TRANSBOUNDARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

Per Lægreid and Lise H. Rykkja

Governing and organizing for crises management and civil protection is an important but neglected research field within public administration and public management (Boin and Lodge, 2016; Lægreid and Rykkja, 2019). This linked issue, following the special issue on «Governing & Organizing for Crisis Management & Civil Protection» (Volume 19, issue 2, 2019) within this journal, takes this as a main rationale.

Crisis management policies are often framed within specific institutional, political and organizational settings or contexts. Thus, the organizational layout of the societal security and crisis management field matters. Furthermore, crises often challenge existing patterns of organization and management. They do not fit easily into established organizational contexts and are framed and reframed. Decisions on how to organize for crisis management ultimately concern values and are therefore inherently political and not merely technical issues. Highlighting this is important in order to understand the challenges that policy makers and administrative leaders in this policy area face. In brief: the politics of crisis management matter (Lægreid and Rykkja, 2019).

Major crises increasingly transcend national borders as well as policy areas and administrative levels, necessitating both vertically and horizontally transboundary coordination (Boin, 2018). They are difficult to predict and difficult to handle, and are perceived as 'wicked problems' characterized by complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity. Crises often challenge existing patterns of organization and management, and there is often a mismatch between the organizational structure and the problem structure, which makes crises difficult to handle.

Structural and governance capacity may constrain or enable crisis management. However, contextual features such as cultural dimensions and national variations, as well as variations between policy areas, have to be taken into account. The general trend in organizing for crisis management seems to have shifted toward a 'whole-of-government' approach including more network arrangements. At the same time, there is also movement towards more centralization and hierarchy (Lægreid and Rykkja, 2019). These changes may be triggered by external crises, but are generally constrained by national traditions and contexts. The core trend has been system-maintaining rather than radical redesign and system transforming. Policy instruments and organizational structures and processes have been adapted to accommodate external pressures for change, while core values and governance arrangements prevail.

Changes often occur within existing administrative orders. Network arrangements tend to be established in the shadow of hierarchy to enhance the coordination capacity. Existing and new organizational arrangements are recombined in an adaptive and pragmatic manner, thereby combining demands from external shocks and contradicting internal pressures for stability, resulting in a more gradual transformation. Public organizations face important capacity constraints in their effort to handle these complexities. These are some of the topics the authors address in this special issue.

The articles in this special issue are, as in the previous linked issue, based on papers presented at the International Public Management Network (IPMN) conference on 'Organizing for Societal Security and Crisis Management. Governance Capacity and Legitimacy' in Bergen, Norway 20-21 September 2018. The conference was organized together with the research project *«Organizing for Societal Security and Crisis Management. Building Governance Capacity and Legitimacy»*, funded by the Norwegian Research Councils program for Societal Security (SAMRISK II). The articles address the problem of governance capacity by focusing on coordination capacity.

The article "Coordinating against work-related crime in Norway" by Synnøve Ø. Jahnsen and Lise H. Rykkja examines inter-agency coordination in a "wicked" policy area by examining the Norwegian model against work-related crime. The main research question concerns how the Norwegian government organizes to ensure coordination in the field of work-related crime. The authors find a push towards joint intelligence efforts at the national level to create more analytical capacity and more effective use of punitive sanctions. The article shows that coordination has intensified over time, but that sector-based priorities, regulations and performance targets remain important obstacles for coordination. A secondary organizational structure, ensuring a more coordinated, cross-sectoral strategy for combating work-related crime has been established at the national and regional level. This supplements the primary organizational structure which is based on the "traditional" division between ministerial areas and policy sectors and allows for both change and organizational stability. The result is a field that is more coordinated, but still complex and constrained by the existing sector-divisions, organizational and management structures.

The article "Europeanization of civil protection: The case of Italy and Norway" by Claudia Morsut and Bjørn Ivar Kruke argues that crises are increasingly not confined by national borders and challenge states' capacities to adequately respond, calling for crisis management governance that goes beyond the nation-state. The article addresses the European Union's civil protection policy which through the EU Civil Protection Mechanism has established forms of cooperation among the participating states of the Mechanism. Through the lens of Europeanisation, the authors aim to uncover the influences the Mechanism exercises on the Norwegian and Italian civil protection systems, and what the kind of influences these states have on the Mechanism's development. A main finding is that national contexts are shaped by EU developments, but also that national context shapes changes within the EU.

REFERENCES

Boin, A. (2018). "The Transboundary Crises: Why we are unprepared and the road ahead". *Journal of Contingencies and Crises Management*, 26: 1-6.

Boin, A. and M. Lodge (2016). "Designing resilient institutions for transboundary crisis management: A Time for Public Administration". *Public Administration*, 94 (2): 289-298.

Lægreid, P. and L.H. Rykkja, (Eds.) (2018). *Societal Security and Crises Management. Governance Capacity and Legitimacy.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lægreid, P. and L.H. Rykkja (2019)." Governing and organizing for crises management and civil protection. Advancing an important but neglected research field". *International Public Management Review*, 19(2): 1-6.