

Journal of Public Policy and Administration (JPPA)

**MITOS as a Single Source of Truth: Enhancing Interoperability and Evidence-Based
Policymaking in Public Administration**

Lampros Lamprinidis

MITOS as a Single Source of Truth: Enhancing Interoperability and Evidence-Based Policymaking in Public Administration



Dr. Lampros Lamprinidis

PhD (Business Administration: Sector of Social Policy / Management), Member of the Social Administration Research Laboratory, University of West Attica

Executive of the General Directorate of Public Administrative Procedures of the Ministry of Interior, Greece

Article History

Received 18th February 2026

Received in Revised Form 21st March 2026

Accepted 24th April 2026



How to cite in APA format:

Lamprinidis, L. (2026). MITOS as a Single Source of Truth: Enhancing Interoperability and Evidence-Based Policymaking in Public Administration. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 11(1), 40–58.
<https://doi.org/10.47604/jppa.3723>

Abstract

Purpose: This paper examines the role of administrative process standardisation as a key driver of interoperability and policy coherence in contemporary public administration.

Methodology: The study adopts a qualitative case study approach, supported by descriptive analysis of administrative data, focusing on the Greek National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS).

Findings: The findings show that MITOS functions as a governance infrastructure rather than a simple registry, enabling interoperability, enhancing transparency, and supporting knowledge management, particularly under conditions of limited human resources.

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy: The study contributes by conceptualising administrative procedures as structured, data-enabled governance units and by introducing the concept of Administrative Process Intelligence, highlighting the importance of process-centric and knowledge-driven approaches to administrative reform. The findings also provide policy implications for digital government reform, interoperability design, and administrative coordination.

Keywords: *Administrative Procedures, Interoperability, Digital Government, Public Administration Reform, Knowledge Management, Single Source of Truth, MITOS*

JEL Classification: *H11, H83, D73, O38*

©2026 by the Authors. This Article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

INTRODUCTION

Public administration is undergoing a profound transformation driven by increasing societal complexity, rising citizen expectations, and rapid technological change. Contemporary governments are required to deliver services that are not only efficient and accessible but also transparent, consistent, and legally sound. However, despite decades of reform, public administration systems continue to face persistent structural challenges, including fragmentation of processes, overlapping responsibilities among public bodies, and inconsistencies in the implementation of administrative procedures.

These challenges are particularly evident in administrative systems where procedures are defined and applied differently across organisational units, leading to uncertainty for citizens and businesses, as well as inefficiencies within the public sector. The lack of a unified and authoritative reference point for administrative procedures often results in multiple interpretations of the same process, discrepancies in required documentation, and uneven service delivery. As a consequence, public administration struggles to achieve both interoperability and coherence.

Over the past decades, reform efforts have evolved from traditional bureaucratic models to New Public Management (NPM) and, more recently, to Public Governance approaches. While these paradigms have contributed to improving efficiency and coordination, they have not fully resolved the issue of procedural fragmentation. In parallel, digital transformation has been widely promoted as a solution to administrative inefficiencies. Nevertheless, existing research indicates that digitalisation alone cannot address structural problems when underlying administrative processes remain unstandardised and inconsistently defined.

This paper argues that a critical yet underexplored dimension of public administration reform lies in the **standardisation and centralisation of administrative process information**. Specifically, it introduces the concept of a “**Single Source of Truth**” for administrative procedures, defined as a unified, authoritative, and continuously updated repository that ensures consistency in how procedures are described, interpreted, and applied across the public sector.

To explore this concept, the paper examines the case of the Greek National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS), a legally established system that serves as the central reference point for all administrative procedures in Greece. Unlike traditional registries, MITOS provides structured, standardised, and reusable procedural information, which supports interoperability between public services, enhances transparency, and enables more coherent policy implementation.

The novelty of this study lies in positioning administrative process registries not merely as documentation tools but as **core governance infrastructures** that support evidence-based policymaking and administrative reform. By bridging insights from digital government, business process management, and public governance, the paper develops a conceptual framework that links procedural standardisation with interoperability and policy effectiveness.

Despite extensive reforms and the widespread adoption of digital government initiatives, significant gaps remain in the standardisation and coordination of administrative procedures. Existing approaches have primarily focused on organisational structures and technological solutions, while the role of procedural definition as a core governance element remains underexplored. As a result, fragmentation and inconsistencies continue to undermine interoperability and policy coherence.

This study addresses this gap by examining the concept of a Single Source of Truth (SSOT) for administrative procedures, using the case of the Greek National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS), and by providing a process-centric perspective on public administration through the introduction of Administrative Process Intelligence as a framework for analysing and improving governance systems, offering insights that are expected to benefit policymakers, public administration practitioners, and researchers by enhancing interoperability, supporting evidence-based policymaking, and strengthening administrative capacity. Building on this problem statement, the study identifies specific gaps in the existing literature that guide the research design.

However, important gaps remain in the existing literature. First, existing studies tend to focus on organisational structures or technological solutions, while the role of administrative procedures as core governance units remains underexplored. Second, the concept of interoperability is often approached as a technical issue, with limited attention to the importance of procedural alignment and standardisation. Third, there is a lack of empirical and conceptual integration between process standardisation, knowledge management, and policy coherence in public administration.

In response to these gaps, this study addresses the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How does the standardisation and centralisation of administrative procedures contribute to interoperability in public administration?
- **RQ2:** In what ways can a Single Source of Truth (SSOT) model enhance policy coherence and administrative coordination?
- **RQ3:** How does the MITOS system function as a governance infrastructure supporting knowledge management and evidence-based policymaking?

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical background, tracing the evolution from classical public administration to digital governance and highlighting the role of process standardisation. Section 3 develops the conceptual framework of “Single Source of Truth” in administrative systems. Section 4 analyses the case of MITOS, focusing on its institutional design, governance model, and role in interoperability. Section 5 discusses the implications of the 2025 reform linking administrative procedures with legislative processes. Finally, Section 6 concludes by outlining theoretical contributions and policy implications for contemporary public administration.

Theoretical Background: From Public Administration to Digital and Process-Centric Governance

The Evolution of Public Administration and the Weberian Paradigm

Public administration has historically constituted one of the fundamental institutional pillars of the modern state, serving as the mechanism through which political authority is translated into organised action. Its classical conceptualisation is closely associated with the work of Max Weber, who framed bureaucracy as the most rational and efficient form of organisation for complex societies (Weber, 1978). In Weber’s analysis, bureaucracy is characterised by hierarchical authority, formalised rules, clearly defined competencies, and the systematic documentation of administrative action. These elements were not accidental but were designed to ensure predictability, legal certainty, and impartiality in the exercise of public power.

Within this framework, administrative procedures play a central role. They constitute the

operational expression of legality, defining how decisions are taken, how services are delivered, and how citizens interact with the state. The standardisation of procedures was thus inherently linked to the rule of law: administrative action could only be considered legitimate if it followed predefined and transparent steps. In this sense, bureaucracy was not merely a technical system but a normative structure that guaranteed equality before the law.

However, the expansion of the welfare state during the 20th century, coupled with increasing socio-economic complexity, placed considerable strain on Weberian administrative systems. As the number of public policies and services increased, administrative procedures multiplied, often without sufficient coordination or standardisation. Over time, this led to a paradox: a system designed to ensure order and predictability became associated with rigidity, excessive formalism, and inefficiency. Bureaucracy began to be perceived not only as a guarantor of legality but also as an obstacle to responsiveness and innovation.

This tension between legality and efficiency lies at the heart of subsequent public administration reforms. The challenge has been to preserve the core values of bureaucracy—such as impartiality and accountability while addressing its structural limitations, particularly fragmentation and procedural complexity.

New Public Management: Efficiency, Managerialism, and Fragmentation

The reform wave that emerged from the late 1970s onwards, commonly referred to as New Public Management (NPM), sought to address the perceived inefficiencies of traditional bureaucracy by introducing managerial principles derived from the private sector. Scholars such as Christopher Hood identified NPM as a paradigm shift from rule-bound administration to performance-oriented management (Hood, 1991).

At its core, NPM promoted a reconfiguration of the public sector based on decentralisation, managerial autonomy, and the use of market-type mechanisms. Administrative units were encouraged to operate with greater flexibility, focusing on outputs and results rather than strict adherence to procedural rules. Performance indicators, benchmarking, and evaluation mechanisms became central tools for assessing effectiveness.

While NPM achieved notable improvements in efficiency and service delivery in certain contexts, it also introduced new challenges. One of the most significant consequences was the fragmentation of the administrative landscape. By decentralising responsibilities and promoting agency autonomy, NPM often weakened coordination mechanisms across the public sector. Different organisations developed their own practices, standards, and interpretations of administrative procedures, leading to inconsistencies and duplication.

Moreover, the emphasis on efficiency sometimes came at the expense of broader public values, such as equity, accountability, and coherence. The conceptualisation of citizens as “customers” shifted attention away from their role as rights-bearing individuals within a democratic system. As a result, while NPM addressed certain operational inefficiencies, it did not fully resolve and in some cases exacerbated the problem of procedural fragmentation.

This fragmentation is particularly relevant for the analysis of administrative procedures (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). When procedures are defined and implemented differently across organisational units, the predictability and uniformity of administrative action are undermined. Consequently, the need for renewed coordination and standardisation became increasingly evident.

Public Governance: Coordination, Networks, and Policy Coherence

In response to the limitations of NPM, the concept of Public Governance emerged as a broader and more integrative framework for understanding public administration (Osborne, 2010). Rather than focusing solely on efficiency or managerial performance, Public Governance emphasises the complexity of contemporary policy environments and the need for coordination among multiple actors.

Public administration is no longer viewed as a closed, hierarchical system but as part of a networked governance structure involving public institutions, private organisations, civil society, and supranational entities. Within this context, the role of the state evolves from that of a direct provider of services to that of a coordinator, regulator, and facilitator.

A central concern of Public Governance is **policy coherence**. Modern policy challenges such as digital transformation, social inclusion, and sustainable development cut across traditional administrative boundaries. Addressing these challenges requires integrated approaches that ensure consistency across different policy domains and administrative levels.

Administrative procedures occupy a critical position within this framework. They represent the operational layer through which policies are implemented. If procedures are inconsistent, unclear, or fragmented, policy coherence cannot be achieved, regardless of the quality of policy design. In this sense, the effectiveness of Public Governance depends not only on strategic coordination but also on the **standardisation and alignment of administrative processes**.

Furthermore, Public Governance places strong emphasis on transparency and accountability. Citizens must be able to understand how administrative processes function, what is required of them, and what outcomes they can expect. This reinforces the need for clear, accessible, and consistent procedural information across the public sector.

Digital Government and the Limits of Technological Solutions

The rise of digital technologies has been widely regarded as a transformative force in public administration. Initiatives under the umbrella of Digital Government or e-Government aim to improve efficiency, accessibility, and transparency through the use of information and communication technologies. International organisations such as the OECD and the European Commission have consistently highlighted digitalisation as a key driver of public sector innovation (OECD, 2020; United Nations, 2022).

Digital tools enable the automation of processes, the integration of data, and the provision of services through online platforms. They can significantly reduce administrative burden, improve service delivery times, and enhance user experience. Moreover, digital systems facilitate interoperability by enabling different administrative units to share and access information more effectively.

However, the transformative potential of digital government is contingent upon the quality of the underlying administrative structures. A critical insight from the literature is that digitalisation does not inherently resolve structural problems. When existing processes are poorly defined, fragmented, or inconsistent, their digitalisation may simply reproduce these deficiencies in a new form. In other words, digital technology can amplify both strengths and weaknesses.

This limitation has led to increasing recognition that digital transformation must be accompanied by organisational and procedural reform. Without standardised and clearly

defined processes, interoperability remains limited, and the benefits of digitalisation cannot be fully realised. Thus, the focus shifts from technology itself to the **governance of information and processes**.

Towards Process-Centric and Data-Driven Governance

Recent developments in public administration theory point towards a shift from organisation-centric to **process-centric governance**. In this perspective, the primary unit of analysis is not the administrative organisation but the procedure itself. Public administration is conceptualised as a system of interconnected processes that cut across institutional boundaries.

This approach aligns with insights from Business Process Management (BPM), which emphasise the importance of mapping, standardising, and optimising processes to improve organisational performance. When applied to the public sector, BPM highlights the need to clearly define administrative procedures, identify redundancies, and ensure consistency in implementation.

At the same time, the increasing availability of data has opened new possibilities for evidence-based policymaking. Structured procedural data can provide valuable insights into how administrative systems function, where bottlenecks occur, and how processes can be improved. This leads to the emergence of what can be described as **data-driven governance**, where decision-making is informed by systematic analysis of administrative processes.

Within this evolving landscape, the concept of a centralised and authoritative repository of administrative procedures becomes particularly significant. Such a system can serve as the foundation for standardisation, interoperability, and policy analysis. By ensuring that each procedure is defined once, updated in a single location, and applied uniformly, it addresses the core challenges of fragmentation and inconsistency. This process-centric perspective aligns with broader transformations in public management described as digital-era governance (Dunleavy et al., 2006).

From Digital Government to Administrative Process Intelligence

Building on the above developments, it is possible to identify an emerging paradigm that goes beyond traditional digital government: **Administrative Process Intelligence**. This concept refers to the systematic collection, structuring, and analysis of procedural information as a basis for governance and policy design.

Administrative Process Intelligence integrates three key dimensions:

- (i) the standardisation of administrative procedures,
- (ii) the centralisation of procedural information, and
- (iii) the use of structured data for analysis and decision-making.

Rather than treating procedures as static descriptions, this approach views them as dynamic, governable entities that can be monitored, evaluated, and improved over time. It enables a feedback loop between policy design and implementation, where insights derived from procedural data inform future reforms.

This paradigm provides the theoretical foundation for understanding systems such as national registries of administrative procedures. These systems are not merely technical tools but constitute **core infrastructures of modern governance**, linking legality, administration, and digital service delivery.

MITOS, Interoperability and the National Policy of Administrative Procedures (Final Version with Data & Knowledge Dimension)

This section combines conceptual analysis with empirical evidence to examine MITOS both as a governance model and as an operational system. Methodologically, the study adopts a qualitative case study approach supported by descriptive analysis of administrative data.

The development of the Greek National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS) constitutes the central institutional expression of the National Policy of Administrative Procedures (Ministry of Interior [Greece], n.d.), a systemic reform initiative designed to address structural deficiencies deeply embedded in the functioning of public administration. These deficiencies were not limited to inefficiencies in service delivery, but extended to a broader lack of coherence in the way administrative procedures were defined, interpreted, and operationalised across the public sector.

Prior to the introduction of this policy framework, administrative procedures were dispersed across legal texts, ministerial decisions, circulars, and internal administrative practices, without a unified mechanism for their systematic recording and validation. This resulted in multiple and often conflicting interpretations of the same procedure, creating inconsistencies in implementation, uncertainty for citizens, and inefficiencies within administrative organisations.

The National Policy of Administrative Procedures (Ministry of Interior [Greece], n.d.) was introduced as a comprehensive governance response, structured around three interrelated pillars: the National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS), the National Programme for Simplification of Procedures, and the Bureaucracy Observatory. These pillars form a continuous policy cycle in which administrative procedures are recorded, standardised, simplified, and evaluated, reflecting a transition towards a **process-centric and data-driven model of governance**.

Within this framework, MITOS operates as the foundational infrastructure, functioning as the national repository and the single authoritative reference point for administrative procedures. Its core contribution lies in transforming fragmented and often tacit administrative knowledge into **structured, codified, and reusable procedural information**, including process steps, legal basis, required documentation, timelines, costs, and service channels.

The scale of the system provides strong evidence of its institutionalisation. MITOS currently comprises¹ (see Appendix A) **4,264 documented procedures across 61 public sector entities**, supported by a broad network of users, including more than **2,600 active users**, as well as hundreds of editors, administrators, and supervisory roles. This level of adoption indicates that MITOS has evolved into a **large-scale administrative infrastructure**, embedded across organisational levels and capable of supporting horizontal coordination.

At the same time, the distribution of procedures across lifecycle stages, published, under processing, pending approval, and pending publication—demonstrates that the system is not static but continuously updated, reflecting ongoing regulatory activity. The predominance of published procedures indicates a high level of operational maturity in terms of validated content, while the presence of procedures in intermediate stages reflects active administrative engagement rather than systemic delay.

A critical development in the evolution of MITOS is the introduction, from 1 January 2025, of the **mandatory linkage mechanism between legislative acts (Government Gazette – FEK)**

and administrative procedures, which requires that no regulatory or legislative act can be published unless its impact on administrative procedures is explicitly declared and documented within MITOS.

The empirical evidence from the implementation of this mechanism (January–July 2025) provides particularly important insights. The distribution of procedures across stages (see Appendix A) shows that approximately² **84% of procedures are fully published**, while the remaining share is distributed across intermediate stages, including approximately **10% under processing, 3% pending approval, 2% pending publication, and only 1% classified as obsolete**.

The interpretation of these data is critical. Rather than indicating merely system maturity, the findings demonstrate that the FEK–MITOS linkage mechanism has been **fully integrated into the legislative workflow**, functioning as a **preventive and enabling instrument** rather than a control mechanism. The extremely high proportion of published procedures indicates that the mechanism does not introduce delays or bottlenecks in the regulatory process. On the contrary, it appears to **accelerate procedural maturation**, ensuring that only fully documented, validated, and administratively clear procedures proceed to publication.¹²

This is further supported by the distribution of procedures in intermediate stages. The presence of procedures “under processing” reflects the normal preparatory phase of regulatory production, while the relatively low numbers in approval and publication stages confirm that these phases operate as **quality filters rather than points of delay**. The negligible share of obsolete procedures indicates systematic updating and high data quality, reinforcing the reliability of MITOS as a procedural reference system.

From a governance perspective, the mechanism fundamentally transforms the relationship between legislation and administration. Administrative procedures are no longer implicit by-products of legal acts but become **explicit, structured, and mandatory components of the legislative process**. This ensures alignment between law and administrative implementation, prevents the emergence of undocumented procedures, and establishes MITOS as both a legal and operational reference point within the state.

The role of MITOS becomes even more significant when examined through the lens of interoperability. While interoperability is often conceptualised as a technical capability, the Greek case demonstrates that its primary precondition is **procedural alignment**. Without a shared and authoritative definition of administrative procedures, digital systems may exchange data but still produce inconsistent outcomes. MITOS addresses this challenge by ensuring that all administrative actors operate on the basis of a common procedural framework, thereby enabling semantic and organisational interoperability across systems and institutions.

This function is operationalised through the integration of MITOS with service delivery infrastructures such as gov.gr and the back-office systems of Citizen Service Centres (KEP), which rely on MITOS as the authoritative source of procedural information. As a result, service delivery becomes consistent across channels and locations, reducing administrative discretion and enhancing predictability.

At the European level, MITOS supports integration with platforms such as EUGO, Your

¹ https://en.mitos.gov.gr/index.php/Main_Page

² Author’s analysis based on administrative data

Europe, and the Single Digital Gateway, enabling Greece to provide harmonised and reliable procedural information for cross-border services. In this context, MITOS operates as a **national interoperability node**, linking domestic administrative processes with European digital governance infrastructures.

Beyond interoperability and regulatory alignment, MITOS plays a crucial role in **knowledge management within public administration**, particularly in the context of evolving human resource constraints. Public administrations across Europe are increasingly confronted with a dual challenge: **restricted recruitment policies and the gradual retirement of experienced personnel**. This creates a structural risk of knowledge loss, particularly in systems where administrative processes rely heavily on tacit knowledge and individual expertise.

MITOS directly addresses this challenge by transforming procedural knowledge into **explicit, structured, and institutionalised knowledge**. By capturing the full lifecycle of administrative procedures in a standardised format, it reduces dependence on individual memory and informal practices, ensuring continuity and consistency in administrative operations. In this sense, MITOS functions as a **repository of institutional memory**, enabling knowledge transfer across generations of public servants and supporting organisational resilience.

Moreover, this knowledge dimension has direct implications for administrative efficiency. When procedures are clearly documented and universally accessible, the need for internal clarification, repeated communication, and ad hoc interpretation is significantly reduced. This leads to a measurable reduction in administrative workload, improved response times, and more efficient use of limited human resources.

Taken together, the empirical evidence and institutional analysis demonstrate that MITOS operates simultaneously as a **knowledge infrastructure, an interoperability enabler, and a regulatory-embedded governance mechanism**. Its contribution extends beyond improving administrative efficiency, redefining the role of administrative procedures as structured, governable, and analytically exploitable entities. This transformation supports a broader transition towards a **process-centric and data-driven model of public administration**, in which governance capacity is increasingly determined by the quality, accessibility, and coherence of procedural knowledge.

The analysis presented in this section suggests that MITOS should not be interpreted merely as an administrative registry, but as a core governance infrastructure that redefines administrative procedures as the central unit of coordination in public administration. By integrating procedural standardisation, interoperability, and legislative alignment, MITOS introduces a model in which administrative processes become structured, governable, and analytically exploitable entities. This positions MITOS as a Single Source of Truth not only in technical terms, but as a foundational governance principle, with implications that extend beyond the Greek administrative context.

Discussion: MITOS as a Governance Innovation

The analysis presented in the previous sections allows for a broader theoretical interpretation of MITOS, moving beyond its description as a digital registry or administrative tool. The evidence suggests that MITOS constitutes a **governance innovation**, introducing a new model for structuring, managing, and coordinating administrative processes within the public sector.

At its core, MITOS redefines the role of administrative procedures. Traditionally, procedures have been treated as secondary elements of public administration—operational artefacts

derived from legislation and implemented within organisational units. In contrast, the MITOS model positions administrative procedures as **primary units of governance**, around which coordination, standardisation, and policy implementation are organised. This shift reflects a transition from organisation-centric to **process-centric governance**, where the effectiveness of public administration depends on the clarity, consistency, and accessibility of procedural knowledge.

A key theoretical contribution of this model lies in the introduction of the concept of a **Single Source of Truth (SSOT)** in public administration. While the notion of a single authoritative data source is well established in information systems literature, its application to administrative procedures represents a significant extension. In the MITOS framework, the SSOT principle is not limited to data consistency but becomes a **structural governance principle**, ensuring that all administrative actors operate based on a shared and validated definition of procedures. This eliminates the fragmentation that has traditionally characterised bureaucratic systems and establishes a common administrative reality across organisations. This interpretation is consistent with broader transformations in governance systems towards integrated and data-driven administrative models (Kettl, 2000).

The integration of MITOS within the legislative process, through the mandatory linkage mechanism between legislative acts and administrative procedures, further reinforces this interpretation. By requiring that procedural implications are explicitly defined before the adoption of legal acts, the system embeds procedural clarity within the policy formulation stage. This represents a shift from reactive to **anticipatory governance**, where administrative processes are designed and validated ex ante rather than adjusted ex post. The empirical evidence indicating high levels of procedural publication and limited bottlenecks suggests that this mechanism contributes not only to compliance but to the **acceleration of administrative clarity and regulatory maturity**.

Another important dimension of the MITOS model is its contribution to interoperability. The findings challenge the dominant view that interoperability is primarily a technical issue, demonstrating instead that it is fundamentally dependent on **procedural alignment**. By establishing a unified and authoritative representation of administrative procedures, MITOS enables semantic and organisational interoperability across systems and institutions. In this sense, interoperability is achieved not through technological integration alone but through the standardisation of administrative reality.

This insight has broader implications for digital government. Many digital transformation initiatives have focused on the digitisation of existing processes without addressing underlying inconsistencies in procedural definitions. The MITOS model suggests that effective digital transformation requires a reversal of this logic: **procedural standardisation must precede digitalisation**. Technology can then operate on a stable and coherent foundation, rather than reproducing fragmentation in digital form.

The role of MITOS as a knowledge infrastructure further extends its theoretical significance. By transforming tacit administrative knowledge into explicit, structured, and institutionalised information, the system enables a form of **institutionalised knowledge governance**. This goes beyond traditional knowledge management approaches, which often focus on storage and retrieval. In the MITOS model, knowledge is actively structured, validated, and integrated into decision-making processes, linking procedural information directly to regulatory production and administrative execution.

This function becomes particularly critical in the context of evolving human resource dynamics within public administration. The combination of restricted recruitment policies and the gradual retirement of experienced personnel creates a structural risk of knowledge loss and declining administrative capacity. By serving as a repository of institutional memory, MITOS mitigates this risk, ensuring continuity and consistency in administrative practice. At the same time, the standardisation of procedures reduces dependence on individual expertise, enabling organisations to operate more efficiently under conditions of limited human resources.

Taken together, these elements point towards a broader conceptual framework that can be described as **Administrative Process Intelligence**. This suggests that MITOS contributes to an emerging paradigm that may be conceptualised as Administrative Process Intelligence, where procedural data becomes a core asset for governance, policy design, and administrative coordination. Within this framework, administrative procedures are treated as structured, data-enabled entities that can be analysed, monitored, and continuously improved. MITOS provides the infrastructure necessary for such a model, enabling the systematic use of procedural data for policy design, evaluation, and reform.

From a theoretical perspective, this represents a convergence of three previously distinct domains: public administration, digital governance, and knowledge management. MITOS integrates these domains into a unified governance model, where procedural knowledge serves as the central organising principle. This integration challenges existing paradigms and suggests new directions for research, particularly in relation to the role of data and processes in shaping administrative systems.

Finally, the case of MITOS highlights the importance of embedding digital and organisational innovations within a broader policy and institutional framework. The success of the system is not solely attributable to its technical design but to its integration within the National Policy of Administrative Procedures and its linkage to the legislative process. This underscores the need to view digital government initiatives as **policy-driven governance transformations**, rather than isolated technological interventions.

In conclusion, MITOS represents a shift towards a new model of public administration, characterised by process-centricity, data-driven decision-making, and institutionalised knowledge. Its significance lies not only in its operational impact but in its potential to reshape how administrative systems are conceptualised and governed.

Policy Implications and Transferability

The analysis of MITOS as a governance model offers a range of policy implications that extend beyond the Greek administrative context, particularly in relation to digital transformation, interoperability, and administrative reform.

A first key implication concerns the **sequencing of reforms in public administration**. The findings of this study suggest that effective digital transformation cannot be achieved through the mere digitisation of existing processes. Instead, it requires prior **standardisation and structuring of administrative procedures**. The MITOS model demonstrates that digital systems should be built upon a stable and coherent procedural foundation, ensuring that services delivered through digital platforms are consistent, legally sound, and interoperable. This challenges prevailing policy approaches that prioritise technological solutions without addressing underlying procedural fragmentation.

A second implication relates to the **institutionalisation of procedural knowledge**. Public

administrations across Europe face increasing pressure due to demographic trends, including limited recruitment and the retirement of experienced personnel. In this context, the systematic recording and structuring of administrative procedures becomes a critical policy priority. MITOS illustrates how procedural knowledge can be transformed into a shared institutional resource, reducing dependence on individual expertise and ensuring continuity of administrative operations. This highlights the need for policies that integrate knowledge management into core administrative systems, rather than treating it as a supplementary function.

A third implication concerns the **integration of administrative processes into the legislative cycle**. The introduction of the FEK–MITOS linkage mechanism demonstrates that procedural clarity can be embedded within the regulatory process itself. By requiring that the impact of legislative acts on administrative procedures is explicitly defined before publication, the mechanism ensures alignment between law and implementation and prevents the emergence of fragmented or undocumented procedures. This suggests that similar mechanisms could be adopted in other administrative systems to strengthen regulatory quality and administrative coherence.

Furthermore, the MITOS model provides important insights into the **governance of interoperability** (Lamprinidis, 2026). Rather than treating interoperability as a purely technical challenge, the findings indicate that it should be approached as a matter of procedural alignment and governance design. Policies aiming to enhance interoperability should therefore prioritise the development of common procedural standards and authoritative data sources. This approach aligns with European initiatives such as the Single Digital Gateway and cross-border service integration, where the quality and consistency of procedural information are critical for effective implementation.

The potential for **transferability** of the MITOS model is particularly significant (Lamprinidis, 2025d). While administrative systems differ across countries, many face similar challenges related to fragmentation, complexity, and lack of coordination. The core principles underlying MITOS, centralisation of procedural knowledge, standardisation of processes, and integration with legislative and digital systems are not context-specific and can be adapted to different institutional environments.

However, successful transferability depends on certain preconditions. These include:

- strong institutional coordination across administrative bodies
- a clear legal framework supporting the authority of the central registry
- integration with existing digital infrastructures
- commitment to continuous updating and quality control of procedural data

Without these elements, the implementation of a similar model may remain incomplete or ineffective.

At the European level, the MITOS case offers a practical example of how national systems can support the broader objectives of **digital governance, interoperability, and administrative simplification**. By functioning as a national interoperability node and providing structured procedural data to European platforms such as EUGO and Your Europe, MITOS contributes to the development of a more integrated European administrative space (European Commission, 2020a, 2020b).

Finally, the analysis highlights the importance of adopting a **policy-driven approach to digital transformation**. The effectiveness of MITOS is not solely attributable to its technical design, but to its integration within a broader policy framework—the National Policy of Administrative Procedures—and its linkage to the legislative process. This suggests that future reforms should prioritise the alignment of policy, institutional design, and technological infrastructure, rather than focusing on isolated digital solutions.

In this sense, MITOS provides not only a national case study but a **reference model for process-centric and knowledge-driven public administration**, with relevance for both national and supranational governance contexts.

Conclusions

The development of the Greek National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS) constitutes a significant step towards a more transparent, efficient, and citizen-oriented public administration. As demonstrated throughout this paper, MITOS should not be understood merely as a digital registry, but as a **process-centric governance infrastructure** that integrates standardisation, interoperability, and knowledge management within a unified framework.

The significance of MITOS extends beyond the national level, as it has received international recognition for its innovative approach. Special mention should be made of the fact that the National Registry of Administrative Procedures (MITOS) has received a **“Special Recognition” distinction at the European Public Sector Award (EPSA) 2023**, organised by the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA). Furthermore, in March 2023, MITOS was identified as a **“best practice”** by the OECD in the report *“Effective Government Information Websites”* (OECD, 2023). These distinctions reinforce the positioning of MITOS not only as a national reform initiative but as an **emerging European benchmark for process standardisation and digital governance**.

Beyond its institutional recognition, the importance of MITOS is fundamentally societal. By providing clear, standardised, and publicly accessible information on administrative procedures, the system contributes to reshaping the relationship between citizens and the state. Administrative action becomes more predictable, transparent, and understandable, reducing uncertainty and strengthening trust. In this sense, MITOS supports the transition towards a **citizen-centred administration**, where the user is not a passive recipient but an informed and active participant.

This user-centric orientation is further enhanced by functionalities that enable interaction and feedback. Citizens can submit comments and observations regarding administrative procedures, while also having the option to receive updates when procedures are modified. This transforms MITOS from a static repository into a **dynamic governance interface**, fostering continuous improvement and responsiveness.

The impact of MITOS also extends to the economic sphere. By simplifying and clarifying administrative procedures, the system reduces transaction costs and administrative burden for economic actors. The impact of administrative simplification is particularly relevant for **start-ups and social cooperative enterprises**³, which often face significant barriers in navigating complex bureaucratic environments. By providing a clear and reliable procedural framework, MITOS contributes to a more favourable environment for economic activity and innovation.

Equally important is the contribution of MITOS to **transparency and the reduction of informal practices**. The standardisation and public visibility of procedures limit discretionary

interpretation and reduce opportunities for corruption, including informal payments (“speed money”). By making procedural requirements explicit and accessible, MITOS strengthens accountability and enhances the integrity of public administration.

At the same time, the long-term effectiveness of MITOS depends on **continuous institutional support and organisational adaptation**. The introduction of the FEK–MITOS linkage mechanism constitutes a crucial first step in embedding procedural standardisation within the legislative process. However, sustaining and expanding this model requires further efforts.

A key challenge lies in the **continuous updating of procedures**, particularly following changes in the legal framework. This constitutes a critical “Achilles’ heel” of the system. Without systematic and timely updates, the reliability of MITOS as a Single Source of Truth may be undermined. Addressing this challenge requires not only formal compliance mechanisms but a deeper transformation in organisational behaviour.

In this respect, reliance on disciplinary measures for non-compliance is unlikely to produce sustainable results. What is required instead is a **shift in organisational culture**, where public servants recognise the value of MITOS as a tool that enhances both administrative efficiency and service quality. This highlights the importance of **training and capacity-building**, ensuring that public officials can effectively use the platform both as users and as “owners” of administrative procedures.

In addition, there is a clear need for the **wider promotion of MITOS among citizens and businesses**, in order to increase awareness and utilisation. A governance system of this scale can only achieve its full potential if it is widely known and actively used by its intended beneficiaries.

Finally, the symbolic dimension of MITOS should not be overlooked. The name itself, attributed to Kyriakos Pierrakakis, draws inspiration from the mythological “thread of Ariadne,” which guided Theseus out of the labyrinth. In a similar way, the digital MITOS aims to guide both citizens and public servants through the complexity of administrative processes, offering a clear pathway out of what has long been perceived as a “labyrinth of bureaucracy.”³

MITOS represents a transformative approach to public administration, combining process standardisation, knowledge management, and interoperability within a unified governance framework. Its continued success will depend on sustained political commitment, continuous updating, organisational learning, and active engagement of both public servants and citizens. As such, MITOS should be understood not as a completed reform, but as an evolving governance infrastructure with the potential to reshape administrative systems and strengthen the relationship between the state and society.

This study has certain limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the analysis is based on a single-country case, which may limit the generalisability of the findings. Second, the empirical evidence relies on administrative data and descriptive analysis rather than causal inference. Third, the study focuses on the institutional and procedural dimensions of MITOS and does not include user-level or performance-based evaluation.

Future research could expand the analysis through comparative studies, quantitative performance indicators, and user experience data, as well as explore the application of similar

³ A broader body of work has examined these issues (Lamprinidis, 2023a, 2023b, 2023c, 2024, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2025e & 2025f)

process-centric governance models in different administrative contexts and the use of procedural data for advanced policy analytics.

Contribution to Theory, Policy and Practice

Contribution to Theory: This study conceptualises administrative procedures as structured governance units and introduces the concept of Administrative Process Intelligence.

Contribution to Policy: The findings highlight the role of procedural standardisation in enhancing interoperability and policy coherence within public administration.

Contribution to Practice: The study provides a governance model based on the MITOS system, supporting transparency, coordination, and knowledge management.

REFERENCES

- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead— Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–494.
- European Commission. (2020a). The European interoperability framework: Implementation strategy. Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission. (2020b). Regulation (EU) 2018/1724 establishing a single digital gateway. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19.
- Kettl, D. F. (2000). The global public management revolution: A report on the transformation of governance. Brookings Institution Press.
- Lamprinidis, L. (2023a). The EU model of socially responsible public procurement. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 8(3), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.47604/jppa.1852>
- Lamprinidis, L. (2023b). Challenges of the Social Economy Action Plan for Greece in the light of socially responsible public procurement. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 8(2), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.47604/jppa.1843>
- Lamprinidis, L. (2023c). Social Impact Bonds and Socially Responsible Public Procurement in the 21st Century. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 8(3), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.47604/jppa.1895>
- Lamprinidis, L. (2024). Socially responsible public procurement as a tool for the development of the social economy (Doctoral dissertation). University of West Attica. <https://doi.org/10.12681/eadd/56439>
- Lamprinidis, L. (2025a). Socially responsible public procurement as a tool for the development of the social economy. Papazisis Editions. ISBN: 978-960-02-4444-1
- Lamprinidis, L. (2025b). Socially responsible public procurement and the social economy: European and global institutional approaches. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 10(1), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.47604/jppa.3297>
- Lamprinidis, L. (2025c). Social entrepreneurship and social security: Synergies for sustainable social policy. *Market Economy: Modern Management Theory and Practice*, 24(2), 9–28. [https://doi.org/10.18524/2413-9998.2025.2\(60\).331666](https://doi.org/10.18524/2413-9998.2025.2(60).331666)
- Lamprinidis, L. (2025d). Participation in the international policy exchange programme PACE – Public Administration Cooperation Exchange: Advancing public administration reform in Greece and Italy. European Commission (TAIEX / Technical Support Instrument), Rome, Italy, 11–12 December 2025.
- Lamprinidis, L. (2025e). The implementation of socially responsible public procurement in Greece: barriers and prospects for Social Economy Entities. (2025). *European Journal of Government and Economics*, 14(2), 235-256. <https://doi.org/10.17979/ejge.2025.14.2.12026>
- Lamprinidis, L. (2025f). *Participation of women in shipping: International strategies, comparative analysis and policy proposals for Greece*. *International Journal of Gender Studies*, 10(2), 15–42. <https://doi.org/10.47604/ijgs.3559>

- Lamprinidis, L. (2026). MITOS as a Single Source of Truth: Enhancing interoperability in public administration procedures [Conference presentation]. Interoperability Roadshow in Greece (IOPEU), Ministry of Digital Governance (Greece) & European Commission, Athens, 17–18 February 2026.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Ministry of Interior (Greece). (n.d.). National Policy of Administrative Procedures. <https://diadikasies.gov.gr/>
- Ministry of Interior (Greece). (n.d.). National Registry of Administrative Procedures. <https://mitos.gov.gr>
- OECD. (2020). Digital government index: 2019 results. OECD Publishing. OECD. (2023). Effective government information websites. OECD Publishing.
- Osborne, S. P. (Ed.). (2010). The new public governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance. Routledge.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). Public management reform: A comparative analysis (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- United Nations. (2022). E-government survey 2022: The future of digital government. United Nations.
- Weber, M. (1978). Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.

Appendix A. Statistical Overview of the MITOS System and FEK–MITOS Linkage Mechanism

This appendix presents the statistical data supporting the empirical analysis of the MITOS system, distinguishing between (a) overall system scale and usage, and (b) the implementation of the FEK–MITOS linkage mechanism.

A.1 Overall System Statistics (MITOS Registry)

The MITOS system demonstrates significant institutional adoption and operational scale across the Greek public administration.

Table A1: MITOS System Overview

Indicator	Value
Total documented procedures	4,264
Public sector entities involved	61
Active users	2,600
Procedure editors (authors)	1,542
Administrators	914
Executive users	127
Supervisors	17

These figures indicate that MITOS functions as a **large-scale administrative infrastructure**, with broad participation across organisational levels.

A.2 Distribution of Procedures by Lifecycle Stage

The system includes procedures at different stages of development and validation, reflecting its dynamic and continuously updated nature.

Table A2: Distribution of Procedures

Stage	Number of Procedures
Published	4,264
Under processing	763
Pending approval	155
Pending publication	114

The predominance of published procedures suggests a high level of **operational maturity**, while the presence of procedures in intermediate stages reflects ongoing administrative activity.

A.3 FEK–MITOS Linkage Mechanism (January–July 2025)

The following data relate specifically to the implementation of the mandatory linkage between legislative acts (FEK) and administrative procedures.

Table A3: Distribution by Status (%)

Status	Percentage
Published	84%
Under processing	10%
Pending approval	3%
Pending publication	2%
Obsolete	1%

These data indicate that the mechanism has been effectively integrated into the legislative workflow, with a high proportion of procedures reaching the publication stage and minimal presence of obsolete entries.

A.4 Analytical Note

It should be noted that:

- The data presented in **Tables A1–A2** reflect the **overall scale and operational status** of the MITOS system.
- The data in **Table A3** relate specifically to the **FEK–MITOS linkage mechanism** and should not be interpreted as a comprehensive measure of total system completeness.

This distinction is methodologically important for the interpretation of empirical findings presented in Section 3.