

**Integration Through Law**

The Role of Law and the Rule of Law in ASEAN Integration

# **The Role of the Public Bureaucracy in Policy Implementation in Five ASEAN Countries**

Edited by Jon S. T. Quah



CAMBRIDGE

THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC  
BUREAUCRACY IN POLICY  
IMPLEMENTATION IN FIVE  
ASEAN COUNTRIES

*Edited by*

JON S. T. QUAH



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107545175](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107545175)

© Cambridge University Press 2016

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2016

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

The role of the public bureaucracy in policy implementation in five Asean countries / edited by Jon S. T. Quah.

pages cm. – (Integration through law: the role of law and the rule of law in Asean integration)

ISBN 978-1-107-54517-5 (Paperback)

1. Public policy–Southeast Asia. 2. Bureaucracy–Southeast Asia. 3. Public administration–Southeast Asia. 4. Southeast Asia–Politics and government. I. Quah, Jon S. T.

JF1525.P6R65 2015

320.60959–dc23 2015020014

ISBN 978-1-107-54517-5 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC BUREAUCRACY IN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN FIVE ASEAN COUNTRIES

This pioneering book addresses an important gap in the literature by comparing the role of the public bureaucracies in policy implementation in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Vietnam. It highlights the importance of the policy context, especially the commitment of the government in allocating the necessary resources and the support of the implementers, as well as the public bureaucracy's effectiveness, as the critical factors responsible for effective policy implementation. The comparative analysis shows that the public bureaucracies in Singapore and Malaysia are more effective in policy implementation than their counterparts in Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam because of their favourable policy contexts and higher level of organizational effectiveness. The focus on policy context and the public bureaucracy's role in the policy-making process and its implementation of two ASEAN policies will be of interest to policy-makers, civil servants, scholars and students concerned with enhancing policy implementation in the ASEAN countries.

JON S. T. QUAH is a retired Professor of Political Science at the National University of Singapore and an Anti-Corruption Consultant based in Singapore. He was a Vice-President of the Asian Association for Public Administration (2010–2012) and co-editor of the *Asian Journal of Political Science*. He has published extensively on corruption and public administration in Asian countries.

## INTEGRATION THROUGH LAW

### The Role of Law and the Rule of Law in ASEAN Integration

#### *General Editors*

J. H. H. Weiler, European University Institute

Tan Hsien-Li, National University of Singapore

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), comprising the ten member states of Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam, has undertaken intensified integration into the ASEAN Community through the Rule of Law and Institutions in its 2007 Charter. This innovative book series evaluates the community-building processes of ASEAN to date and offers a conceptual and policy toolkit for broader Asian thinking and planning of different legal and institutional models of economic and political regional integration in the region. Participating scholars have been divided up into six separate thematic strands. The books combine a mix of Asian and Western scholars.

#### **Centre for International Law, National University of Singapore (CIL-NUS)**

The Centre for International Law (CIL) was established in 2009 at the National University of Singapore's Bukit Timah Campus in response to the growing need for international law expertise and capacity building in the Asia-Pacific region. CIL is a university-wide research centre that focuses on multidisciplinary research and works with other NUS or external centres of research and academic excellence. In particular, CIL collaborates very closely with the NUS Faculty of Law.

## TABLES

Table 1.1	The policy context in the five ASEAN countries	<i>page 13</i>
Table 1.2	Disaster statistics in four Asian countries, 2000–2009	15
Table 1.3	Voice and accountability in the five ASEAN countries, 1996–2013	23
Table 1.4	Political stability in the five ASEAN countries, 1996–2013	24
Table 1.5	Perceived level of corruption in the five ASEAN countries, 2013–2014	26
Table 1.6	Rule of law in the five ASEAN countries, 1996–2013	27
Table 1.7	Ranking of the five ASEAN countries for political stability, perceived level of corruption and rule of law	27
Table 1.8	Size of the five ASEAN public bureaucracies, 2009–2013	34
Table 1.9	Government effectiveness of the five ASEAN countries, 1996–2013	36
Table 1.10	Regulatory quality of the five ASEAN countries, 1996–2013	37
Table 1.11	PERC's effectiveness of the five ASEAN public bureaucracies, 1998–2012	38
Table 1.12	Implementing agencies of the ACD in the five ASEAN countries	67

## TABLES

Table 1.13	Implementing agencies of the AMMTC/ SOMTC in the five ASEAN countries	71
Table 1.14	Effectiveness of the five ASEAN public bureaucracies in policy implementation	72
Table 1.15	Comparing the implementation of the ACD and AMMTC/SOMTC	74
Table 2.1	Growth, inflation and unemployment in Indonesia, 1998–2013	105
Table 2.2	Indonesian election results, 1971–1997	109
Table 2.3	Results of the parliamentary elections, 1999–2014	111
Table 2.4	Growth of Indonesian Civil Service, 1950–2014	115
Table 2.5	Indonesian Civil Service by age and gender, October 2011	115
Table 2.6	Distribution of Indonesian Civil Service by position, 2012–2014	116
Table 2.7	Basic monthly salary for civil servants in Indonesia, 2014	119
Table 2.8	Travel budget for Civil Service, 2009–2011	133
Table 2.9	Misuse of travel budget in selected Indonesian ministries	134
Table 3.1	Number of government agencies in Malaysia, 2014	190
Table 3.2	Ethnic representation in the Malaysian Public Service, 2005	203
Table 3.3	Ethnic representation in the Malaysian Public Service, 2009	204
Table 3.4	Statistics on product sampling, January– September 2009	213

Table 3.5	Cancellation of notifications by the National Pharmaceutical Control Bureau, 2008–2014	214
Table 3.6	Drug-trafficking arrests in Malaysia, 2009–2011	218
Table 3.7	Status of trafficking in persons cases brought to justice in Malaysia, 2008–2011	220
Table 3.8	Identified victims of trafficking (men, women and children) in Malaysia, September 2011	221
Table 4.1	Policy context of the Philippines	237
Table 4.2	Growth of the Philippine Civil Service, 1970–2010	244
Table 4.3	Factors of implementation	257
Table 4.4	Philippine interview respondents	269
Table 5.1	Composition of the Singapore population by ethnic group, 2013	300
Table 5.2	Composition of the Singapore population by religious affiliation, 2010	301
Table 5.3	Composition of the Singapore population by occupational group, 2001 and 2013	302
Table 5.4	Size and composition of civil servants in Singapore by division, 2001 and 2013	307
Table 5.5	Number of feedback inputs sent to government agencies through REACH, 2006–2011	318
Table 6.1	Employed population in Vietnam by economic sector, 2009–2014	379



## CONTRIBUTORS

**Nik Rosnah Wan Abdullah**, PhD is Deputy Dean and professor at the Tun Abdul Razak School of Government, University Abdul Razak in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. She was a senior international fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies, Johns Hopkins University; a senior visiting fellow at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore; Head of Department of Administrative Studies and Politics at the Faculty of Economics and Administration, University of Malaya; and Executive Director of the International Institute of Public Administration (INPUMA). She has published extensively on regulatory reform, health sector reform, public policy and governance.

**Jairo Acuña-Alfaro** is Policy Advisor on Core Government Functions and Public Service Excellence at the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in New York. From October 2007 to December 2014, he was Policy Advisor on Public Administration Reform and Anti-Corruption at UNDP Vietnam. In that capacity he helped develop several policies regarding public sector and civil service reforms and provided policy advice for the formulation and approval of the civil service law and new alternatives to measure governance and public administration performance. He was a Ronaldo Falconer Scholar at

St Antony's College, Oxford and a recipient of a British Chevening Scholarship.

**David Seth Jones**, PhD is a retired academic and currently a consultant in public procurement. He was formerly Associate Professor of Public Policy at the University of Brunei Darussalam and Associate Professor of Political Science at the National University of Singapore. He was also an adjunct professor at the Singapore Management University and Local Director (Singapore), Master in Public Administration Programme, Australian National University and Civil Service College, Singapore. He has published extensively on public policy and administration, public finance, government procurement and land administration. He has also undertaken many consultancy projects in these areas in various Southeast Asian countries.

**Giulio Napolitano**, PhD is Professor of Administrative Law at the Department of Law, Roma Tre University. He was a visiting and programme affiliate scholar at the Max Planck Institut of Heidelberg and at the New York University School of Law. He is a member of the Inaugural Council of the International Society of Public Law Society and of the Board of Editors of the *European Public Law Review*. He has published extensively in the fields of theoretical foundations of administrative law, comparative administrative law, regulation and anti-trust, economic analysis of public law and global governance.

**Agus Pramusinto**, PhD is a professor of public administration and director of the graduate programme in public

policy and administration at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University in Indonesia. He received his MA and PhD degrees from the Australian National University. He is involved in research and consultancy projects on administrative reform for local governments and national ministries in Indonesia. He has published extensively in national and international journals and is participating in the Asian Leadership and Management Development Project in six Asian countries initiated by the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies in Tokyo, Japan.

**Jon S. T. Quah**, PhD is a retired professor of political science at the National University of Singapore and an anti-corruption consultant based in Singapore. His major books include *Curbing Corruption in Asia: A Comparative Study of Six Countries* (2003); *Combating Corruption Singapore-Style: Lessons for Other Asian Countries* (2007); *Public Administration Singapore-Style* (2010); *Taiwan's Anti-Corruption Strategy: Suggestions for Reform* (2010); *Curbing Corruption in Asian Countries: An Impossible Dream?* (2011; 2013); *Minimizing Corruption in China: Is this an Impossible Dream?* (2013); and (as editor) *Different Paths to Curbing Corruption: Lessons from Denmark, Finland, Hong Kong, New Zealand and Singapore* (2013).

**Vicente Chua Reyes, Jr**, PhD is a lecturer of social science at the Faculty of Education, University of New England in Armidale, New South Wales, Australia. He is an executive committee member of the Educational Research Association of Singapore, a fellow of the Centre for Chinese

Studies in Taiwan and a visiting academic at the Institute of Education, University of London. His research interests focus on the political economy of education reform, corruption, educational leadership, policy learning and implementation. His latest book is *Mapping the Terrain of Education Reform: Global Trends and Local Responses in the Philippines* (2015).

**Anh Tran**, PhD is an assistant professor at the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, specializing in governance issues of developing countries. His research focuses on transparency, tax evasion, corruption, political networks and their economic and social outcomes. His articles have appeared in *American Political Science Review*, *Journal of Financial Economics*, *Journal of Law and Economics* and *Journal of Public Economics*. Tran frequently works as a consultant for reform initiatives by national governments, the United Nations and the World Bank. He has participated in UNDP's Academic Fellowships, Asia Foundation's Emerging Leaders Programme and the Vietnamese Prime Minister's Research Council.

## GENERAL EDITORS' PREFACE

This monograph is published within the context of a wide-ranging research project entitled, *Integration Through Law: The Role of Law and the Rule of Law in ASEAN Integration (ITL)*, undertaken by the Centre for International Law at the National University of Singapore and directed by J. H. H. Weiler and Tan Hsien-Li.

The Preamble to the ASEAN Charter concludes with a single decision: "We, the Peoples of the Member States of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations . . . [h]ereby decide to establish, through this Charter, the legal and institutional framework for ASEAN." For the first time in its history of over four decades, the Legal and the Institutional were brought to the forefront of ASEAN discourse.

The gravitas of the medium, a Charter: the substantive ambition of its content, the creation of three interlocking Communities, and the turn to law and institutions as instruments for realization provide ample justification for this wide-ranging project, to which this monograph is one contribution, examining ASEAN in a comparative context.

That same substantive and, indeed, political ambition means that any single study, illuminating as it may be, will cover but a fraction of the phenomena. Our *modus operandi* in this project was to create teams of researchers from Asia and elsewhere who would contribute individual monographs within an overall framework which we had designed.

The project framework, involving several thematic clusters within each monograph, is thus determined by the framework and the place of each monograph within it.

As regards the specific content, however, the authors were free, indeed encouraged, to define their own understanding of the problem and their own methodology and reach their own conclusions. The thematic structure of the entire project may be found at the end of this Preface.

The project as a whole, and each monograph within it, display several methodological sensibilities. First, law, in our view, can only be understood and evaluated when situated in its political and economic context. Thus, the first studies in the overall project design are intended to provide the political, economic, cultural and historical context against which one must understand ASEAN and are written by specialists in these respective disciplines. This context, to a greater or lesser degree, also informs the sensibility of each monograph. There are no "black letter law" studies to be found in this project and, indeed, even in the most technical of areas we encouraged our authors to make their writing accessible to readers of diverse disciplines.

Comparative experience suggests that the success of achieving some of the more ambitious objectives outlined in Article 1 of the Charter will depend in no small measure on the effectiveness of legal principles, legal rules and legal institutions.

This is particularly true as regards the success of establishing "an ASEAN Community comprising the ASEAN Security Community, the ASEAN Economic Community and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community as provided for in the

Bali Declaration of ASEAN Concord II". Article 2(2)(n) stipulates the commitment of ASEAN Member States to act in accordance with the principle of "adherence to multilateral trade rules and ASEAN's rules-based regimes for effective implementation of economic commitments and progressive reduction towards elimination of all barriers to regional economic integration." The ASEAN Member States therefore envisage that rules of law and the Rule of Law will become a major feature in the future of ASEAN.

Although, as seen, the Charter understands itself as providing an institutional and legal framework for ASEAN, the question of the "role of law and the rule of law" is not advocacy but a genuine enquiry in the various substantive areas of the project as to:

- the substantive legal principles and substantive rules of the various ASEAN communities;
- the procedural legal principles and rules governing institutional structures and decision-making processes;
- implementation, enforcement and dispute settlement.

One should not expect a mechanical application of this scheme in each study; rather, a sensibility that refuses to content itself with legal enactments as such and looks to a "living" notion of law and institutions is ubiquitous in all the studies. Likewise, the project is sensitive to "non Law." It variously attempts to locate the appropriate province of the law in this experience. That is, not only the role of law, but also the areas that are and should remain outside the reach of legal institutionalization with due sensitivity to ASEAN and Asian particularism and political and cultural identities.

The project, and the monographs of which it is made, are not normatively thick. They do not advocate. They are designed, for the most part, to offer reflection, discuss the pros and cons, and in this way enrich public awareness, deepen understanding of different options and in that respect contribute indirectly to policymaking.

This decisive development of ASEAN has been accompanied by a growing Asian interest in various legal and institutional forms of transnational economic and political cooperation, notably the various voices discussing and showing an interest in an East Asia Integration project. The number of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) has increased from six in 1991 to 166 in 2013, with a further 62 in various stages of negotiations.

Methodologically, the project and many of the monographs are comparative in their orientation. Comparative law is one of the few real-life laboratories that we have in which to assess and understand the operation of different legal and institutional models designed to tackle similar objectives and problems. One should not need to put one's own hand in the fire to learn that it scorches. With that in mind a couple of monographs offer both conceptual reflection and pragmatic "tool boxing" on some of the key elements featuring in all regional integration systems.

Comparative law is in part about divergence: it is a potent tool and means to understand one's own uniqueness. One understands better the uniqueness of Apples by comparing them to Oranges. You understand better the specialness of a Toyota by comparing it to a Ford.



Comparative law is also about convergence: it is a potent tool and means to understand how what are seemingly different phenomena are part of a broader trend, an insight which may enhance both self-understanding and policy potentialities.

Although many studies in the project could have almost immediate policy implications, as would the project as a whole, this is not its only or even principal purpose. There is a rich theory of federalism which covers many countries around the world. There is an equally rich theory of European integration, which has been associated with the advent Union. There is also considerable learning on Free Trade Areas and the like.

To date, the study of the legal aspects of ASEAN specifically and other forms of Asian legal integration has been derivative of, and dependent on, theoretical and conceptual insight which were developed in different contexts.

One principal objective of ITL and these monographs will be to put in place the building blocks for an authentic body of ASEAN and Asian integration theory developed in, and with sensitivity to, the particularities and peculiarities of the region and continent. A theory and conceptual framework of Asian legal integration will signal the coming of age of research of and in the region itself.

Although the monographs form part of an overarching project, we asked our authors to write each as a "standalone" – not assuming that their readers would have consulted any of the other titles. Indeed, the project is rich and few will read all monographs. We encourage readers to pick and choose from the various monographs and design