

An annotated glossary of terms relating to integrated governance.

Preliminary version—for discussion

This glossary was developed in parallel with the paper, *Integrated Governance and Healthy Public Policy: Two Canadian Examples*. You can view the complete paper at [www.ncchpp.ca](http://www.ncchpp.ca). However, for those with an interest in intersectoral work, or integrated governance, or whole of government approaches, these definitions below may be of interest in their own right. It is for that reason that we have provided this glossary independently of the paper.

## Glossary: integrated governance

### Introduction

The usage of the concepts designating the different type of initiatives we have termed “integrated governance” is remarkably variable in the academic and grey literature that concern them. To provide some situational clarity and to establish more consistency in usage, this glossary strives to define the terms pertaining to this family of concepts.

To this end, the NCCHPP has identified or drawn inspiration from definitions proposed by researchers in public administration, political science, and in the social sciences and humanities more generally. Definitions were also taken from or inspired by documents produced by public administration agencies (e.g., ministries or departments, strategic units, the World Health Organization) that are mobilizing these terms by giving them an explicit or (more often) implicit definition. In these cases, we have provided some brief comments to specify which usage we endorse.

This exercise also provides an opportunity to indicate the contexts in which these terms tend to be used most often and to focus on some of their distinctive characteristics. Thus, this glossary is presented both as an exercise in conceptual clarification and as a cartography of the contexts in which these terms are utilized.

### 1. Integrated governance

(Gouvernance intégrée)

Proposed definition:

*An initiative may be called an “integrated governance initiative” in so far as it is an action initiated and developed by a public agency striving to integrate the actions of other actors around the same problems. Thus, any action to coordinate public policy that has been initiated and developed by a public authority and that is made current by multiple public and/or private actors may be called “integrated governance,” regardless of whether the parties involved belong to one or several other governmental levels and/or sectors and/or act on one or several different scales.*

Our proposed definition of “integrated governance” is the most general concept we use, since it potentially embraces all the governance initiatives that belong to the family of initiatives discussed in this document.

Our definition is primarily inspired by a definition from the Institute of Public Administration Australia.

Integrated governance describes the structure of formal and informal relations to manage affairs through collaborative (joined-up) approaches which may be between government



agencies, or across levels of government (local, state and Commonwealth) and/or the non-government sector. (2002, p.2)

*Reference point.* The term “integrated governance” is most often used in the United Kingdom, but is also used by some Australian researchers.

**2. Intersectoral action**  
(Concertation intersectorielle)

Proposed definition:

Our proposed definition of “intersectoral action” is in fact that of Lebeau et al (1997, p.73).

*[Intersectoral action] is a practice by actors in more than one sector of intervention who are mobilizing and engaging in a complementary fashion so that each person’s expertise may be utilized to meet, of their common accord, the needs that are clearly identified in the community.” (Our translation)*

*Discussion.* The proposed definition emphasizes the coordination of interventions. As such, it describes a very specific dimension of public policy processes.

*Reference point.* This usage is common in Quebec, and frequently encountered in the sector of health care. For example, “intersectoral action” may be used to refer to or to organize the coordination of intervention practices in mental health with those in social housing or shelter resources. It could also potentially be used in other sectors of government activity.

**3. Horizontal management**  
(Gestion horizontale)

Proposed definition:

Our definition of “horizontal management” is inspired by that of Bourgault and Lapierre.

*Horizontal management is a practice initiated and implemented by one or several public administration organizations belonging to the same order of government (be it federal, provincial or municipal). It consists in no longer addressing a problem based exclusively on the respective/common concerns and responsibilities of the parties involved, but based on the interests, resources and constraints of all of the public administration actors taking action in one way or another regarding the problem at hand.*

*Discussion.* This definition emphasizes two principal elements. First, it specifies that the actors who initiate, implement and participate (in one way or another) in these initiatives are officially part of the administrative state apparatus, to the exclusion of all private-sector (for-profit or not-for-profit) actors. Second, the definition specifies that these actors all belong to the same order of government (be it Canadian federal, provincial, regional or municipal government). Defining the concept in this way has the advantage of restricting its application exclusively to a set of initiatives that share relatively common issues, since these organizations are all part of public administrations. This category of initiative may be understood in *contradistinction* to an entire set of other types of initiatives that also involve private-sector (for-profit or not-for-profit) actors and types of initiatives that are informed by issues specific to them.

*Example.* Formulated in this way, this definition of “horizontal management”

may, for example, be used to refer to the strategy to address section 54 of Quebec's *Public Health Act*. Instruments such as health impact assessment (HIA) mechanisms may be used to coordinate public policy between various ministries or departments.

*Other definitions.* Here is the definition of “horizontal management” provided by Bourgault and Lapierre:

Horizontality essentially exists when one or several managers of one or several organizations address a question no longer based exclusively on preoccupations for which they are responsible, but on a wider approach aiming at including [the] interests, resources and constraints of other stakeholders [in] this field. (2000, p. 1.)

The level of abstraction in this definition appeared too high for us, leading us to modify its content. More specifically, Bourgault and Lapierre's definition introduces two kinds of problems in providing a thorough definition this term. The first problem is that it does not specify that the organizations involved must belong to the same order of government. As a result, their definition could also be used to designate “vertical management” practices—practices that involve organizations from different orders of government. We contend that the imprecise nature of this definition must be corrected since the qualifier (“horizontal”) evokes the idea that different “levels,” or “orders” of government are involved. Moreover, using the term “horizontal management” to denote a form of management that involves different orders of government would also amount to a useless specification. The second problem is that Bourgault and Lapierre's definition

does not specify that the organizations involved must officially belong to a public administration, thereby opening the door to including management practices that involve organizations from other sectors (e.g., businesses or community organizations). This aspect of their definition is somewhat confusing. Since the organizations involved are not officially part of the state apparatus, it is rather perilous to attempt to locate them on any cartography of different orders of public administration. Doing so would imply, as specified earlier, a notion of horizontality (indeed, along with one of verticality). We therefore find it preferable to use the term “integrated governance” to refer to a type of management practice that involves private organizations and/or different orders of government.

*Reference points.* The term “horizontal management” is often used by university researchers Bourgault and Lapierre, who work in Quebec. It has also been used across Canada, often in English-language documents produced by the federal public administration (including some collaborative works by Bourgault and Lapierre).

#### 4. Vertical management or governance (Gestion ou gouvernance verticale)

Proposed definition:

While our proposed definition is inspired by the definition of horizontal management proposed by Bourgault and Lapierre, to distinguish it from that definition, we propose that the terms “vertical management” or “vertical governance” be defined as follows:

*Vertical management or vertical governance is a practice that is initiated by one or several public administration*

*organizations that belong to different orders of government (be they federal and/or provincial and/or regional and/or municipal) in the same field of activities and that consists in no longer addressing a problem based exclusively on concerns for the respective parties' responsibilities but based on the interests, resources and restrictions of others who take action in one way or another regarding the problem at hand.*

For example, we could be referring to the collaborative efforts of Quebec's transport ministry to work with the City of Montréal roadworks department to develop and implement a public transit funding policy.

**5. Joined-up government or whole-of-government**  
(No French equivalent)

Proposed definition:

*A "joined-up government" or "whole-of-government" initiative coordinates public services delivered collaboratively through partnerships between a multiplicity of public administration actors (ministries/departments or sub-departments of ministries/departments and/or regional bodies and/or governmental agencies) and private sector (for-profit or not-for-profit) organizations.*

*Discussion.* We contend, As Ling does, that the two terms "joined-up government" and "whole-of-government" are equivalent, for all intents and purposes. Our proposed definition is inspired by that of Ling, who writes that joined-up government initiatives are

based on the view that important goals of public policy cannot be delivered through the separate activities of existing organizations but neither

could they be delivered by creating a new "super agency." It therefore seeks to align the activities of formally separate organizations towards particular goals of public policy. Therefore, joined-up working aims to coordinate activities across organizational boundaries without removing boundaries themselves. These boundaries are inter-departmental, central-local, and sectoral (corporate, public, voluntary/community). To join-up, initiatives must align organizations with different cultures, incentives, management systems and aims. Therefore, "joined-up government" is an umbrella term describing various ways of aligning formally distinct organizations in pursuit of the objectives of the government of the day. (2002, p.616)

Our definition, in accordance with that of Ling, endorses the use of the terms "joined-up government" and "whole-of-government" to specifically designate initiatives that are taken by one or more public bodies, but that aim to coordinate actions by other public actors (e.g., located in other ministries or other orders of government) with those of private (for-profit or not-for-profit) organizations.

*Reference point.* The term "joined-up government" is most often used in the United Kingdom. It seems to have been popularized by Tony Blair's Labour Party administration. The term "whole-of-government" is most often used in Australia.

**6. Network government**  
(No French equivalent)

Proposed definition:

Our proposed definition of “network government” is inspired by Atkinson.

*“Network government” refers to public policy coordinating initiatives that aim to include sections or agencies from all orders of government as well as private (for-profit or not-for-profit) organizations that involve a great deal of knowledge management transformation through new information and communications technologies.*

*Discussion.* By defining the chain of coordination as being characteristic of the term “network government,” our definition focuses specifically on the concepts of joined-up government and whole-of-government. However, our proposed definition differs from Atkinson’s definition in that it specifies the initiatives that involve strong concerns regarding the integration of new information and communications technologies.

Atkinson’s influence on our definition may be seen in the excerpts below.

Creating effective governance for the New Economy will require a fundamentally new approach, relying more on networks, information technology (IT) systems, and civic and private sector actors, and less on hierarchical, rule-based, bureaucratic programs. If bureaucratic government was about managing government agencies, albeit to achieve public aims, network government is about influencing the strategic actions of other actors. But let’s be clear: Network government is not a conservative’s paradise, for their vision of small government implies letting other actors make their own decisions free from collective influences (of regulation, funding, or incentives). Network government very much involves government promotion of collective action

to advance the public good, but by engaging the creative efforts of all of society.

Atkinson, R. D. (2003) “Network Government for the Digital Age,” Progressive Policy Institute, Washington, pp.3–4)

If networks are the core concept of a new form of government, then it is time to shift from thinking about government to thinking about governance. Public management is a narrow field, focusing on the deliberately taken actions of public agencies to address discrete problems. While public management is part of governance, not all governance involves public management. Governance is a broader concept and implies better aligning the actions of all actors — government, organizations, and individuals — to public ends. Therefore, a key task of governance is to help ensure that complex networks produce socially desirable results. This means that we need to replace the concept of hierarchical bureaucratic government with the concept of government as a manager of policy networks containing all relevant actors, including agencies at all levels of government, quasi-public and other non-profit organizations, private companies, and even citizens.” (2003, p.4)

*Reference point.* The term “network government” is most often used in the United States.

## An annotated glossary of terms relating to integrated governance

### Authors:

François Gagnon and Denise Kouri

NCCHPP

December 2008

Production of this document has been made possible through a financial contribution from the Public Health Agency of Canada through funding for the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP). The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the Public Health Agency of Canada.

This document is available in its entirety in electronic format (PDF) on the website of the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP) at [www.ncchpp.ca](http://www.ncchpp.ca)

La version française est disponible sur le site Internet du CCNPPS au [www.ccnpps.ca](http://www.ccnpps.ca)

This document is a preliminary version. We invite reader feedback, which can be sent to [ncchpp@inspq.qc.ca](mailto:ncchpp@inspq.qc.ca)

Information contained in the document may be cited provided that the source is mentioned.



Centre de collaboration nationale  
sur les politiques publiques et la santé  
National Collaborating Centre  
for Healthy Public Policy

Institut national  
de santé publique  
Québec