

Lessons learned from streamlining the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam from 1945 to the present

Dr. Nguyen Quang Vinh

Academy of Public Administration and Governance

Abstract: *This article analyzes the formation, adjustment, and gradual streamlining of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus from a historical perspective, in connection with the requirements of national construction, national defense, and the improvement of the Socialist Rule-of-Law State of Vietnam across different historical periods. Based on an overview of the development of the state administrative system, the article identifies key lessons learned from this process. It then examines the relevance of these historical lessons for the current period and proposes several solutions to further streamline the state administrative apparatus into a streamlined and robust structure characterized by greater performance, effectiveness, and efficiency.*

Keywords: *Streamlining the apparatus; organization of state administrative apparatus; administrative history; administrative reform; socialist rule-of-law State.*

1. The formation and adjustment of the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam after the August Revolution of 1945

The state administrative apparatus in Vietnam is a core component of the state machinery, directly responsible for performing administrative management functions, organizing the implementation of the *Constitution* and laws, ensuring the effectiveness of state management across all areas of social life, and serving the people. From a historical perspective, the formation and adjustment of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus have not merely been matters of organizational

technique; rather, they have been closely linked to the Party's revolutionary line, the requirements of national construction and defense in each historical period, and the development of the Socialist Rule-of-Law State of Vietnam. The *Constitutions* of 1946, 1959, 1980, 1992, and 2013 each marked an important development stage of the modern Vietnamese state and provided the political and legal foundations for organizing and reforming the administrative apparatus in accordance with the demands of different historical periods.

Received:

May 19, 2026

Revised:

June 03, 2026

Accepted:

June 22, 2026

<https://doi.org/10.59394/JSM.140>

Following the August Revolution of 1945 and the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, an urgent task was the rapid construction of a new governmental apparatus capable of managing the country and replacing the colonial and feudal administrative systems. Facing immense challenges and a fragile revolutionary government, the early administrative apparatus was organized to be lean, flexible, unified, and capable of mobilizing maximum resources to safeguard the revolutionary government, conduct resistance efforts, and rebuild the nation. The *1946 Constitution* served as the first constitutional foundation, establishing the fundamental principles of the organization of state power, with the administrative apparatus designed in accordance with the democratic nature of the revolutionary government (National Assembly, 1946). A distinctive feature of this period was its flexibility, centralized direction, and close connection to practical realities. However, due to wartime conditions and the still rudimentary level of institutional development, the administrative structure was largely adaptive and responsive to immediate circumstances rather than constituting a fully developed modern administrative system.

From 1954 until the period preceding the Doi moi (renovation) reforms, the state administrative apparatus continued to be consolidated and developed under specific historical circumstances. The *1959 Constitution* reflected the requirements of socialist construction in North Vietnam and the consolidation of the people's democratic state while the country remained temporarily divided (National Assembly, 1959). Following national reunification, in July 1976, the Sixth National Assembly officially adopted the name Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The *1980 Constitution* further institutionalized the state model of the period in which the entire

country embarked on the transition to socialism under a centrally planned and subsidized economic system (National Assembly, 1980). Throughout this period, the administrative apparatus was strengthened in the direction of greater centralization, unity, sectoral specialization, and expansion to meet the demands of comprehensive socio-economic management. This model played a positive role in mobilizing resources for the country's strategic tasks. However, over time, it also revealed several limitations, including an excessive number of organizational units, multiple intermediary layers, overlapping functions, and relatively low operational efficiency. These shortcomings created an objective need to reform the thinking underlying the organization of the state administrative apparatus in the subsequent period.

The 6th National Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam in 1986 initiated the comprehensive Doi moi process, marking a significant turning point in both the perception and practice of organizing the state administrative apparatus. The *1992 Constitution* institutionalized the renovation guideline and provided the political and legal foundation for further improving the state apparatus, including the administrative system (National Assembly, 1992). From this point onward, administrative apparatus restructuring was no longer limited to increasing or reducing organizational units; rather, it became closely associated with the need to more clearly distinguish state management functions from production and business functions, reform administrative methods, and strengthen governance through law, strategies, planning, development plans, and macro-level policies. It can be argued that this period marked the gradual transition of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus from a model of "subsidy-based management" to

one of “development-oriented governance,” thereby laying the foundation for the emergence of a rule-of-law-based public administration capable of supporting the country’s renovation and international integration.

Entering the twenty-first century, reform of the state administrative apparatus was accelerated and incorporated into the overall framework of public administration reform. Decision No. 136/2001/QĐ-TTg dated September 17, 2001, issued by the Prime Minister, established a comprehensive reform framework in which organizational restructuring constituted one of the key pillars (Prime Minister, 2001). Subsequently, Government Resolution No. 76/NQ-CP dated July 15, 2021, reaffirmed the objective of building a democratic, professional, modern, streamlined, effective, and efficient public administration that is development-oriented and people-centered during the 2021 - 2030 period (Government, 2021). Since the Doi Moi era, and particularly from 2001 onward, the adjustment of the state administrative apparatus has thus no longer been understood merely as a mechanical restructuring of organizational units; rather, it has become increasingly linked to the requirements of modernizing the public administration and enhancing national governance capacity.

Following the adoption of the 2013 Constitution, the demand for organizational reform and restructuring became more strongly emphasized throughout the political system. Resolution No. 18-NQ/TW dated October 25, 2017, of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam (12th tenure) clearly identified the task of continuing to reform and reorganize the political system’s organizational structure in a streamlined manner to improve effectiveness and efficiency (Party Central Committee, 2017).

After reviewing the implementation of this Resolution, the 13th Central Committee issued Conclusion No. 121-KL/TW dated January 24, 2025, providing an important political foundation for carrying out more comprehensive and far-reaching organizational restructuring in the new period (Party Central Committee, 2025). In this context, the streamlining of the state administrative apparatus has been demonstrated through three major directions:

First, the organizational model of local government has been reformed toward a two-tier structure, based on National Assembly Resolution No. 203/2025/QH15 dated June 16, 2025, on amendments and supplements to a number of articles of the *Constitution* of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and the *2025 Law on Organization of Local Government*. This reform aims to reduce intermediary levels and more clearly define responsibilities between the provincial and commune levels.

Second, provincial-level administrative units have been reorganized pursuant to National Assembly Resolution No. 202/2025/QH15 dated June 12, 2025, on the restructuring of provincial administrative units. This initiative seeks to establish more rational administrative sizes, expand development space, and enhance the governance capacity of provincial authorities (National Assembly, 2025).

Third, ministries and ministerial-level agencies at the central level have been restructured under National Assembly Resolution No. 176/2025/QH15 dated February 18, 2025. This restructuring reflects a trend toward greater integration and interconnectivity and a reduction in the number of redundant administrative overlaps across sectors and fields, thereby enhancing cross-sectoral and policy coordination capacity (National Assembly, 2025).

From this overall process, it can be observed that the formation and adjustment of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus have followed a relatively consistent developmental trajectory: from building a governmental apparatus capable of safeguarding power and national independence, to consolidating a centralized management model during the period of socialist construction, and subsequently transitioning toward the development of a modern, streamlined, high-performing, effective, and efficient rule-of-law-based public administration in the context of Doi Moi and international integration.

Major policy decisions in recent years - such as the establishment of a two-tier local government model, the reorganization of provincial-level administrative units, and the restructuring of ministries and ministerial-level agencies - demonstrate that the process of streamlining Vietnam's state administrative apparatus has entered a new phase, characterized by deeper institutional reforms, broader implementation scope, and stronger determination in execution. This marks a new stage of development built upon the selective inheritance of the positive values of Vietnam's revolutionary administration, while responding to the requirements of building a socialist rule-of-law State and promoting rapid and sustainable national development in the new era.

2. Lessons learned from the process of streamlining the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam

From the formation, evolution, and adjustment of the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam across different historical periods, it can be affirmed that streamlining the administrative apparatus is neither a temporary measure nor merely a technical organizational operation. Rather, it is an objective requirement arising from the process of building the Socialist Rule-of-Law State of Vietnam, reforming the political

system, and enhancing national governance capacity.

First, a fundamental and overarching lesson is the need to ensure unified, comprehensive Party leadership throughout the process of reorganizing and streamlining the state administrative apparatus. In every revolutionary period, the leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam has been the decisive factor in providing political direction, ensuring consistency in organizational objectives, and appropriately balancing stability with reform and continuity with development. This demonstrates that streamlining the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam is not merely an adjustment driven by the technical logic of public governance; rather, it is, above all, an important political task that must be carried out on the basis of steadfast adherence to the objectives and principles of socialist state power organization while preserving the nature of a state of the People, by the People, and for the People.

Second, practical experience shows that the state administrative apparatus can be streamlined and operate effectively only when organizational restructuring is based on functions, responsibilities, authority, and the development requirements of each historical period, rather than merely mechanically reducing the number of organizational units. When historical demands change, failure to adjust the administrative apparatus in line with new management functions inevitably leads to overlapping responsibilities, fragmentation, excessive intermediary layers, and reduced implementation effectiveness. Streamlining, therefore, does not simply mean formal reduction; rather, it involves restructuring the administrative system by assigning the right tasks to the right institutions, clearly defining responsibilities, and eliminating unnecessary intermediary

stages. This lesson is particularly important in the current context, where state governance is increasingly associated with the development of a socialist-oriented market economy, international integration, digital transformation, and the continued development of the rule-of-law state.

Third, the process of streamlining the state administrative apparatus can only achieve sustainable results when it is carried out in a synchronized manner across the central and local levels, between organizational structures and administrative units, and between levels of government, decentralization, delegation of authority, and mechanisms for controlling power. Practical experience from organizational restructuring during the 2025 - 2026 period demonstrates that if streamlining is limited to administrative agencies without simultaneously reorganizing administrative units, reforming the local government model, and clarifying mechanisms for decentralization and delegation, its effectiveness will remain constrained. Conversely, when reforms are implemented comprehensively - from organizational models, administrative boundaries, and levels of government to operational mechanisms - the administrative apparatus can evolve from being merely “superficially lean” to “substantively potent”. The streamlining of the administrative apparatus must therefore be undertaken along an appropriate roadmap, with carefully planned, well-sequenced steps, supported by thorough political, legal, organizational, and social preparation. It cannot be pursued hastily, but neither can it be delayed.

Fourth, a particularly important lesson is that streamlining the state administrative apparatus must be closely linked to personnel management, workforce restructuring, and enhanced public service accountability. Experience over many years has shown that

simply merging organizations, consolidating units, or reducing organizational entities without simultaneously reforming position standards, civil service evaluation mechanisms, and implementation discipline is likely to result in changes that are largely formal rather than substantive improvements in governance quality.

Streamlining the administrative apparatus is therefore, not merely a matter of reducing personnel or organizational units. More fundamentally, it requires reorganizing the system to ensure that the right people are assigned to the right positions, that responsibilities are clearly defined, and that problems such as responsibility avoidance, blame-shifting, overlapping functions, and fragmented accountability are effectively addressed. In modern public administration, organizational quality is measured not only by the number of agencies or intermediary levels but also by implementation capacity, coordination capability, and the extent to which public officials assume full responsibility for executing their duties.

Fifth, experience gained from the reform of Vietnam’s state administrative apparatus demonstrates that streamlining must be organically linked with institutional improvement, administrative procedure reform, digital transformation, and data-driven governance. Under contemporary conditions, streamlining can be truly effective only when accompanied by the reduction of intermediary procedures, the simplification of administrative processes, the digitization of workflows, and the development of shared databases to ensure connectivity and interoperability in management and administration. Streamlining is therefore not merely a question of “how many agencies should exist,” but also of “how those agencies operate.” In the context of modern governance, streamlining the administrative

apparatus must be embedded in broader institutional reforms and innovations in operational methods; otherwise, organizational restructuring is unlikely to yield tangible benefits for citizens and businesses.

It can be affirmed from the foregoing analysis that the process of streamlining the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam has yielded lessons that are both historically significant and highly relevant to contemporary governance. These include the lesson of ensuring the unified leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam; the principle that organizational apparatus must be designed on the basis of functions, responsibilities, and development requirements; the importance of synchronizing organizational restructuring with decentralization, delegation of authority, power control mechanisms, and personnel management; and the necessity of linking administrative streamlining with institutional reform, administrative procedure reform, and digital transformation. Above all, these experiences underscore that the ultimate objective of streamlining must be to enhance the effectiveness of state management and improve the quality of public services provided to the People. These lessons provide a direct foundation for continued application in the current period, as Vietnam is implementing large-scale, strategically significant reforms to build a modern, streamlined, strong, high-performing, effective, and efficient state administration.

3. Reference values for the current revolution of streamlining organizational apparatus in Vietnam

The evolution of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus underscores that historical lessons are not only valuable for reviewing the past but also provide direct reference points for the present period, when

Vietnam is accelerating the building of a socialist rule-of-law State, reforming the political system, advancing administrative reform, and restructuring the administrative apparatus toward a model that is leaner, stronger, more effective, and more efficient. The value of these lessons lies first in demonstrating that streamlining the state administrative apparatus is neither a temporary solution nor a simple mechanical reduction in organization and personnel. Rather, it is an objective requirement arising from the country's development process, the renewal of leadership and management methods, and the enhancement of national governance capacity. Accordingly, recent major policies of the Party and the State have consistently approached organizational restructuring as part of a broader agenda of institutional improvement, enhanced state management effectiveness and efficiency, and improved public service quality.

A foundational reference lesson is the need to ensure unified Party leadership throughout the process of reforming and reorganizing the state administrative apparatus. Historical experience demonstrates that every major adjustment to the state apparatus has succeeded only when carried out under the direct and comprehensive leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam, thereby ensuring both political consistency and an appropriate balance between stability and reform, as well as between inheritance and development. In the current context, this lesson is particularly significant since the reorganization of the administrative apparatus must remain closely linked to the task of building the socialist rule-of-law State and promoting the People's mastery. Such an approach helps prevent a purely technocratic perspective that views streamlining merely as an organizational restructuring exercise. In

reality, it is a process of restructuring state management to better serve the interests of the nation and its people.

Another important lesson is that the design of the administrative apparatus must be based on functions, responsibilities, authority, and practical development requirements. In the current context, the organization of the state administrative apparatus is no longer focused solely on reducing the number of organizational units; rather, it is increasingly directed toward restructuring management functions and redefining relationships among levels of government, between central and local authorities, and between regulatory bodies and implementing agencies.

The promulgation of the *2025 Law on the Organization of the Government and the 2025 Law on the Organization of Local Government* demonstrates that the orientation for improving the current administrative apparatus is guided by a clearer delineation of functions, responsibilities, and authority, while emphasizing decentralization, delegation of powers, and enhanced accountability at every level and within every agency. Historical lessons, therefore, realize their full value only when translated into modern organizational principles: each task should be assigned to a single lead agency; each level of government should have clear primary responsibility; overlaps and unnecessary layers should be minimized; and inter-agency coordination should be strengthened.

The reference value of these historical lessons is also evident in how they address the relationship among the administrative apparatus, local government models, and the restructuring of provincial-level administrative units. Whereas the organization of the administrative apparatus was once viewed primarily through the lens of agency structures, current reforms have progressed to

a deeper level by reshaping both local government models and the state governance space.

National Assembly Resolution No. 203/2025/QH15 and the *2025 Law on the Organization of Local Government* have provided the constitutional and legal foundations for the transition to a two-tier local government model. At the same time, National Assembly Resolution No. 202/2025/QH15 demonstrates that streamlining the administrative apparatus must be accompanied by the reorganization of administrative territories, the establishment of more appropriate administrative scales, and the strengthening of local governments' management capacities.

Drawing on more than eighty years of experience in state-building and national development, it is evident that if administrative units remain fragmented and local government structures continue to contain multiple intermediary layers, overall administrative effectiveness will be difficult to improve, even when internal organizational restructuring is undertaken within individual agencies. The key lesson, therefore, is the need for a synchronized approach that combines organizational restructuring, adjustments to administrative units, and innovation in local governance models.

At the central level, the reference value of these historical lessons is clearly reflected in the restructuring of ministries and ministerial-level agencies toward a more streamlined, interdisciplinary approach and enhanced capacity for policy coordination. National Assembly Resolution No. 176/2025/QH15 on the organizational structure of the Government for the 15th National Assembly term, together with National Assembly Resolution No. 09/2026/QH16 dated April 7, 2026, on the Government structure for the 16th National Assembly term, indicate that the

Government is currently organized into 14 ministries and three ministerial-level agencies. This reflects a shift from an organizational model based on separate sectoral management toward one organized around closely interconnected functional clusters that are better suited to the requirements of modern governance. In a context where development challenges are increasingly complex, cross-sectoral, cross-regional, and closely linked to digital transformation, innovation, green growth, and non-traditional security issues, the restructuring of ministries should not be viewed merely as an effort to reduce the number of agencies. Rather, it should be directed toward strengthening strategic coordination, minimizing authority conflicts, reducing resource fragmentation, and ensuring greater consistency in the formulation and implementation of national development policies.

The historical lessons discussed above are particularly valuable in addressing the need to link streamlining of organizational apparatus with workforce restructuring, improvements in public service performance, institutional reform, administrative procedure reform, digital transformation, and data-driven governance. Practical experience demonstrates that no administrative apparatus can be considered genuinely streamlined if organizational structures have changed while the workforce, working methods, and accountability mechanisms remain unchanged. Therefore, organizational reform must be carried out in parallel with reforms in cadre management and development, including refining position standards, introducing performance-based evaluation systems, strengthening administrative discipline and accountability, and eliminating avoidance, blame-shifting, and risk-averse behavior among public officials. At the same time, under current conditions, streamlining the administrative

apparatus cannot be separated from administrative procedure reform, process digitalization, data interoperability, and performance measurement through concrete outputs and outcomes. Only through the proper application of these reference values can the ongoing process of streamlining Vietnam's state administrative apparatus ensure political consistency, legal rigor, organizational rationality, and effectiveness in the context of modern national governance.

4. Solutions for further streamlining the state administrative apparatus

Based on the lessons outlined above, the continued streamlining of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus should be implemented through a comprehensive approach that both adheres to the political orientation and requirements of building the Socialist Rule-of-Law State of Vietnam and responds to the demands of modern national governance in a new development context. Current reform measures should go beyond merely reducing the number of organizational units. Instead, they should aim for a comprehensive restructuring of functions, authority, operational mechanisms, and the quality of implementation of the state administrative apparatus.

First, it is necessary to continue improving the institutional framework governing the state administrative apparatus by clarifying the functions, responsibilities, authority, and working relationships among administrative agencies. This is a foundational solution, since any streamlining initiative that is not fully institutionalized is likely to result in only formal restructuring, in which organizations are merged but responsibilities and authority remain inadequately defined. Building upon the *2025 Law on the Organization of the Government* and the *2025 Law on the Organization of Local Government*, it is necessary to continue reviewing sector-

specific laws and decrees governing the functions, duties, powers, and organizational structures of administrative agencies. Such reviews should reinforce the principle that each task is assigned to only one lead agency with primary responsibility, while eliminating overlapping authority, duplicated functions, and gaps in accountability. Only when the institutional foundation is strengthened in this manner can streamlining of the administrative apparatus be effectively linked to improved performance, effectiveness, and efficiency.

Second, the two-tier local government model should be implemented comprehensively and substantively in conjunction with the reorganization of provincial-level administrative units. National Assembly Resolution No. 203/2025/QH15 and the *2025 Law on the Organization of Local Government* have provided the constitutional and legal basis for establishing a two-tier local government system, while Resolution No. 202/2025/QH15 has established a new structure for provincial-level administrative units. In this context, priority should be given to clearly defining the authority of provincial and commune-level governments and to reorganizing management processes, public service delivery systems, reporting mechanisms, and intergovernmental coordination arrangements in accordance with the logic of the new model. At the same time, the implementation of Resolution No. 203/2025/QH15 should ensure well-designed transitional mechanisms for newly reorganized localities in order to maintain organizational stability, prevent disruptions in state management, and fully capitalize on the advantages arising from larger administrative scales, expanded development space, and enhanced governance capacity following the restructuring process. This demonstrates that streamlining at the local level should be understood as a comprehensive restructuring of

the entire local governance system rather than merely the removal of an administrative tier.

Third, at the central level, ministries, ministerial-level agencies, and specialized administrative bodies should continue to be reorganized in an inter-sectoral direction, with fewer intermediary units, stronger policy coordination capacity, and reduced functional overlap. National Assembly Resolution No. 176/2025/QH15 on the organizational structure of the government for the 15th National Assembly Term, together with the continued maintenance of a government structure consisting of 14 ministries and three ministerial-level agencies in the new term, reflects a trend toward integrating closely related sectors into more coherent administrative entities suited to the demands of modern governance. Building on this experience, periodic post-restructuring reviews should be conducted to address remaining areas of functional overlap, improve inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms, and rationalize internal organizational units within ministries and specialized agencies at the local level. The ultimate objective of restructuring at the central level is not merely to reduce the number of agencies, but to create a more coherent administrative apparatus with fewer intermediary layers and stronger capacity for policy coordination.

Fourth, organizational restructuring must be closely linked to the restructuring of cadres, civil servants, public employees, and to comprehensive reforms in cadre management and development within the state administrative sector. Practical experience demonstrates that if organizational structures are rearranged without simultaneously restructuring personnel, reassessing job positions, strengthening administrative discipline, and reforming performance-based

evaluation mechanisms, the administrative apparatus may become leaner in form but not necessarily stronger in capacity. It is therefore necessary to continue improving the system of job positions, standardizing competency requirements for public service positions, and evaluating public officials based on outputs, task completion, and accountability. At the same time, greater attention should be devoted to training and professional development for cadres and civil servants, particularly those at the commune level, following the implementation of the two-tier local government model. Due to recent administrative mergers and restructuring, many commune-level leaders and heads of professional divisions have yet to fully meet the required professional and managerial standards. Moreover, contemporary cadres and civil servants are expected not only to possess strong professional and legal knowledge but also to demonstrate digital competencies, inter-agency coordination skills, and the capacity to implement policies effectively within a modern governance environment.

Fifth, the streamlining of the administrative apparatus must be closely integrated with administrative procedure reform, decentralization and delegation of authority, digital transformation, and performance-based monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. If organizational structures are reformed while administrative procedures remain cumbersome, data remains fragmented, and coordination mechanisms remain ineffective, the administrative costs borne by citizens and businesses are unlikely to decrease, and the effectiveness of reform will be difficult to perceive in practice. Consequently, organizational restructuring should be synchronized with process simplification, the

digitalization of administrative records, the standardization of shared data systems, enhanced interagency data exchange, and the use of service delivery outcomes as key indicators for evaluating organizational performance. In addition, a clear system of performance indicators should be established to measure reductions in organizational units and administrative layers, shorter processing times, higher levels of citizen and business satisfaction, stronger inter-sectoral coordination, and lower administrative costs. These efforts should be accompanied by strengthened oversight and supervision by elected bodies, the Vietnam Fatherland Front, socio-political organizations, and citizens. Only when administrative apparatus streamlining is integrated with procedural reform, digital transformation, and results-based power control can the restructuring of the state administrative apparatus become a genuine driver of innovation in public governance.

The continued streamlining of Vietnam's state administrative apparatus should be pursued through a comprehensive approach that combines institutional improvement, the reorganization of local government models, the restructuring of ministries and specialized agencies, the enhancement of workforce quality, the acceleration of administrative procedure reform, decentralization and delegation of authority, digital transformation, and strengthened monitoring and performance evaluation. These are the essential conditions for ensuring that administrative streamlining not only reduces organizational units but also advances the broader goals of improving the performance, effectiveness, and efficiency of state management, while enhancing the quality of public services provided to the people in the new stage of national development.

5. Conclusion

Based on practical experience since the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, it can be affirmed that the process of forming, adjusting, and gradually streamlining the state administrative apparatus in Vietnam has been a continuous process closely associated with the revolutionary leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the requirements of national construction and defense in each historical period, and the ongoing development of the Socialist Rule-of-Law State of Vietnam. Experience has demonstrated that streamlining the state administrative apparatus is not merely a mechanical reduction of organizational units. Rather, it is a purposeful and systematic process of restructuring aimed at clarifying functions and responsibilities, reducing intermediary layers, enhancing administrative performance, effectiveness, and efficiency of state management, and improving the quality of services provided to the people.

The current revolution in streamlining the state administrative apparatus should continue to be implemented comprehensively, encompassing institutional improvement, organizational restructuring, workforce reorganization, enhanced training and development for cadres and civil servants, accelerated administrative reform and digital transformation, and strengthened mechanisms for power control. Only on this basis can Vietnam build a state administration that is lean, streamlined, strong, high-performing, effective, and efficient, capable of meeting the requirements of rapid and sustainable national development in the new era.

References:

Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam. (2017). *Resolution No. 18-NQ/TW dated October 25, 2017, on continuing the reform and restructuring of the political*

system's organizational apparatus toward a streamlined, effective, and efficient model.

Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam. (2025). *Conclusion No. 121-KL/TW dated January 24, 2025, on the review of the implementation of Resolution No. 18-NQ/TW dated October 25, 2017, of the 12th Central Committee.*

Government. (2021). *Resolution No. 76/NQ-CP dated July 15, 2021, promulgating the Master Program on State Administrative Reform for the 2021 - 2030 period.*

National Assembly. (1946). *The 1946 Constitution.*

National Assembly. (1959). *The 1959 Constitution.*

National Assembly. (1980). *The 1980 Constitution.*

National Assembly. (1992). *The 1992 Constitution.*

National Assembly. (2013). *The 2013 Constitution.*

National Assembly. (2025). *Law on the Organization of the Government.*

National Assembly. (2025). *Law on the Organization of Local Government.*

National Assembly. (2025). *Resolution No. 202/2025/QH15 dated June 12, 2025, on the reorganization of provincial-level administrative units.*

National Assembly. (2025). *Resolution No. 176/2025/QH15 on the organizational structure of the government for the 15th National Assembly Term.*

National Assembly. (2025). *Resolution No. 203/2025/QH15 dated June 16, 2025, on amendments and supplements to several articles of the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.*

National Assembly. (2026). *Resolution No. 09/2026/QH16 dated April 7, 2026, on the organizational structure of the government for the 16th National Assembly Term.*

Prime Minister. (2001). *Decision No. 136/2001/QĐ-TTg dated September 17, 2001, approving the Master program on state administrative reform for the 2001 - 2010 period.*