

Summary of the Treaty

This Treaty would be put to the people to deliberate, and thence to vote on as a package. Then it would be put into practice through a new set of rules for government and some new roles. It would cover the redistribution of power, the depoliticisation and institutionalisation of comprehensive feedback on results and performance of every sphere of government, and the politicisation of delivery with executive ministers and a new Civil Service (with a modern name) employing the right people for the right roles.

To make the whole system work organisationally, these are the building blocks or the design:

1. Feedback
2. Abandonment programme
3. Policy vetting
4. Operations
5. People
6. Competitive democracy
7. Separation of powers, behaviours, tamper-proof rules, custodian role
8. Intergenerational fairness, and responsibility deal

First we need feedback and government by results. This means feedback of results or outcomes on anything and everything done by or for the state, including legislation, regulation, statutory

duties, policies and programmes, public sector services and bodies including the government private sector. Results equals judgement day awaiting every government proposal – its results will be examined and measured, regularly and publicly. This is an overdue discipline on everyone in government. And on corporate lobbies. And on us.

Second, alongside results would come the abandonment programme. Wherever something is not working or is not going to work, it would halt quickly alongside its costs. Policy termination would be the norm, not the exception.

Third, the stuff going into the pipeline must have a far higher chance of coming out the other end. The way policy is made and decisions are taken would change. Thus policies and decisions would be vetted and, if not up to standard, rejected. Ten tests would be applied. These would obliterate ideology, prejudice, initiativitis, something (anything) must be done, preferential lobbying, and the second, third and fourth rate. Learning from others would become the everyday means of working. Transparency would be common, not rare. Perpetuating the status quo and vested interests would become ‘proscribed’ activities.

Fourth, for turning policy into practice, getting it done – the operations of government, a set of duties including one of straight speak would apply to all public sector bodies and to their private sector relatives and to everyone working there. The approach to getting performance and value out of the public sector would go well beyond the current method of New Public Management and its offshoots. Rigorous feedback and results would of themselves make a huge difference, along with renewable terms of office for heads and chief executives, changing boards of management, effective supervision of regulators and PSOs, the search for and application of best organisational practice (for example, ‘benchmarking’ how other countries enforce planning permissions on rogue developers), and harmonised and fair terms and conditions across the public sector. Real local government – which looks nothing like the sham we have now – is all part of creating responsive, functioning and cost-effective government and would be run according to the same conditions of the Treaty. Delivery would be dispersed to where it can, on balance, achieve the most. In time public services would be run with world-class ambition and achievement.

Fifth, all of this means some big changes in the type and experiences of people in government. We need governments to get things done, which means people in them who know how to get things done. The Treaty proposes executive ministers, specialisation and training of politicians, maximum terms of eight years for prime ministers, four-year terms for governments, and new rules for changing party leaders. A new breed of politicians would emerge from executive roles in the public sector and elsewhere, and obtain their 'coaching' qualifications for government. With political authority in the right place, at last the Civil Service would be effectively reformed and split in two.

Sixth, we need high standards of competition amongst political parties through full proportional representation, fair funding of political parties including limited state funding and banning large donations, the right to referendum, free assembly and expression, and public deliberation and engagement.

Seventh, these roles must be in the right place to work. Just as the scores are not left to the managers to assert, spin, and argue over in sport, so governments cannot rate themselves. Thus a fourth and fifth separation of powers are needed, beyond the power held by the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary. In acceding our political authority to the state, we would be allocating these new powers not to the executive but to the revitalised House of Lords for results – the Resulture – and to the House of Commons for policy vetting. The independent score keepers – the NAO and the ONS – would be offspring of the House of Lords, not of the government and not of the Commons. This is a major change. The Lords would have to acquire the vision, ambition, and energy to reform government and to organise themselves to establish the Resulture. The Resulture would be staffed independently of the government's administrative Civil Service, as would the other independent bodies. The comparator here is the judiciary.

The House of Lords would also have the role of setting and disciplining the behaviour and standards applicable to ministers and others in the system. This would include relationships with news media owners and editors.

Our Treaty has to be looked after and its rules applied without tampering. Our custodian would be an essentially apolitical 'stakeholder'-based House of Lords. In effect, and by chance and

some design, this is nearly what we now have. We are lucky indeed. Hurdles for changing the Treaty would be set too.

Eighth and finally is the intergenerational, fairness, and responsibility deal whereby no transfers in costs to future generations would be allowed for current account debt, pensions, or climate chaos; fair pension provision for all; fair taxation; new rules for corporate behaviour; and a Congress for the Future with clout would be run annually.

We are starting to see an aligned organisation with each part facing in the same direction. We have put politics in the right places and taken them out of the wrong. Power is balanced and can no longer be appropriated by the wealthy. We have a competitive market for government – and one that lives or dies by the results for us. We have reclaimed much political authority through the visibility and thus accountability of the whole system, by the right to referendum and engagement, through stakeholder policymaking, and most notably in time through the restoration of real local government. Policies and decisions would be taken to deal effectively with issues, not to indulge an ideology or lazily bat a problem into the long grass. The operations in the middle to deliver these decisions and policies have delivery itself as their objective, rather than their own existence. The people coming into the system would increasingly be those that can deliver and do the job. The priorities of political parties would change from: policy, power, and delivery (coming a long way last); to power, delivery, and policy.

This is the architecture of good and world-class government. Is it complex? Of course – although far less so than at present. Will it take commitment and ambition to build, and time for its full benefits to show? Of course. Will there still be failures? Of course – but many fewer.