

INNOVATING THE FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LAW UNDER RESOLUTION NO. 66-NQ/TW: THE INSTITUTIONAL PILLAR FOR REALIZING THE FOUR STRATEGIC BREAKTHROUGHS IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Abstract:

This article analyzes Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW in relation to the Party's "four pillar resolutions," employing an interdisciplinary approach and applying analytical–synthetic, doctrinal, and policy analysis methods. It explains why innovating the formulation and implementation of law is regarded as the "breakthrough of all breakthroughs" in the process of building a socialist rule-of-law state and implementing the Development Strategy to 2030 with a vision to 2045. Based on an examination of Party documents, legal instruments, and relevant scholarly works, the article clarifies the role of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW as the "institutional pillar" for the four strategic breakthroughs: (i) improving the development institution; (ii) developing human resources, especially high-quality personnel; (iii) building synchronous and modern infrastructure; and (iv) developing science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation. Accordingly, the article proposes several recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW, focusing on refining the legal architecture associated with the four breakthroughs, innovating the mechanisms for law implementation toward data- and results-based governance, strengthening resource guarantees, and promoting the role of two-tier local governments as well as broader social participation.

Keywords: Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW, formulation and implementation of law, institutional pillar, four strategic breakthroughs, socialist rule-of-law state.

1. Introduction

During the 2021–2026 period, Viet Nam has entered a new development trajectory amid a rapidly changing, complex, and unpredictable international environment. Strategic competition among major powers, shifts in global supply chains, local conflicts, and crises in energy, food, and finance have intensified, alongside strong trends of green transition and digital transformation. Domestically, the economy has had to both recover from the Covid-19 pandemic

and address long-standing structural constraints, including institutional quality, labor productivity, infrastructure development, human resource quality, and discipline and order in the implementation of law. The Government’s review report for the 2021–2026 term highlights that the requirements of rapid and sustainable development, while maintaining political and social stability, impose significant demands for innovating the growth model, improving the institutional framework, and enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of national governance (Government, 2025).

In this context, the demand for an “institutional breakthrough” emerges as a prerequisite for unlocking development resources. This requires not merely the enactment of additional laws, ordinances, and decrees, but a fundamental transformation in the formulation and implementation of law—addressing overlaps, inconsistencies, and the prevalence of “framework laws” and “blanket laws,” as well as legal gaps; while simultaneously reinforcing discipline and order in law enforcement at both the central and local levels.

To meet development requirements in the new era, the Central Committee has issued a set of four pillar resolutions, comprising: Resolution No. 57-NQ/TW on science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation; Resolution No. 59-NQ/TW on international integration in the new context; Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW on innovating the formulation and implementation of law; and Resolution No. 68-NQ/TW on private sector development. These resolutions are designed to provide a strategic orientation framework for the implementation of the four strategic breakthroughs: (i) improving the development institution; (ii) developing human resources, particularly high-quality personnel; (iii) building synchronous and modern infrastructure; and (iv) advancing science, technology, and innovation.

Within this set, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW holds a particularly significant position, exerting direct influence on the institutional pillar. The Resolution identifies the formulation and implementation of law as the “breakthrough of all breakthroughs” in improving the development institution. It emphasizes the need for stronger linkages between lawmaking and law enforcement, enhanced power control, and the prevention and combat of corruption and negative practices throughout both the legislative and enforcement processes, while promoting digital transformation across the entire policy and legal lifecycle. The Government’s

Action Programme for implementing Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW (Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP) further translates these orientations into concrete tasks, solutions, and roadmaps for the state administrative apparatus at both the central and local levels. Thus, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW may be seen as both a connecting point and a foundational anchor. It provides the institutional basis for realizing all four strategic breakthroughs; simultaneously, the success or failure of efforts to innovate the formulation and implementation of law under Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW will determine the overall effectiveness of the four-pillar resolutions as a whole.

The article primarily employs qualitative research methods grounded in an interdisciplinary approach that integrates legal studies, political science, public administration, and institutional economics. First, analytical–synthetic methods and the doctrinal approach are applied to clarify the content, structure, and internal logic of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW in relation to the Documents of the 13th Party Congress and other pillar resolutions, thereby elucidating the position of lawmaking and law enforcement as the “institutional pillar” within the national development strategy. Next, the systems–structural method is used to connect theoretical and practical arguments drawn from domestic studies as well as reports and recommendations of the OECD, the World Bank, the United Nations, and others, thereby forming an analytical framework for the “ecosystem of lawmaking and law enforcement.” Concurrently, the article employs policy analysis and comparative approaches to identify similarities and differences among various perspectives on development institutions, from which insights are generated for institutional design and the organization of law implementation in line with the spirit of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW in the coming period.

2. Research Context

International studies on institutions, the rule of law, and development have established a relatively solid theoretical foundation for understanding the role of law as an “institutional pillar” of long-term growth. North (North D.C, 1990) conceptualizes formal and informal institutions—with the legal system at the core—as “humanly devised constraints” that shape actors’ incentives and behavior, thereby determining economic performance. Building on this foundation, Acemoglu and Robinson (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012) distinguish between

100 inclusive and extractive institutions, emphasizing that inclusive institutions—
101 associated with the rule of law, protection of property rights, competition, and
102 mechanisms of power control—are essential for unlocking creative and innovative
103 capacities.

104 In the same line of research, the World Bank’s *World Development Report*
105 *2017: Governance and the Law* (WB, 2017) and OECD recommendations on
106 regulatory policy and governance (OECD, 2011) identify the gap between “law on
107 the books” and “law in practice” as a major cause of policy failure. Accordingly,
108 these studies propose viewing law as a closed policy cycle encompassing impact
109 assessment, consultation, promulgation, implementation, inspection–examination,
110 and post-review. United Nations (UN, 2019) and UNDP (UNDP, 2014) documents
111 on the rule of law and “legal empowerment” likewise underscore the relationship
112 between legal reform, the capacity of judicial and administrative institutions, and
113 the protection of human rights in sustainable development.

114 In Viet Nam, numerous studies have approached the improvement of
115 development institutions, the building of a socialist rule-of-law state, and the
116 innovation of lawmaking and law enforcement from various perspectives. At the
117 level of political orientation, the Documents of the 13th Party Congress identify the
118 “comprehensive improvement of development institutions” and the building of a
119 socialist rule-of-law state as central tasks, viewing the quality of the legal system
120 as a decisive condition for realizing the strategic breakthroughs (Communist Party
121 of Viet Nam, 2021). Building on this orientation, (Vuong, 2022, pp 3-11)
122 emphasizes the need to continue innovating the legislative activities of the National
123 Assembly in order to establish a solid legal framework for development and
124 integration, including solutions such as the “one law to amend multiple laws”
125 approach to promptly address institutional bottlenecks. Nguyen Minh Doan
126 (NguyenM.D, 2023, pp 3-10) focuses on the heightened requirements for the
127 capacity and responsibility of law-making actors in a socialist rule-of-law state,
128 ranging from policy analysis abilities to evidence-based regulatory design skills.
129 Other scholars propose renewing legislative thinking by shifting from a
130 “management-oriented” mindset to a “development-enabling” mindset, viewing
131 legislation as a highly professionalized activity closely linked to empirical review
132 and long-term forecasting.

From the perspectives of human rights, law enforcement, and the culture of the rule of law, Duong Van Quy (DuongV.Q, 2024) links the protection of human rights to the legislative process, emphasizing the need to concretize constitutional rights and harmonize domestic legislation with international standards. Ha Thi Lan Phuong and Ngo Thi Phuong Thao (HaT.L.P& NgoT.P.T, 2025) propose new orientations for developing legislation on public service ethics, viewing this as a soft foundation for the socialist rule-of-law state and a modern civil service. Meanwhile, Dang Hoang Anh (DangH.A, 2025) analyzes international experience in building a legal culture in road traffic, thereby clarifying the role of legal knowledge, respect for the law, and compliance behavior in the “internalization” of legal norms.

In parallel, numerous studies focus on key areas of development institutions: mobilizing resources for urban infrastructure (DuD.H, 2021); the role of the State in the land sector; reforming land policies to create momentum for socio-economic development; developing infrastructure through public–private partnerships (PPP); financial mechanisms for railway transport; and so forth. Research on science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation (Ngo T.C, 2022; Pham T.T& Chu. T.L.A, 2023) elucidates existing limitations in R&D investment and the science–technology market, as well as the need to improve policies and laws to transform science–technology, innovation, and digital transformation into core pillars of development.

Overall, domestic studies have contributed significantly to clarifying: (i) the requirements for improving development institutions and building a socialist rule-of-law state; (ii) innovations in legislative thinking and methods; (iii) the interrelationships among lawmaking, human rights protection, public service ethics, and the culture of the rule of law; and (iv) institutional “bottlenecks” in major development pillars such as land, infrastructure, science–technology, digital transformation, and public-sector human resource development. However, most existing studies approach these issues as relatively separate “institutional components” (legislation, human resources, land, PPP, science–technology, etc.) and have not yet considered lawmaking and law enforcement as a unified “institutional ecosystem” directly linked to the four strategic breakthroughs. Notably, to date, there have been virtually no studies that systematically analyze

Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW as an “institutional pillar” within the “set of four pillar resolutions” on science–technology, digital transformation, lawmaking and law enforcement, and private sector development in Viet Nam; nor have studies explained the role of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW in connecting legal design with law implementation toward data-driven and results-based governance.

3. Discussion

3.1. Core Innovations of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW on Lawmaking and Law Enforcement

3.1.1. Guiding viewpoints and the “new mindset” regarding the role of lawmaking and law enforcement in Viet Nam

First, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW unequivocally affirms the Party’s comprehensive and direct leadership over the lawmaking process, while simultaneously strengthening its leadership over law enforcement. Lawmaking and law enforcement are situated within the overall mission of building and perfecting a socialist rule-of-law state “of the people, by the people, and for the people,” closely linked with the requirements of power control; the prevention and combat of corruption, wastefulness, negative practices, and group interests; and the promotion of the supervisory and social criticism role of the Viet Nam Fatherland Front as well as the substantive participation of citizens and enterprises.

A strategic highlight of the Resolution is the identification of lawmaking and law enforcement as the “breakthrough of all breakthroughs” in perfecting the development institution in the new era. Accordingly, lawmaking and law enforcement are not merely technical stages in the state management process but constitute a central institutional driver that opens pathways, unlocks all development resources, and creates national competitive advantages—directly connected to the goals of building a socialist rule-of-law state and achieving rapid and sustainable development.

The Resolution also reflects a distinctly new legislative mindset. Lawmaking must be “rooted in Viet Nam’s practical realities,” grounded in overarching national interests while selectively absorbing the legal achievements of humanity. It views institutions and law as foundational elements and drivers of economic

growth, including the ambition to create institutional space to promote double-digit economic expansion.

With respect to law enforcement, the Resolution emphasizes the need to build a culture of legal compliance, ensuring that respect for the Constitution and the law becomes a behavioral norm for all actors in society. It underscores the spirit of serving the people, the development-enabling mindset of public officials and civil servants, and the principle that “citizens and enterprises may do whatever is not prohibited by law.”

Another highly significant innovation is the affirmation of the viewpoint that “investment in policy and lawmaking is investment in development.” The State must prioritize resources, modernize technical infrastructure, accelerate digital transformation, and adopt exceptional mechanisms and policies for strategic research, policymaking, and lawmaking, as well as for the personnel performing these tasks. This marks a fundamental shift from the traditional perception that the legal sector primarily constitutes recurrent expenditure and generates little direct “value added.”

On that foundation, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW highlights the need for close linkage between lawmaking and law enforcement, viewing law enforcement as the substantive measure of institutional quality and an essential feedback channel for improving the law. The requirement to “closely integrate lawmaking and law enforcement” becomes a consistent guiding principle, further specified in the Government’s Action Programme under Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP.

3.1.2. Goals for 2030 and Vision to 2045 for Viet Nam’s Legal System and Law Enforcement Effectiveness

With respect to medium-term goals, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW sets the requirement that by 2030, Viet Nam shall have a democratic, equitable, coherent, unified, public, transparent, and enforceable legal system, accompanied by a rigorous and consistent enforcement mechanism. This legal system must both provide a legal basis for the regular, continuous, and seamless functioning of the state apparatus following organizational restructuring, and promptly remove obstacles arising from practice, thereby paving the way for development-enabling governance and mobilizing all societal resources for socio-economic development.

The Resolution also links legal objectives with national development goals toward 2030. Accordingly, Viet Nam is to become a developing country with a modern industry and upper-middle income status by that time. To achieve this, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW identifies several specific benchmarks: by 2025, fundamental resolution of institutional “bottlenecks” caused by legal regulations; by 2027, completion of amendments, supplements, and new promulgation of legal instruments to ensure a coherent legal foundation for the new model of governmental organization; and by 2028, completion of the legal framework on investment and business, placing Viet Nam’s investment environment among the leading group in the region. The Government’s Action Programme in Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP further concretizes these goals into detailed indicators and tasks, requiring ministries, sectors, and local authorities to develop action plans, review and address legal bottlenecks, and improve laws on the socialist-oriented market economy, state apparatus streamlining, decentralization and devolution, science and technology, innovation, and digital transformation.

In terms of long-term vision, by 2045, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW sets the goal of establishing a high-quality, modern legal system aligned with advanced international standards and practices while remaining suitable to Viet Nam’s conditions, and implemented in a strict, consistent manner that respects, guarantees, and effectively protects human rights and citizens’ rights. By that time, respect for the Constitution and the law shall become a universal behavioral norm in society, and national governance shall be based on a streamlined, effective, and efficient state apparatus capable of meeting the requirements of transforming Viet Nam into a developed, high-income country oriented toward socialism by 2045.

The objectives of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW extend beyond merely “completing the system of legal instruments”; they aim to build a coherent and effectively functioning ecosystem of law and law enforcement that is directly aligned with the country’s strategic development milestones for 2025, 2027, 2028, 2030, and the 2045 vision. This ecosystem comprises:

- (i) A coherent, unified, and enforceable system of legal norms that converges with international standards while remaining compatible with Viet Nam’s practical conditions;

- (ii) Institutions and actors responsible for lawmaking, law enforcement, and oversight that are streamlined, effective, and efficient, from the central level to the two tiers of local government;
- (iii) A policy–legislation–implementation–oversight–feedback cycle that operates seamlessly and is driven by data and results;
- (iv) A cultural foundation of the rule of law, public service ethics, and societal awareness of legal compliance; and
- (v) Mechanisms ensuring financial resources, human resources, and digital infrastructure commensurate with the role of lawmaking and law enforcement as the “institutional pillar” of the national development strategy.

3.1.3. Major Groups of Tasks and Solutions under Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW

Based on the guiding viewpoints and objectives outlined above, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW sets forth a relatively comprehensive system of tasks and solutions, which may be summarized into several major groups below (further operationalized in the Government’s Action Programme under Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP):

First, ensuring the Party’s leadership in lawmaking and law enforcement; strengthening power control and preventing corruption, negative practices, and “group interests” in both legislation and implementation. The Resolution requires Party committees at all levels to exercise comprehensive and direct leadership over the institutionalization of the Party’s guidelines and orientations; to regard the formulation and improvement of institutions and laws, as well as inspection and supervision of law enforcement, as central and regular tasks of central ministries and agencies. It simultaneously emphasizes personal accountability of heads of agencies, linking performance in lawmaking and law enforcement with cadre evaluation and appointment, and tightening discipline and order to prevent all forms of profiteering or policy manipulation.

Second, reforming legislative thinking and orientation: shifting from a “management-oriented” approach to a “development-enabling” approach. The Resolution calls for definitively abandoning the mindset of “prohibiting what cannot be managed,” and for developing laws that simultaneously meet state

management requirements and encourage creativity, unlock productive forces, and mobilize all development resources. It stresses the importance of early and forward-looking policy research based on empirical review and international experience; improving the quality of impact assessment, forecasting, and policy selection; and strengthening policy communication as well as mechanisms for receiving and responding to public feedback.

Third, improving the organizational apparatus and the workforce responsible for lawmaking and law enforcement: professionalization, incentives, and the cultivation of high-quality human resources. The Resolution introduces several breakthrough personnel solutions: ensuring that leadership structures in ministries and sectors include officials with legal expertise; strengthening rotation and secondment of legal officials between the central and local levels; adopting special, preferential policies to attract, employ, and remunerate highly qualified legal experts; enhancing the quality of legal education and strictly controlling substandard law training institutions; and upgrading institutions responsible for strategic legal and policy research.

Fourth, enhancing the effectiveness of law enforcement; improving procedures and coordination mechanisms; diversifying implementation methods; and promoting robust application of digital technologies. The Resolution requires prioritizing effective law enforcement in areas associated with new growth drivers (science and technology, innovation, digital transformation, social protection, environment, etc.). It also emphasizes building a culture of legal compliance; strengthening communication, dissemination, and education on the law through digital platforms; expanding legal explanation and guidance; promoting dialogue and timely handling of feedback and recommendations; regularly assessing post-promulgation enforcement effectiveness; and developing mechanisms to detect and promptly address legal “bottlenecks” through data-driven and digital tools.

Fifth, strengthening inspection, examination, oversight, and accountability in the formulation and implementation of law; and expanding the oversight roles of the National Assembly, the Viet Nam Fatherland Front, the public, the press, and the business community. The Resolution directs the intensification of inspection, review, and systematization of legal normative documents; enhancement of post-promulgation review and enforcement monitoring; and the close combination of

prevention with timely detection and strict handling of violations, especially corruption, negative practices, abuse of power, and avoidance of responsibility. At the same time, it emphasizes the principle of avoiding the criminalization of economic and civil relations and refraining from using administrative measures to unlawfully intervene in civil and economic disputes.

Sixth, ensuring resources and conditions for implementation: viewing investment in lawmaking and law enforcement as investment in development, in line with the Government’s Action Programme (Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP). The Resolution requires a fundamental reform of financial mechanisms for lawmaking and law enforcement; ensuring that budget resources are allocated “accurately, adequately, and in a timely manner,” linked to performance and outputs; establishing a fund to support policy and law development through a combination of state budget resources and socialized contributions; prioritizing funding for legal dissemination, education, and legal aid for vulnerable groups; and investing in information technology infrastructure, big data systems, artificial intelligence applications, and digital transformation throughout the entire policy and legal lifecycle.

Taken together, these groups of tasks and solutions demonstrate that Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW does not aim merely at “technical adjustments” to individual laws or discrete procedures, but seeks to comprehensively restructure the entire ecosystem of lawmaking and law enforcement. In this ecosystem, the legal framework, organizational institutions, policy processes, oversight and accountability mechanisms, rule-of-law culture, and the resources for legal activities are designed and operated as an integrated whole aligned with the four strategic breakthroughs. In other words, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW aims to transform lawmaking and law enforcement from a “functional stage” into an institutional ecosystem that directly serves national development objectives toward 2030 with a vision to 2045.

3.2. Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW – The Institutional Pillar for Realizing the Four Strategic Breakthroughs

Before delving into each strategic breakthrough, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW should be understood through the lens of a “law–law enforcement ecosystem.” This ecosystem is not merely a collection of laws, decrees, and circulars, but an

integrated whole comprising: a development-oriented legal framework; institutions responsible for lawmaking, law enforcement, inspection, and oversight; data-driven policy processes; digital tools for monitoring, evaluation, and feedback; and, importantly, the culture of the rule of law and the human resources embedded within this system. When Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW operates upon the four breakthrough pillars, it simultaneously enhances each “layer” of the law–law enforcement ecosystem, ensuring that law truly becomes the institutional infrastructure for development.

3.2.1. In Relation to the Breakthrough on Improving Development Institutions

First, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW positions lawmaking and law enforcement as the “breakthrough of all breakthroughs” in improving development institutions, directly continuing the orientation set by the Documents of the 13th Party Congress, which identify the quality of the legal system as one of the decisive conditions for implementing six central tasks and the three strategic breakthroughs (institutional improvement, human resource development, and synchronous infrastructure building). The 13th Party Congress Documents emphasize the need to “continue to comprehensively improve development institutions, establishing a solid legal framework for rapid and sustainable national development,” while removing obstacles and addressing “internal weaknesses of the economy that have been significantly affecting socio-economic development and environmental protection” (Communist Party of Viet Nam, 2021, Vol. II, pp. 6–7). Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW concretizes this orientation by affirming that “lawmaking and law enforcement constitute the ‘breakthrough of all breakthroughs’ in improving the development institution in the new era,” and by identifying this as a central mission in the process of building and perfecting the socialist rule-of-law state of Viet Nam (Section I.2).

Second, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW directly targets the removal of institutional “bottlenecks” by requiring that by 2025, Viet Nam “basically complete the removal of bottlenecks caused by legal regulations”; by 2027, complete the legal foundation for the new model of state organizational apparatus; and by 2028, complete the legal system on investment and business sufficient to place Viet Nam’s investment environment among the top three in ASEAN (Section II.1). This

approach continues the logic of “developmental institutions,” viewing the need to “continue strongly renewing the legislative activities of the National Assembly to build and improve a coherent legal framework, and to overcome overlaps, inconsistencies, gaps, shortages, and loopholes in the law” as a prerequisite for unlocking resources and creating new drivers of growth (Vuong D.H, 2022).

Third, on that foundation, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW expands the connotation of “improving development institutions” by orienting toward the creation of a multi-layered “developmental legal architecture” that encompasses the socialist-oriented market economy institution, the institution for science–technology development, innovation and digital transformation, the green economy, the circular economy, and the exploitation of data assets and tokenized assets. Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW calls for “focusing on developing laws on science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation, creating a legal corridor for new and non-traditional issues (artificial intelligence, digital transformation, green transition, data resource exploitation, tokenized assets...) in order to form new growth drivers, promote the development of new productive forces and new industries” (Section III.2). This directly aligns with the 13th Party Congress viewpoint requiring a “timely review, amendment, and supplementation of mechanisms and policies that are inadequate, contradictory, overlapping, insufficient, or exceeding actual needs; and, when necessary, the adoption of one law to amend multiple laws to remove bottlenecks that hinder development” (Communist Party of Viet Nam, 2021, Vol. II, p. 39).

Fourth, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW closely links the improvement of development institutions with the reform of legislative methods, emphasizing the requirement to “attach importance to and proactively conduct strategic and policy research early, based on practice and international experience.” It clearly distinguishes between the policy development process and the drafting process, mandates centralized and professionalized drafting of legal normative documents, and treats policy impact assessment, empirical review, and comparative international research as mandatory components—thereby “scientificizing” the legislative process (Section III.2). At the strategic level, this is consistent with the orientation of “continuing to strongly renew legislative activities” set out in the dissemination materials of the 13th Party Congress, which stress the need to

enhance the predictability, coherence, uniformity, and feasibility of the legal system as core criteria of a “developmental institution” (Vuong D.H, 2022).

3.2.2. In Relation to the Breakthrough on Human Resource Development, Especially High-Quality Human Resources

First, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW identifies the professionalization of the workforce engaged in lawmaking and law enforcement as a central element of the human resource breakthrough. Accordingly, the Implementation Plan for Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW emphasizes the adoption of special and exceptional policies on recruitment, remuneration, and contracting of experts; extending the working period (without holding leadership positions) for officials who have reached retirement age but possess high qualifications and extensive practical experience in lawmaking; attracting leading legal scholars, jurists, and lawyers into the public sector; and providing 100% salary support for personnel directly and regularly engaged in strategic advisory work, policymaking, and legal drafting (Section 5). This requirement is consistent with the view that achieving a high-quality legal system necessitates strengthening the capacity and responsibility of lawmaking actors at all stages—from policy analysis, drafting, appraisal, and verification to the adoption of legal instruments (Nguyen M.D, 2023, pp. 3–4). At the same time, legislative mindset reform is identified as an urgent requirement of the “new era,” emphasizing the professionalism of policy developers and the codification of policy as a “profession” that demands high-level expertise and skills (Tran T.Q, 2025, pp. 184–185).

Second, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW links the human resource breakthrough with the requirement to fundamentally reform the organization of law enforcement in the fields of education, training, utilization, and human resource development. From a human rights perspective, numerous studies show that lawmaking must ensure and promote the realization of fundamental rights, including the rights to education, development, and participation in socio-economic life. Therefore, improving legislation on education, vocational training, employment policies, and social security is essential for creating a legal environment that encourages lifelong learning, enhances skills, and supports the mobility and effective utilization of human resources (Duong V.Q, 2024). In this sense, the requirement to “renew legislative thinking” goes beyond legislative technique; it entails rethinking the

approach to human beings as the “most precious value” that the law must respect, protect, and enable to develop comprehensively (Nguyen M.D, 2023). This perspective further clarifies the role of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW in linking the breakthrough in institutional improvement with the breakthrough in human resource development. A well-designed institutional framework, grounded in respect for and protection of human rights, is a prerequisite for shaping and developing a high-quality workforce that can serve the nation’s development goals.

At the same time, in the public sector, the training, utilization, and attraction of talent are recognized as core components of the human resource breakthrough—especially for the cadre of leaders and managers, who must possess outstanding professional competence, strong moral character, strategic vision, and the capacity to unite and lead the implementation of national policies and development orientations (Nguyen. T.N; Nguyen V. C; Ha T. T., & Hoang, V. H, 2024, pp. 266–269). The recent trend of capable public officials and civil servants moving to the private sector is an alarming signal, indicating that without timely policy reforms, the public sector will struggle to retain the “vitality of the nation,” particularly in key areas such as governance, science–technology, and public service delivery (Nguyen H.K& Le T.N.M, 2023, pp. 43–46). Research on talent attraction and retention also shows that to address “brain drain,” the public sector needs a coherent legal framework built on three pillars: competitive remuneration and income; a democratic, creativity-encouraging working environment; and mechanisms that appropriately honor and recognize the contributions of talented individuals (Le V.T, 2023, pp. 88–91).

Building on the National Strategy for Talent Attraction and Utilization to 2030, with a Vision to 2050, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW incorporates the requirement to continue improving legislation on cadres, civil servants, and public employees, as well as institutional frameworks for talent in the public sector. It regards the development of a talented workforce—particularly leadership and managerial talent—as a decisive condition for realizing the “human resource breakthrough” in the new phase of national development (Nguyen. T.N; Nguyen V. C; Ha T. T., & Hoang, V. H, 2024, pp. 169–177).

Third, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW emphasizes the construction of a rule-of-law culture and a culture of legal compliance as the “soft foundation” of the human

resource breakthrough. Research on public service ethics shows that, in the context of a streamlined administrative apparatus and the transition toward a modern civil service, public officials and civil servants are required to master the law, maintain exemplary conduct, comply with codes of ethics, and build a civil service that is “ethical, transparent, cultured, civilized, upright, and modern,” capable of meeting new responsibilities in a civil service increasingly associated with AI technologies (Ha T.L.P& Ngo T.P.T, 2025, pp. 254–255). Likewise, revolutionary ethical standards and regulations on ethics and lifestyle for leaders and managers in state administrative bodies are established as an important pillar for cultivating and selecting a cadre that is both “red and expert,” valuing new norms of public service ethics in a context of organizational streamlining and functional restructuring (Ha T.L.P& Ngo T.P.T, 2025, 2025, pp. 258–259). Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW and the Government’s Action Programme under Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP concretize this requirement by “focusing on building a culture of legal compliance, ensuring that respect for the Constitution and the law becomes a behavioral norm for all actors in society,” diversifying communication and legal education, and prioritizing the use of digital technologies and mass media to disseminate rule-of-law values.

Theoretically, legal culture is understood as the synthesis of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors that reflect respect for the law by individuals and organizations, expressed through “beautiful, responsible conduct” that not only complies with legal regulations but also embodies ethical and humanistic values in legal life (Dang H.A, 2025). When Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW identifies the development of legal culture as a core component of the pillar on lawmaking and law enforcement, it demonstrates that law is not merely a regulatory instrument but also a means for shaping the value system of the public-sector workforce—from mastering legal rules to cultivating the habit of “living and working in accordance with the Constitution and the law” in everyday professional practice.

At the institutional design level, the orientation to develop a unified Code of Public Service Ethics for the entire administrative system, together with sector-specific codes (for the courts, prosecution, inspection, taxation, customs, etc.)—defining ethical principles, mechanisms for asset declaration and disclosure, regulation of conflicts of interest, bans on receiving gifts, prohibitions on inappropriate lobbying, independent oversight mechanisms, and detailed codes of

conduct for public officials—is regarded as a key solution for establishing the “value infrastructure” of the civil service in the digital era. This, in turn, forms the basis for selecting, utilizing, evaluating, and filtering high-quality human resources for the public sector.

3.2.3. In Relation to the Breakthrough on Building Synchronous and Modern Infrastructure

First, on improving the legal framework to unlock and allocate resources effectively for infrastructure development

Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW provides clear strategic direction for improving laws on public investment, private investment, public–private partnerships (PPP), land, planning, construction, finance, and banking as an institutional pillar for unlocking and effectively allocating resources for infrastructure development. From the perspective of development space and territorial organization, numerous studies on mobilizing resources for sustainable urban infrastructure share a common conclusion: without a sufficiently flexible institutional mechanism that allows for the combination of state budget resources, credit capital, PPP, and community contributions, local governments face great difficulty in meeting infrastructure needs—such as transport, water supply and drainage, environment, and social housing—given the severe constraints on public resources (Du D.H, 2021, pp. 33–36). On this foundation, the comprehensive improvement of development institutions—including institutions on land, land finance, and local government organization—is identified as one of the three strategic breakthroughs required to “activate” growth drivers, especially the breakthrough on infrastructure development (Cao T.H, 2022, pp. 34–38).

In a context where land is a special resource owned by the entire people and administered by the State, the State's role in regulating the land-use rights market, supporting the market, and ensuring social welfare is decisive for land-use efficiency and socio-economic growth (Dinh T.P, 2025). To transform land into a truly “vast resource,” it is essential to eliminate “ask–give” mechanisms, reduce administrative intervention, and develop a transparent land market mechanism that protects the legitimate rights and interests of citizens and investors while addressing prolonged disputes and complaints (Nguyen T.T.H& Do P.H, 2022, pp. 35–41). Improving land-price legislation in line with market mechanisms,

including the application of mass appraisal models based on data and digital technologies, is considered a core solution to enhance transparency, eliminate the “dual-price” phenomenon, and establish a sustainable financial foundation for infrastructure development (Nguyen M.T, 2025, pp. 82–88). Alongside this, in order for land to truly become “development capital,” institutions must be synchronized—from the legal framework and financial mechanisms to sanctions and market information—shifting from administrative allocation of land toward mechanisms that incentivize efficient, economical land use aligned with sustainable development goals (Le B.T&N.H, 2025, pp. 26–31).

From the perspective of transport infrastructure—particularly railway and urban transport—Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW and Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP also set forth the requirement to the legal framework on finance and investment as a prerequisite for creating a true “leap forward” in infrastructure. In practice, although rail transport is recognized as an important mode with significant advantages in terms of safety, environmental performance, and cost efficiency, investment capital for railway infrastructure remains extremely limited and relies predominantly on the state budget. During the 2021–2025 period, medium-term public investment for railways accounts for only about 4.7% of total public investment; in 2024, development investment capital for railway infrastructure represents merely around 2% of total transport sector investment, and maintenance funding meets only about 40% of actual needs. The financial mechanism for the railway sector remains inflexible; PPP models are difficult to implement; financial risk-sharing arrangements are unclear; and instruments such as infrastructure bonds and infrastructure investment funds have not been effectively utilized (Pham T.L& Tran H.T, 2025, pp. 13–16).

International experience shows that a modern transport infrastructure system depends not only on the scale of investment but also on a coherent institutional framework for integrated planning, the development of high-quality public transport, the application of smart technologies, and transparent, private-sector mobilization mechanisms (Tran T.T, 2025). These analyses further reinforce the argument that laws on investment, finance, and PPP in infrastructure—fully in line with Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW—is a prerequisite for shifting from fragmented

investment (“đầu tư mạnh mẽ”) to synchronized and modern infrastructure development.

Second, on law enforcement in infrastructure projects

With respect to the enforcement of law in infrastructure projects, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW and the Government’s Action Programme under Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP emphasize the need to simplify procedures, ensure transparency in processes, and strengthen risk management on the basis of a coherent legal framework (Section I.1). In practice, the auctioning of land-use rights in project implementation has revealed overlaps and inconsistencies among the Land Law, the Law on Asset Auction, the Investment Law, and others—creating post-auction risks that affect project progress, investor interests, and public confidence. Therefore, in law enforcement, it is essential to standardize and publicize procedures, clarify mandates and investor selection criteria, and enhance the application of digital technologies to ensure transparency throughout the entire auction process (Nguyen V.D, 2025, pp. 247–252).

Parallel analyses of financial mechanisms and PPP legislation indicate that attracting private-sector participation in infrastructure development requires not only a complete PPP legal framework but also enforcement practices that ensure risk-sharing, effective operation of financial-support tools (such as viability gap funds, guarantees, and tax incentives), and minimization of legal uncertainty during contract negotiation and execution (Tran T.L& Le T.A, 2016, pp. 14–20; Ha H.P& Pham T.L, 2025, pp. 217–222). At the same time, analyses of the 2025 growth target of 8% consistently highlight public investment—especially in critical infrastructure—as one of the four central growth drivers, but achieving this requires “unshackling institutional constraints” in implementation: accelerating disbursement, improving investment efficiency, and leveraging private and foreign direct investment into infrastructure (Bui V.H, Dinh T.N& Le T.A, 2025, pp. 15–19).

In other words, innovating lawmaking and, more importantly, law enforcement under Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW serves as a direct instrument for transforming land auctions, land valuation, PPP mechanisms, and related processes from “institutional bottlenecks” into engines that promote infrastructure

development—both in terms of mobilizing capital and improving project timelines and quality.

Third, to address obstacles in the rearrangement of administrative units, the organization of two-tier local governments, and the handling of planning in areas undergoing urbanization, legal reform must focus first and foremost on the *institutional bottlenecks* directly associated with the breakthrough on synchronous and modern infrastructure. Rather than making piecemeal technical adjustments to organizational structures, it is necessary to develop a comprehensive “institutional package” covering the classification of administrative units, the structure of specialized agencies, job-position frameworks, salary and allowance regimes, public asset management, decentralization and devolution, and accountability mechanisms—aimed at genuinely empowering local authorities to proactively organize development space and infrastructure systems.

In the coming period, laws and decrees must adhere to the principle that the central government provides only the overarching framework. Local authorities should be granted flexibility to design organizational models, determine the number of departments and staffing levels, and structure public service delivery in ways that reflect the specific characteristics of urban areas. At the same time, legislation must directly address bottlenecks in land, planning, construction investment, public service units, and public service delivery—issues that are currently hindering land clearance, project implementation, and infrastructure connectivity in rapidly urbanizing regions.

Alongside legislative development, the law enforcement mechanism must be designed and operated in a manner that is sufficiently flexible yet disciplined, and sufficiently coherent yet clearly decentralized, in order to prevent infrastructure breakthroughs from being constrained by procedures and legal rigidities. The two-tier local government model will only be effective if law enforcement moves ahead proactively: swiftly consolidating organizational structures after administrative unit rearrangement; standardizing and digitalizing procedures relating directly to infrastructure (land, planning, construction investment, finance–budget); publicly disclosing internal procedures at both provincial and communal levels; and linking enforcement responsibility with measurable indicators on project progress, public investment disbursement, and citizen and business satisfaction.

In addition, mandatory competency standards and mechanisms for retraining and upskilling local officials must be clearly established, especially in critical areas such as land, finance, investment, and digital transformation. Only when there is both a sufficiently enabling legal framework for decentralization and empowerment, and a sufficiently robust enforcement mechanism to ensure discipline and effectiveness, can two-tier local governments truly become an “institutional foundation” for achieving the breakthrough in building synchronous and modern infrastructure.

3.2.4. In Relation to the Breakthrough on Developing Science, Technology, Innovation, and Digital Transformation

Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW can be viewed as the institutional pillar for realizing the breakthrough in science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation in a context where institutions remain fragmented, investment in R&D is still low, the science and technology market develops slowly, and innovation incentives are insufficiently strong. Reviews of the 2011–2020 period show that science and technology contributed significantly to growth; however, Viet Nam’s R&D expenditure accounts for only about 0.44% of GDP—far below the global average of 2.23% of GDP. The science and technology market remains fragmented, and financial, tax, and credit mechanisms for enterprises undertaking technological innovation are not sufficiently attractive (Ngo T.C, 2022, pp. 8–10). Given that the 2021–2030 Socio-Economic Development Strategy identifies “vigorously developing science, technology, and innovation” as a key breakthrough driver, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW underscores the need for the legal framework, mechanisms, and policies to ensure that strategic objectives on science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation are implemented on a coherent and robust institutional foundation.

From the standpoint of growth drivers, recent studies make clear that escaping the “middle-income trap” requires Viet Nam to shift from a model heavily dependent on capital and low-cost labor to one based on science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation—where institutions serve as the decisive “lever” for unlocking private-sector resources for science–technology and the digital economy (Pham T.T& Chu T.L.A, 2023, pp. 8–10). Current policy tools—such as the Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation Development to 2030,

the National Program on Productivity Enhancement based on STI, and the National Digital Transformation Program to 2025 with orientation to 2030—have begun to foster the innovation ecosystem, but a unified “institutional rulebook” is still needed to connect legislation, executive direction, and law enforcement within the digital space.

Here, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW plays the role of institutional pillar by prescribing the of laws on science and technology, innovation, the digital economy, data, artificial intelligence, and regulatory sandboxes—ensuring a balance between incentivizing innovation and managing risks. At the same time, it calls for accelerating digital transformation within the very processes of lawmaking, promulgation, and law enforcement: developing legal databases, digitalizing records, and using data analytics and artificial intelligence tools to monitor law enforcement and assess policy impacts.

From the perspective of development institutions, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW clearly articulates the orientation to the legal environment for science and technology (S&T) and the science and technology market by emphasizing the need to harmonize laws on intellectual property, standards–metrology–quality, procurement, science finance, public–private partnerships, and support for innovative start-ups; and by recognizing enterprises as the central actors within the innovation ecosystem and the science and technology market (Ngo T.C, 2022, pp. 10–11). Alongside measures to increase investment, develop S&T human resources, and build information, data, and science–technology infrastructure, the “digitalization of lawmaking and law enforcement” under Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW will create a “digital institutional infrastructure,” serving as the framework and soft infrastructure that enable the absorption and diffusion of science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation throughout the economy and society.

3.3. Recommendations for Strengthening the Role of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW as an “Institutional Pillar”

3.3.1. Further Improving the Legal Architecture Aligned with the Four Strategic Breakthroughs

719 **First**, the legal system should be viewed as a unified “institutional
720 architecture” encompassing economic, social, infrastructure, and science–
721 technology domains, rather than amended or supplemented in separate, fragmented
722 provisions of individual laws. This systemic and integrated approach has been
723 emphasized when affirming the role of law in building the socialist rule-of-law
724 state of Viet Nam. Law must be coherent, unified, feasible, and closely linked to
725 the task of national development in the new period. In this spirit, it is necessary to
726 develop “codification programs by thematic pillars” (development institutions,
727 human resource institutions, infrastructure institutions, and STI institutions), in
728 which each pillar clearly identifies groups of laws, ordinances, and decrees that
729 must be reviewed, streamlined, consolidated, or upgraded to directly serve the four
730 strategic breakthroughs.

731 **Second**, the medium- and long-term legislative program of the National
732 Assembly and the Government must be designed to ensure a strong linkage
733 between resolutions and the lawmaking agenda. Each major orientation of the
734 pillar resolutions should be accompanied by a corresponding “package” of legal
735 amendments or new legal instruments, together with a sufficiently strong
736 mechanism for organizing law enforcement. Recent institutional reform proposals
737 consistently stress the need to regard lawmaking as the “breakthrough of all
738 breakthroughs,” focusing on removing legal bottlenecks, eliminating “ask–give”
739 mechanisms, reducing administrative procedures, creating a conducive investment
740 and business environment, and encouraging innovation. These priorities must be
741 concretized more explicitly in each law and decree to ensure that the legal system
742 truly becomes the institutional foundation for development.

743 **3.3.2. Innovating the Mechanism for Organizing Law Enforcement** 744 **Toward Data-Driven and Results-Based Governance**

745 **First**, the organization of law enforcement needs to shift from a model based
746 primarily on “administrative reporting” to one grounded in “data-driven and
747 results-based governance.” Accordingly, a set of indicators measuring the
748 effectiveness of law enforcement should be developed in alignment with the
749 objectives of the four strategic breakthroughs, such as:

- 750 (i) Time and cost of administrative procedures;
- 751 (ii) Satisfaction levels of citizens and enterprises;

- (iii) Improvements in business environment indicators;
 - (iv) The degree of support for innovation and digital transformation.
- These indicators must be continuously updated on information systems and electronic dashboards at ministerial, sectoral, and local levels, serving as regular monitoring and operational tools rather than merely supporting periodic reviews.

Second, the application of digital technologies in monitoring, evaluating, and providing feedback on law enforcement should be strengthened. This includes: digitalizing procedures and files; receiving and processing citizens' and enterprises' feedback online; and utilizing data analytics tools to detect institutional bottlenecks, errors in legal instruments, and shortcomings in enforcement. Recent reform proposals suggest establishing mechanisms for legal interpretation and guidance based on clear principles and criteria to ensure the "vitality" of legal provisions rather than frequently amending legal documents. This approach allows law enforcement performance to be measured through concrete, transparent, and verifiable outcomes.

3.3.3. Strengthening Resource Assurance for Lawmaking and Law Enforcement

First, a new approach to financing and staffing for legal development and enforcement is required, commensurate with the role of Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW as an "institutional pillar." Numerous studies on legal system reform underscore that a modern legal architecture cannot be achieved without a professional corps of legal experts with strong theoretical grounding and practical experience, nor without stable financial resources for drafting, reviewing, impact assessment, policy consultation, and law enforcement activities. Therefore, it is necessary to examine a dedicated financial mechanism for lawmaking, ensuring adequate funding for surveys, investigations, impact assessments, policy reviews, and stakeholder consultations.

Second, developing human resources for law and legal affairs must be considered an integral component of the breakthrough in high-quality human resources. Recent policy proposals advocate prioritizing the training, professional development, and remuneration of those involved in lawmaking and law enforcement—particularly legal departments in ministries, sectors, and local

governments—to ensure the “political integrity, professional ethics, and technical competence” required in the context of international integration and digital transformation. In parallel, investment should be prioritized for digital infrastructure, data analytics tools, and digital skills training so that this workforce can effectively operate digital platforms, databases, and AI-based applications in both lawmaking and law enforcement.

3.3.4. Enhancing the Role of Two-Tier Local Governments and Societal Participation

First, the orientations set out in Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW and the Government’s Action Programme under Resolution No. 140/NQ-CP need to be concretized in provincial- and commune-level plans for lawmaking and law enforcement, closely linked to local socio-economic planning and development strategies. At the two tiers of local government, improving the legal framework should not be limited to the issuance of resolutions and decisions by People’s Councils and People’s Committees; rather, local authorities should proactively propose amendments and supplements to central regulations that hinder infrastructure financing, human resource development, or the implementation of new economic and service models. This approach aligns with the requirement to strengthen decentralization and devolution in tandem with oversight, inspection, and control of power—an issue repeatedly emphasized in studies on the legal system.

Second, mechanisms for consultation, feedback, and co-governance in lawmaking and law enforcement must be expanded, particularly those involving enterprises, professional associations, the scientific community, and citizens. Institutional reform recommendations consistently underscore the role of society in identifying “legal bottlenecks,” contributing policy feedback, and monitoring enforcement, considering such participation a prerequisite for ensuring that the law genuinely reflects development needs and protects human rights and citizens’ rights.

Clarifying the accountability obligations of state bodies and enhancing transparency in lawmaking and law enforcement processes will enable Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW to fully its role as an “institutional pillar” in realizing the four strategic breakthroughs for national development.

4. Conclusion

Within the overall framework of the four pillar resolutions, Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW occupies a distinctive position by placing lawmaking and law enforcement in the role of the “breakthrough of all breakthroughs,” directly linking the task of building a socialist rule-of-law state to the requirements of rapid and sustainable development. Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW does not merely add technical requirements for legislation and law enforcement; it introduces a new approach to the architecture of development-oriented law and a “digital institutional infrastructure,” thereby tightly integrating the four strategic breakthroughs: institutions, developing human resources, building synchronous and modern infrastructure, and promoting science, technology, innovation, and digital transformation. In the coming period, it is necessary to continue designing the legislative program in close alignment with the four strategic breakthroughs; fundamentally innovate the mechanisms for organizing law enforcement toward data-driven and results-based governance; strengthen the assurance of financial, human, and digital infrastructure resources for legal work; and, at the same time, enhance the role of two-tier local governments and societal participation in lawmaking and oversight of law enforcement. If institutionalized and implemented consistently, these orientations will enable Resolution No. 66-NQ/TW to fully its role as an institutional pillar in the process of realizing Vietnam’s development goals through 2030 and the 2045 vision./.

REFERENCES

- 848 1. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of*
849 *power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.
- 850 2. Bui, V. H., Dinh, T. N., & Le, T. A. (2025). Drivers enabling Vietnam to
851 achieve 8% growth in 2025: Current situation and solutions. *Journal of*
852 *Finance and Accounting Research*, 25(294), 15–19.
- 853 3. Communist Party of Vietnam. (2021). *Documents of the 13th National*
854 *Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam* (Vol. II). Truth National
855 Political Publishing House.
- 856 4. Cao, T. H. (2022). Synchronously institutional development for national
857 progress according to the viewpoint of the 13th National Congress of the
858 Communist Party of Vietnam. *State Management Review*, 30(316), 34–38.
- 859 5. Dinh, T. P. (2025). Enhancing the effectiveness of the State's role in the land
860 sector in Vietnam today. *Vietnam Journal of Science and Technology*, 67(4),
861 40–46.
- 862 6. Du, D. H. (2021). Mechanisms for mobilizing resources for sustainable
863 urban infrastructure development: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of*
864 *Economics and Forecasting*, 31(3), 33–36.
- 865 7. Duong, V. Q. (2024). Ensuring human rights in lawmaking in Vietnam today.
866 *Journal of Jurisprudence*, Special Issue, 28–38.
- 867 8. Dang, H. A. (2025). Experiences of several countries in building legal
868 culture in road traffic and their application to the current practice in Vietnam.
869 *Journal of Education & Society*, March 2025 (Issue 2), 212–215.
- 870 9. Government. (2025). *Report No. 983/BC-CP dated October 10, 2025, on the*
871 *Summary of the Government's 2021–2026 Term*. pp. 89–90.
- 872 10. Ha, H. P., & Pham, T. L. (2025). Recommendations for improving the
873 Vietnamese law on public–private partnership investment contracts based on
874 the experience of several Asian countries. *Journal of Education & Society*,
875 (5), 217–222.

- 876 11. Ha, T. L. P., & Ngo, T. P. T. (2025). New orientations in developing
877 legislation on public service ethics. *Education and Society*, May 2025 (Issue
878 1), 254–259.
- 879 12. North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic*
880 *performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- 881 13. Ngo, T. C. (2022). Developing science, technology, and innovation for the
882 2021–2030 period to contribute to rapid and sustainable socio-economic
883 development. *Journal of Finance and Accounting Research*, 06(227), 5–12.
- 884 14. Nguyen, M. T. (2025). Mass appraisal models in land valuation:
885 International experience and lessons for Vietnam. *Journal of Finance and*
886 *Accounting Research*, 25(287), 82–88.
- 887 15. Nguyen, T. T. H., & Do, P. H. (2022). Reforming land policies and laws to
888 promote socio-economic development. *Communist Review*, 993(7/2022),
889 35–41.
- 890 16. Nguyen, T. N., Nguyen, V. C., Ha, T. T., & Hoang, V. H. (2024). Training,
891 using, and attracting talented leaders and managers: Perceptions and
892 solutions. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 10(3), 265–274.
- 893 17. Nguyen, V. D. (2025). Auctioning land-use rights in project-based
894 developments: Obstacles and implementation solutions. *Journal of*
895 *Education & Society*, May 2025 (Issue 2), 247–252.
- 896 18. Nguyen, M. D. (2023). Higher requirements for the competence and
897 responsibility of lawmakers in the socialist rule-of-law State of Vietnam.
898 *Legislative Studies Journal*, 03(475), 3–10.
- 899 19. Nguyen, H. K., & Le, T. N. M. (2023). Issues of talent and human resources
900 in the public sector in Vietnam. *Journal of State Organization*, (4/2023), 43–
901 46.
- 902 20. Le, B. T., & An, N. H. (2025). Improving mechanisms for creating
903 incentives to use land effectively in Vietnam. *Asia-Pacific Economic*
904 *Review*, 2(687), 26–31.

- 905 21. Le, V. T. (2023). Improving policies for attracting and employing talent in
906 the public sector in the current period. *State Management Review*, (328), 88–
907 91.
- 908 22. OECD. (2011). *Regulatory policy and governance: Supporting economic*
909 *growth and serving the public interest*. OECD Publishing.
910 <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264116573-en>
- 911 23. OECD. (2009). *Multi-level regulatory governance*. OECD Publishing.
- 912 24. OECD. (2018). *OECD regulatory enforcement and inspections toolkit*.
913 OECD Publishing.
- 914 25. Pham, T. L., & Tran, H. T. (2025). Financial policies for the development of
915 railway transport infrastructure in Vietnam. *Journal of Finance and*
916 *Accounting Research*, (289), 13–16.
- 917 26. Pham, T. T., & Chu, T. L. A. (2023). Development of science, technology,
918 innovation, and digital transformation in Vietnam today: Current situation
919 and recommendations. *Journal of Theoretical Education*, 355(5), 8–12.
- 920 27. Tran, T. T. (2025). Singapore’s experience in transport infrastructure
921 development and implications for Vietnam. *Journal of Finance and*
922 *Accounting Research*, (288), 93–96.
- 923 28. Tran, T. Q. (2025). Innovating legislative thinking to meet the requirements
924 of the new era in Vietnam today. *Education and Society*, May 2025 (Issue
925 2), 181–187.
- 926 29. Tran, T. L., & Le, T. A. (2016). Financial mechanisms to attract the private
927 sector to participate in public–private partnership (PPP) investment projects
928 in Vietnam’s infrastructure development. *Journal of Finance – Accounting*
929 *Science*, (7/2016), 14–20.
- 930 30. Vuong, D. H. (2022). Continuing to innovate the legislative activities of the
931 National Assembly to synchronize the development institution and create a
932 solid legal framework for national development and integration. *Communist*
933 *Review*, (984), 3–11.
- 934 31. UN. (2019). *Rule of law and development*. United Nations.

- 935 32. UNDP. (2014). *Legal empowerment strategies at work: Lessons in inclusion*
936 *from country experiences.*
- 937 33. WB. (2017). *World development report 2017: Governance and the law.*
938 World Bank.
- 939

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR