Worldwide Women
Public Sector Leaders
Index 2014

Opening the door for women working in government
In this report

As we present this Index for the second time, we would like to thank all the government leaders and EY professionals from across the world who have taken the time to share their insights with us.

www.ey.com/government/womenleaders

About the Worldwide Women Public Sector Leaders Index 2014

EY’s Worldwide Women Public Sector Leaders Index charts the representation of women in public sector leadership positions across G20 countries. It is intended to stimulate a global conversation about the policies, measures and role models that are needed to promote and retain the female talent that abounds in the public sector.

As we present this Index for the second time, we would like to thank all the government leaders and EY professionals from across the world who have taken the time to share their insights with us.

www.ey.com/government/womenleaders

Research undertaken by Dods
In 2014, governments need innovation more than ever. After five years of stagnation, the world economy is on the brink of bouncing back, according to the World Bank’s *Global Economic Prospects* report. This turning point, however, is unlikely to see a return to “business as usual.” It brings policy challenges for developed countries, which will need to ensure that the first signs of growth continue to spread, and for developing countries, which will need to find ways to accelerate poverty reduction and keep pace as the global economy starts to grow. Meanwhile, long-term trends of shifting demographics, fast-moving technology developments and the challenges of climate change continue to present challenges — and opportunities. Diversity is shown to improve innovation and creative problem solving, so governments that have a diverse group of people devising and implementing policies will surely find themselves at an advantage. Governments also need to access top talent in their countries to lead change and redesign services. They will not do this if 51% of the population are under-represented. Making workforces more diverse not only fosters innovation but also helps to drive up quality within that workforce, increasing the pool of talent available and offering a plurality of skills to meet changing needs.

Last year, we published the first EY *Worldwide Index of Women as Public Sector Leaders*, which showed that while women account for about 48% of the overall public sector workforce, they represent less than 20% of public sector leadership across the G20. The study showed that only four countries in the G20 have one-third or more women in leadership roles across the public sector. Canada ranked first place in the Index with 45% women leaders, followed by Australia (37%), the UK (35%) and South Africa (33%).

We felt that is was important to revisit the research and monitor what progress has been made to match the ambitions and public commitments of many countries. Overall, the 2014 Index shows a moderately encouraging picture — in all but five of the countries surveyed, the proportion of women in public sector leadership posts has increased. Progress, however, has not been fast. On average, the proportion of women has grown by 1% or 2% annually, at which rate it would take at least another five years for even those countries at the top of the Index to reach parity between men and women.

The same five countries — Canada, Australia, South Africa, the United Kingdom and Brazil — occupy the top slots, though South Africa has moved up one place to number three. There are indications that South Africa will continue to rise as its parliament is currently debating a new women’s empowerment and gender equality bill which, if passed, would see a mandatory target of 50% representation for women in decision-making structures across organizations in all areas, from private sector boards through public services and religious organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G20 Country</th>
<th>2014 Index rank</th>
<th>Women leaders – 2014 Index</th>
<th>2013 Index rank</th>
<th>Women leaders – 2013 Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top performers

Canada remains at the top of the Index, with women making up 45.9% of leaders in its Government. The country has a long history of taking positive action to promote under-represented groups in public services. Since the early 1980s, there have been voluntary affirmative action programs in both public and private sectors. In the 1990s, these were given legislative force in the public sector, and later in industries regulated by the federal government.

As this is the second year we have carried out this research, we are also able to pinpoint countries making above-average progress. In some cases what seems to be significant progress is in fact due to improvements in the available data. Several countries stand out, though, as having seen significant change.

In 2011, the European Commission set in place a new strategy for ensuring that women are better represented at senior levels. This has already seen impressive results – the proportion of women in top posts rose from 20.5% in 2012 to 27.5% in 2013.

In France, quotas on the number of women in senior posts, introduced in 2012, are already having an impact, and we can expect to see further progress as quotas increase in 2015 and 2018. In Germany, the federal government introduced a 30% quota for women on the boards of DAX-listed companies in November 2013, but there is no equivalent quota for their own civil service. Since 2001, however, it has had a law in place requiring federal departments to support equal opportunities through, for example, flexible working practices and giving priority to female candidates in areas where they are under-represented.
Causes for concern

Two countries have shown significant declines since the last batch of data was collected: South Korea and Turkey.

Turkey has seen a long-term drop in the women’s labor market participation rate – from a high of 48% in 1980 to just 27% in 2010. Poor childcare options and a shift away from a traditional agricultural economy, in which women are well-represented have contributed to this low participation rate. There has been a slight increase since then, but at 29% the rate remains significantly below rates in most other G20 countries. The decline in women leaders at the top of public services could be a reflection of this wider long-term trend. There have also been a number of institutional changes that appear to undermine women’s status in the political and public sphere. In 2011, for example, the ruling Justice and Development (AKP) party re-named the Ministry of State for Women’s Affairs as the Ministry of Families and Social Policies, a move that was seen by women’s activists as a backwards step.

As Turkey continues to negotiate entry to the European Union, there will be continued pressure on the country to improve its gender equality track record. There has been much progress in the legislative sphere, but the country now needs to follow this up with real social change. Speaking in November 2013, the European Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, Štefan Füle, put it this way: “It is already a few years since the Commission concluded that Turkey already has the overall legal framework that guarantees women’s rights and gender equality broadly in place and in line with European standards. Turkey now needs to make sustained efforts to turn legislation into social, economic and political reality, along with the necessary change in mentality.”
## Public leadership in context

### G20 Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G20 Country</th>
<th>Public sector rank</th>
<th>Women public sector leaders</th>
<th>Parliamentary rank</th>
<th>Women in parliament</th>
<th>Private sector boards rank</th>
<th>Women on private sector boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our research also considered data on the representation of women on private sector boards and in each country's parliament. There is some broad correlation here – countries that are in the top half of the Public Leadership Index tend also to be in the top of the other indices. It's notable that South Africa is relatively high in all three indexes, a testament to its strong framework of targets and affirmative action.

Conversely, South Korea and Japan perform poorly in all three indices. Although each country has equal opportunity legislation in place, it is undermined by persistent cultural and social discrimination. Fang Lee Cooke, Professor of Human Resource Management and Chinese studies at Monash University, Australia, describes the enforcement of equal opportunity legislation in all three countries as “ineffective,” and notes that affirmative action programs in Korea and Japan are voluntary and appear to have had little effect. It is widely agreed, she says, that Japan introduced its equal employment opportunity legislation “as a response to international pressure rather than as an acknowledgement of the changing social values in Japan,” while in Korea, “high levels of distrust of government policies imposed via political processes and the ignorance of the potential benefits of affirmative actions” are two reasons why employers failed to participate in an affirmative action scheme introduced in 2006.

Gender stereotypes can be a disadvantage to women in management roles around the world, but this is especially true in China, Japan and Korea, she notes, “which share a male-dominant Confucian culture in which women are subordinate to men socially and economically. Women's primary responsibility is home-making whereas men are seen as the pillar of the family, socially, financially and spiritually.”

The bulk of care responsibilities fall on women, regardless of their employment status, so factors like access to childcare will play a part in women's ability to access employment, despite broad parity in education levels between the genders. In Japan and Korea, it is still common for employers to “exert pressure, albeit now more implicitly, following the introduction of equal opportunity laws in the late 1980s, for women to resign when they get married and become pregnant,” she adds.

Interplay between policy and society can also be seen in Latin American countries. Mexico and Argentina both have quotas for the number of female candidates who must stand in local and state elections; both perform well in the index of political leadership. But they are not top performers in other indices, suggesting that social conservatism is still prevalent despite enforced change through quotas in some areas.

These examples show the delicate balance between social reform and policy or legislative levers that come into play here. Again, it is dangerous to compare countries directly, but even considering the unique context and data for each state, we can draw out some themes that merit a closer examination.
High-level engagement

It is not enough to put in place policies to promote gender equality within an organization unless these have strong support and a framework to ensure that departments are accountable for their progress against the policy. In France, for example, public bodies face fines if they do not comply with the new gender quotas.

In South Africa, despite the strong culture of affirmative action, the Public Service Commission recently found a lack of skills and understanding about key concepts that would promote gender equality across the whole of society, according to Barbara Watson, Chief Director of Diversity Management at the Department of Public Service and Administration. In response, her department created a Strategic Framework for Gender Equality within the Public Service. Since frameworks are not obligatory, her team advised their minister to set out a determination that each department submit a report every six months on how it was using the tools in the framework to put gender equality in all policy-making processes.

“The report goes directly to the cabinet, so there tends to be better compliance,” she says, illustrating the importance of senior support for gender equality policies of all types. Veronica Villalobos, Director, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, at the US Office of Personnel Management (OPM) says, “If you don’t have your senior leaders believing in diversity, you are never going to achieve what you are trying to. They can’t just be saying it. They have to believe it is going to improve the workforce.”

In 2011, the US Government set out a diversity and inclusion strategic plan that sets out a goal of creating “flexible workplace policies that encourage employee engagement and empowerment,” explains Villalobos, as well as requiring departments to provide a “robust orientation process” for new employees and new members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) “to introduce them to the agency culture and to provide networking opportunities.” Since 2012, agencies have had to create their own plans to implement this strategy, and Villalobos’s team has been working hard to ensure that each organization is on track with its own plan as well as learning from other parts of government. “During 2012-13, we met with [agencies] in groups of three so they could see what others had been doing,” she says. Her team then held roundtables with “equal opportunities directors, diversity directors and other staff to tell them what works well and how they can improve.” This, she says, “is how we have been able to keep [agencies] accountable and focused.”

In Brazil there is another, very personal, example of how a senior leader can effect change. President Dilma Rouseff, elected in 2011, is a vocal proponent of the need to get more women in senior positions across all sectors. She has appointed women to 10 cabinet posts, and in 2012, all but one of her inner circle of advisers were women, according to an article in Der Spiegel newspaper. Gilberto Carvalho, who ran the presidential office at the time, told the paper that this wasn’t because of quotas or policy but simply because: “Given a choice between a man and a woman with the same qualifications, she prefers to hire the woman.” Brazil has seen a slight increase in women in public leadership posts since our last Index, though it is not possible to say whether this reflects a substantial trend. It will be interesting to watch the data in coming years to consider what effect Rouseff will have on gender representation among her civil servants.
Though women are under-represented in the leadership posts of all the governments in our study, they are well-represented across the public sectors in those countries. What, then, is keeping women from reaching the top posts? In many countries, the barriers come from outside the government itself.

In Japan and South Korea, for example, social expectations and norms that deter women from focusing on their careers, and implicit or active discrimination that prevent them from being fairly promoted, mean that despite equal access to education and broadly equal participation in the labor market overall, women are not reaching leadership levels.

We have noted that Japanese women are often expected to leave work when they have children. If they do return to the workforce, they usually take lower-status jobs. “They are generally classified as part-time workers,” says Cooke, “not because of the slightly reduced number of hours they work compared with full-time workers but because of the absence of job security, career progression opportunities and other benefits that are enjoyed by their full-time counterparts.” Japanese women are also disadvantaged by the traditional Nenko system of promotion, which “rewards employees based on the long service and hard work principle,” explains Cooke, and “further assumes that this principle only applies to regular male workers but not women, even if they are in regular status jobs.”

In China, consistent state intervention over many decades – thanks to the socialist belief that women’s participation in the workforce is vital – means there is a relatively small wage gap between the genders, and an above-average rate of female participation in the workforce. Women tend to take only short breaks to have children, a result of the one-child policy, and there is good access to childcare. Most women work full time regardless of their care responsibilities. Nevertheless, they are under-represented in senior roles in government. This may be because their careers are seen to be less important than men’s. In a study focusing specifically on women in management posts in the Chinese Government, Cooke noted that “It is not expected, or, in some cases, tolerated, that a wife be more advanced in her career than her husband. Evidence suggests that some women lack motivation to advance their careers because of the way they voluntarily prioritise their family responsibilities.”

In the Chinese Government, says Cooke, this societal assumption that women's careers are unimportant is exacerbated by a lack of a formal career development structure. “There is no official HR policy, such as a mentoring system, to support employees’ career development,” she says. “Female employees at the lower levels dare not disclose their career aspirations to their line managers. Women are afraid of sharing their thoughts with each other to avoid being seen as competitive and ambitious.” This lack of HR support affects men and women, but women may be more severely affected because they are not able to network and access informal support as easily as men. She reports that there is high competition between female peers because of the limited opportunities for promotion, while Chinese society generally disapproves of close relationships – even professional ones – between men and women outside of marriage.
Cooke argues that “in societies where patriarchal social orders remain influential ... a strong and continuous state is vital to achieve a level of gender equality.” The same might be said of employers: where social barriers to women’s promotions are particularly strong, an employer who wishes to encourage diversity at the senior levels must ensure strong and continuous interventions to help talented women reach leadership posts.

In fact, this could be said not just of countries that are especially traditional and patriarchal. Even in the UK Government, one of the top performers in our Index, recent qualitative research suggests that women still face disadvantages because they are more likely to take time off work to care for children or work part time for several years. The UK civil service has been tracking the progress of women in its senior ranks for a number of years, and has noted that while women are being over-represented in promotions to the senior cadre, they are not being promoted up within that cadre to the very top posts of director general and permanent secretary. In 2013 it set up a series of focus groups among senior women to identify why this is the case.

Among the barriers mentioned were those that might be characterized as gender-based, such as the well-documented fact that women tend to underestimate their ability to do a job compared to men, and those that related to care responsibilities. In one focus group, attended by the newspaper Civil Service World, a woman who had spent about a decade working part time said: “I don’t think that experience has put me in a very good position now to progress.” The lack of time for personal development, networking or self-promotion means that part time work “doesn’t particularly equip me for promotion,” she said.
Demographics and pipelines

If we are to see improvements in the representation of women in public leadership positions, we need a pipeline of talented women in more junior posts – or even outside governments. For without talented women to promote, even the best-laid gender diversity policies will flounder.

One broad concern here is the impact of austerity measures on women’s representation in public sectors overall. As we noted in last year’s Index, cuts to the public sector in the UK and US are disproportionately affecting women, a trend described by Dr. Minouche Shafik as creating a “huge loss of talent.” These countries have both taken great care to improve diversity at senior levels in recent years and will need to ensure that they keep a watchful eye on the impact of austerity measures on the long-term progress of this agenda.

Demographic concerns and public sector workforce composition will vary from country to country, but the underlying message is that if diversity is to be achieved and maintained, governments must consider the pipeline of talent coming into an organization as well as how to retain those who do make it to the top. Villalobos explains that the US Government aims to maintain a good talent pipeline and diversity profile by reaching out to encourage applications from under-represented groups, as well as working with recruiters and those deciding promotions to remove factors such as unconscious bias. “As long as we are doing outreach in every community, then we receive applications from qualified candidates from each group,” she says. “If all things are fair and we know they are fair, then we should be able to hire at the rate of their application for jobs.”
Conclusions and actions

It's important that as the twin currents of social and organizational change move on, senior leaders in government remain focused on the diversity agenda. Countries that not only set up targets and policies, but accompany these with strong systems of accountability, are more likely to keep improving gender diversity. But it cannot just be about targets.

We have identified four streams of action, which, when taken together, seem to lead to greater representation of women in leadership roles.

1. Legislation to address visible barriers

Research from Carleton University, Canada, suggests that legislation and political reform can reverse women’s under-representation. Legislation is also important to:

- Extend equal employment opportunity
- Address open discrimination
- Safeguard maternity leave
- Ensure other protections of women in the workforce

2. Cultural transformation to address invisible barriers

Unconscious bias, in both men and women, is powerful and pervasive. Leaders need to send a consistent message to achieve greater equality at senior levels.

Part of the solution is to embed accountability into the performance targets of every leader. It is also crucial to lead by example and address inappropriate behaviors and attitudes. There is a need to continuously improve public sector recruitment practices and departmental cultures, entrenching respect for diversity.

3. Role models and leadership

Attention needs to be paid on how policies and legislation get implemented in practice. The following questions should be asked to determine a department's practice:

- Does everyone have the opportunity to progress, even if they work part time?
- Is progress against gender and other diversity targets measured in a meaningful way or is it merely a routine compliance exercise without efforts being actively refocused when progress has stalled?

Decision-makers must take a long-term view of an employee's potential contribution and support re-entry of employees after maternity leave.

4. Actions for future women public sector leaders

- Have a go – put your hand up. Let others know that you are ambitious.
- Be assertive – understand the options available to you and speak up for yourself.
- Learn to negotiate effectively – your manager will not offer you the right role and coach you into leadership positions unless you can articulate what you want.
- Tell your employer what you want – be clear about the type of role that will work for you at this point in your life and the role you aspire to in the future.
- Play the long game – accept that it's okay your career takes a back seat while you start a family.
- Respect that flexibility goes both ways – be flexible where and when you can to support your team and organization.
- Agitate for change – as women leaders, public sector employees and board members, gender equity is not only a social justice issue, it improves productivity, engagement and decision-making.
- Ask for advice – talk to people about their experiences.
Research for this 2014 G20 Index report was conducted by the international research team at Dods. The Worldwide Index of Women as Public Leaders report will form part of a series of regular reports designed to track progress and change in governments and stimulate conversation promoting diversity among the leadership of the public service around the globe.

The figures presented in this report have been obtained by either consultation and correspondence with each of the G20 member states, verification by at least one government official or from government data. A list of sources used to compile the report is available on the facing page.

We have defined public leaders as being non-elected senior executives across federal or national governments, or the executive ranks of the core civil service in central government. This group constitutes approximately the most senior 10% of public officials. Definitions of the civil service, as well as sectors covered at the central level of government, differ across countries, and this should be considered when making comparisons.

The total public sector employment figures comprise the percentage of women among all persons who fulfill the requirements of delivering or managing public services. As the variation in government structures and definitions is diverse, we have in each instance selected the most comparable data available in compiling the Index rankings.

Please note that the figures used for China and Argentina in this year’s Index refer to a group of individuals with a slightly different definition than in last year’s index. While this may make direct comparisons between the indexes for these countries difficult, we have chosen to include the new measures of gender diversity as they are more accurate and more readily comparable with figures for other countries in the Index.
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About EY

EY is a global leader in assurance, tax, transaction and advisory services. The insights and quality services we deliver help build trust and confidence in the capital markets and in economies the world over. We develop outstanding leaders who team to deliver on our promises to all of our stakeholders. In so doing, we play a critical role in building a better working world for our people, for our clients and for our communities.

EY refers to the global organization, and may refer to one or more, of the member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young Global Limited, a UK company limited by guarantee, does not provide services to clients. For more information about our organization, please visit ey.com.

How EY's Global Government & Public Sector Center can help your organization

Around the world, governments and not-for-profit organizations are continually seeking innovative answers to complex challenges. They are striving to provide better services at lower costs and to ensure sustainable economic development, a safe environment, more transparency and increased accountability. EY combines private sector leading practices with an understanding of the public sector’s diverse needs, focusing on building organizations’ capability to deliver improved public services. Drawing on many years of experience, we can work with you to help strengthen your organization, deliver value for money and achieve lasting improvement. Our Global Government & Public Sector Center brings together teams of highly skilled professionals from our assurance, tax, transaction and advisory services. We are inspired by a deep commitment to help you meet your goals and enhance public value, today and tomorrow.
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