// (VI: 4/13/15)//
 O-No (LUX): (K) 10/23/34/ (Sk) 7/14/32pl/ (A) 7/21/26// (VI: 27/32/17)//
 O-No (NL): (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 13/15/1/ (A) 7/14/26// (VI: 13/15/22)//
 O-No (UK): (K) ../..../ (Sk) 29-17-32/2-18-25/8-11-14-15-21/ (A) ../..../ (VI: 29/34/14)//
 O-No (Sw): (K) 10/28/22// (Sk) 13-15/32org-32eval/19// (A) 7/27/38// (VI: 27/35/1)//

O-So (GR): (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 14-1-15/27-13/32org-32eval/ (A) 7/9/38// (VI: 18/2/13)//
 O-So (IT): (K) 10/23/16/ (Sk) 1/15/25/ (A) 6/8/24// (VI: 4/15/18)//
 O-So (POR): (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 13-27/1-14-15/32/ (A) 38/9/7// (VI: 10/13/9)//
 O-So (SP): (K) 33/13-16/27/ (Sk) 4/17/13/ (A) 6/25/20// (VI: 3/15/25)//

Ne-No (EST): (K) 23/..16// (Sk) 13/39/1// (A) -7/26// (VI : -/-/-)//
 Ne-No (LAT) : (K) 16-23/34/33/ (Sk) ..2/13/3/ (A) 9/20/15// (VI: 16/13/29)//
 Ne-No (LIT): (K) 16/33/34/ (Sk) 3/32org-13/14/ (A) 14/24/27// (VI: 16/13/3)//
 Ne-No (PL): (K) 10/16/34/ (Sk) 3/14/32/ (A) 6/7/9// (VI: 1/9/7) //

Ne-So (CYP) : (K) 16/34/35/ (Sk) 13/15/1/ (A) ..38-19/..2-5/20// (VI: 13/16/15)//
 Ne-So (CR): (K) 16/10/28/ (Sk) 14/15/..?/ (A) 7-31/40/..?/ (VI: 6/16/20)//
 Ne-So (HU): (K) 33/35/16-10/ (Sk) 32org/19/3/ (A) ..2/30-41/17// (VI: 10/27/14)//
 Ne-So (MT): (K) 10/33/35/ (Sk) 2/9/13-43/ (A) 6/..18-24/38// (VI: 13/15/2)//
 Ne-So (SL): (K) 10/28/22/ (Sk) 1/13-43/3 (A) 7/29/14// (VI: 7/16/13)//

VI.4. Who would you like to be selected to represent you in Brussels as a public leader who deals occasionally with Brussels (Bronze)?

O-No (GER): 29/24/13// O-No (FIN): 16/22/20// O-No (IRE): 34/13/15// O-No (LUX): 27/10/1// O-No (NL): 16/14/22// O-No (UK): 29/34/14// O-No (SW): 35/1/27//	Ne-No (EST): -/-/-// Ne-No (LAT): 16/32/20// Ne-No (LIT): 3/25/27// Ne-No (PL): 24/25/9//
O-So (GR): 24/26/2// O-So (IT): 1/8/26// O-So (POR): 10/15/9// O-So (SP): 19/30/29//	Ne-So (CYP): 12/28/30// Ne-So (CR): 8/31/15// Ne-So (HU): 17/25/19// Ne-So (MT): 13/16/2// Ne-So (SL): 1/14/3//

III.3. What does your ideal public leader look like, who is rarely dealing with Brussels (Bronze)? (K)/ (Sk)/ (A)// (vgl met VI)

O-No (GER): (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 1-14-15/13-27/32/ (A) 7/38/26/ (VI: 29/24/13)//
 O-No (FIN): (K) 10/16/35/ (Sk) 15/39/14/ (A) 7/12/..38/ (VI: 16/22/20)//
 O-No (IRE): (K) 33/23/10/ (Sk) 15/14-8/23/ (A) ..21-1/6/..18-24// (VI: 34/13/15)//
 O-No (LUX): (K) 10/33/16/ (Sk) 7/14/32pl/ (A) 7/21/26/ (VI: 27/10/1)//
 O-No (NL): (K) 10/16/22/ (Sk) 15/8/3/ (A) 14/9/7/ (VI: 16/14/22)//
 O-No (UK): (K) ../..../(Sk) 29-17-32/ 25-2-18/14-15-8-21-11/ (A) ../..../ (VI: 29/34/14) //
 O-No (Sw): (K) 33-34/10/22-34// (Sk) 13-15/32org-32eval/19// (A) 7/27/38// (VI: 35/1/27)//

O-So (GR): (K) 10/16/28/ (Sk) 27-13/32org-32eval/3/ (A) 7/38/26// (VI:24/26/2)//
 O-So (IT): (K) 10/33/16/ (Sk) 32org/1/25/ (A) 8/6/24/ (VI: 1/8/26)//
 O-So (POR): (K) 10/16/22/ (Sk) 13-27/14-15-1/32/ (A) 38/9/7/ (VI: 10/15/9)//
 O-So (SP): (K) 23/..../16/ (Sk) 3/19/32org/ (A) 29/32eval/11-30/ (VI: 19/30/29)//

Ne-No: (EST): (K) 23/..../16// (Sk) 3/11/31// (A) 29/7/26// (VI:--/--)//
 Ne-No (LAT): (K) 16/33/3/ (Sk) ..2/18/..../ (A) 9/9/19/ (VI: 16/32/20)//
 Ne-No (LIT): (K) 33/16/34/ (Sk) 3/25/32eval/(A) 29/31/27/ (VI: 3/25/27)//
 Ne-No (PL): (K) 10/16/34/ (Sk) 3/32/14/ (A) 9/7/40/ (VI: 24/25/9) //

Ne-So (CYP): (K) 34/33/..27/ (Sk) 27/32/32/ (A) 7/..38/9/ (VI: 12/28/30)//
 Ne-So (CR): (K) 10/..../ (Sk) 1/32eval/3/ (A) ..40/7/26/ (VI: 8/31/15)//
 Ne-So (HU): (K) 35/..../11/ (Sk) 19/..../3/ (A) 17/7/40// (VI: 17/25/19)//
 Ne-So (MT): (K) 34/35/33/ (Sk) 13-43/32org/2-18/ (A) ..?/9/6/ (VI: 13/16/2)//
 Ne-So (SL): (K) 10/22/33/ (Sk) 14/19/31-8/ (A) 6/12/29/ (VI: 1/14/3)//

VII. Remarks of respondents

- In *Cyprus* only a small number of Civil Servants is involved in EU-issues, doing all types of tasks (Gold, Silver and Bronze).
- In *Germany*, specific competencies for Europe have been defined as the ability of the staff to perform its tasks involving the European Union. Competencies for Europe are about the ‘Ability and willingness to compromise’. The three European based competencies are: ‘Language skills’, ‘Expert knowledge’ and ‘Negotiating skills and ability to communicate across cultures’.
- In answering to the questionnaire, *Ireland* understood public leaders to mean non-elected officials only, and that the Gold-Silver-Bronze definitions did not imply status, but referred to the degree of interaction and applied to all people who deal with Brussels regardless of their level or status within the national system.
- *Latvia* developed an annual evaluation form for civil servants, based on six competencies, namely: HRM; Co-operation; Planning and Control; Communication; Strategic Perspective and Creativity; and: Professional Knowledge.
- Filling up the questionnaire and taking into account its own national system of European affairs co-ordination, *Lithuania* drew some specification to each of the three types of leaders:
- Gold is understood as representatives of the political level, that is: heads and senior officials of PM-office, ministries and other state institutions;
- Silver is understood as national representatives in European working groups and committees, that is: officials in the PM-office and ministries;
- Bronze is understood as civil servants participating in the drafting of the national positions.
- The Senior Civil Service in *The Netherlands* defines competence as: a behaviour criterion. The competency language makes it possible to express the skills and qualities of human resources in terms of *perceptible* behaviour. Competencies is about identifying the critical factors of success.
- *Sweden* strongly disagrees with the use of ‘Gold/Silver/Bronze’, because the terminology implies a ranking. Sweden further comments that they have different systems based on competencies for different sectors. One system is established in the Foreign Service; an other in EU-affairs.
- *United Kingdom* distinguishes between competencies for recruitment of graduate entry (Fast Stream) and for seniors (Senior Civil Service). UK further emphasises that the interpretation and use of competency is that the focus is on application. It has therefore been difficult to respond to questions about knowledge. UK considers only ‘Skills’ in their competence framework. ‘Knowledge’ and ‘Attitude’ underlie their training programmes. UK indicates further that their competence based appraisal and recruitment system has been served as an example for some of the new member countries.