Public Disclosure Authorized

Report No: AUS0000222

Europe and Central Asia
Development of EU Governance Indicators
Indicators of Citizen-Centric Public Service Delivery – Final Report

March 16, 2018

GOV

Public Disclosure Authorized

Document of the World Bank

© 2017 The World Bank
1818 H Street NW, Washington DC 20433
Telephone: 202-473-1000; Internet: www.worldbank.org

Some rights reserved

This work is a product of the staff of The World Bank. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of the Executive Directors of The World Bank or the governments they represent. The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this work is subject to copyright. Because The World Bank encourages dissemination of its knowledge, this work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for noncommercial purposes as long as full attribution to this work is given.

Attribution—Please cite the work as follows: "World Bank. {YEAR OF PUBLICATION}. {TITLE}. © World Bank."

All queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to World Bank Publications, The World Bank Group, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA; fax: 202-522-2625; e-mail: pubrights@worldbank.org.

Indicators of CITIZEN-CENTRIC Public Service Delivery

WORLD BANK GROUP
Governance

European Commission

Indicators of CITIZEN-CENTRIC Public Service Delivery

WORLD BANK GROUP
Governance

European Commission

© 2018 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank
1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433
202-473-1000 | www.worldbank.org

Some rights reserved.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent. The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgment on the part of The World Bank concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Nothing herein shall constitute or be considered to be a limitation upon or waiver of the privileges and immunities of the World Bank, all of which are specifically reserved.

Rights and Permissions
The material in this work is subject to copyright. Because the World Bank encourages dissemination of its knowledge, this work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for noncommercial purposes as long as full attribution to this work is given. Any queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to World Bank Publications, World Bank Group, 1818 H Street, Washington, DC 20433, USA; fax 202-522-2625; email: pubrights@worldbank.org.

Contents

Acknowledments . . . . . **v**

Introduction . . . . . **vi**

I Planning a Citizen-Centric Service Delivery Assessment: How and Why? **1**

What is Citizen-Centric Service Delivery, and What are Its Benefits? 1

The Evolution of the Theory and Practice of Public Service Delivery 3

How Can Citizen-Centricity Be Measured? 5

II The Citizen Survey and Public Administrator Checklist **8**

Objectives and Structure of the Instruments 8

What Do the Components Capture? 8

Question Types 11

Answer Types 13

III Customizing the Citizen-Centric Service Delivery Assessment **14**

Objectives 14

Number and Sequencing of Questions 14

Answer Scale 15

Target Group and Survey Method 15

Frequency of Enumeration 16

IV. The Citizen Survey **18**

V. The Administrator Checklist **25**

Appendixes

A Administrator Checklist as Filled Out by a Municipal Registry Office: Illustrative Example . . . 37
B Citizen Survey as Customized by a Municipal Registry Office: Illustrative Example . . . 49
C Advantages and Disadvantages of Various Surveying Methods . . . 52

References and Bibliography . . . 55

Boxes

1.1 Citizen-Centric Service Delivery Indicators: What They Are Not . . . 1
1.2 Client, Beneficiary, User, and Citizen: A Clarification of Terminology . . . 2
1.3 "Life is about Events, Not Agencies": Building Government Services Around the Needs of New and Expectant Parents in New Zealand . . . 5
1.4 Measuring Citizen Satisfaction: Caveats . . . 6

Tables

2.1 Summary of Issues Explored in Citizen Survey and Administrator Checklist . . . 10
2.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Open- and Closed-Ended Questions . . . 13

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared in response to a request by the Economic Analysis Unit of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO) to the World Bank.

The report was prepared by Hélène Pfeil with valuable contributions from Sanjay Agarwal, David Bernstein, Francesca Recanatini, Steve Knack and Peter Ladegaard. Sanjay Agarwal coordinated the overall effort; while David Bernstein, task team leader, provided strategic guidance.

The team would like to thank the following peer reviewers for their comments and helpful guidance on improving the final report: Jairo Alcuna-Alfaro (United Nations Development Program), Dan Batista (Institute for Citizen-Centered Service, Canada), Etienne Charbonneau (Ecole nationale d'administration publique, Canada), Maksym Ivanya (Joint Vienna Institute, Austria), Orla McBreen (Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, Ireland), Alina Mungiu-Pippidi (Hertie School of Governance, Germany), Stephen Nix (International Republican Institute, USA), Mitchell Seligson (Vanderbilt University, USA), Anwar Shah (Center for Public Economics, China), Gabriel Sipos (Transparency International, Slovakia), Laura Sommer (Department of Internal Affairs, New Zealand), Santosh Srinivasan (Transparency International Secretariat, Germany), Ruslan Stefanov (Center for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria), Alexander Stoyanov (Center for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria), Johannes Tonn (Global Integrity, USA), Stephanie Trapnell (George Mason University, USA), and Steven Van de Walle (KU Leuven Public Governance Institute, Belgium).

Finally, the team would like to thank Lewis Dijkstra, Head, Economic Analysis Sector, DG REGIO for providing the trust funds to support the Actionable Governance Indicator Project and for his personal guidance and leadership in the development of this report.

Introduction

This report and the instruments it proposes are primarily aimed at public administrators who would like to ensure that their service delivery mechanisms respond to the needs and expectations of citizens. The goal is to encourage reflection on how to best design and enhance public service delivery processes so that public institutions serve their constituents well, increase transparency and accountability, and strengthen the trust of citizens in the state, thereby reinforcing the social compact. This work may also be of interest to academics and practitioners working on issues related to citizen-centricity.

The report was developed under the European Union Actionable Regional Governance Indicators for Public Administrative Performance and Capacity Initiative, which is funded by the European Commission and implemented by the World Bank Group. The overall initiative, requested by the Economic Analysis Unit of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO), is structured as three sets of activities that aim to identify and develop actionable indicators of the quality and capacity of public administrations in European Union Member States at the national and regional levels.

This document summarizes research undertaken under the set of activities dealing with *citizen-centric governance indicators*, that is, indicators that measure the capacity of public agencies to put the needs of citizens at the center of their service delivery mechanisms. The other two activity sets focus on public sector governance indicators and regulatory governance indicators, respectively.

The report is structured into five parts. Part I presents the conceptual framework that forms the backdrop for developing citizen-centric service delivery indicators and summarizes what citizen-centric service delivery entails. Part II introduces two complementary tools designed to assess the performance of public institutions and the quality of public services from the perspective of European Union citizens: a *demand-side citizen survey* and a *supply-side self-assessment checklist for public administrators*. They are meant to help public agencies identify gaps and areas for improvement in their service delivery mechanisms by gathering direct feedback regarding the experiences and perceptions of their users and by critically examining public sector efforts to fulfill the needs and expectations of citizens. The instruments complement one another in facilitating the institutional strengthening of public service delivery, but they are not prescriptive or set in stone. Instead, they are intended as flexible, inspirational tools that provide an initial grid for administrations willing to move one step closer to their citizens. Part III describes options for customizing the instruments, which can be adapted to a variety of circumstances and service delivery types. Parts IV and V present the citizen survey and administrator checklist. For illustrative purposes, appendixes A and B depict versions of the tools tailored to the delivery of administrative documents by a municipal registry office. Appendix C explores the advantages and disadvantages of a range of surveying methods.

I. Planning a Citizen-Centric Service Delivery Assessment: How and Why?

What is Citizen-Centric Service Delivery, and What are Its Benefits?

High-quality service delivery requires a sound understanding of citizens' expectations, experiences, and key drivers of satisfaction, as well as a policy framework that places citizens at the center of decision-making processes rather than at the periphery. Citizen-centric service delivery indicators focus on the collection of data that can help governments become better at what they do—deliver services to citizens in a responsive and equitable manner. No political elite can build a sustainable and just environment, where institutions foster inclusive economic growth and higher standards of living for all segments of society, without a constructive, two-way relationship with citizens. The organizing principle of public service delivery must be the needs of users. This is notably reflected in the Sustainable Development Goal 16.6, which aims to "develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels," as well as indicator 16.6.2, which proposes to measure the "proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services."

Citizen-focused service delivery indicators measure the extent to which the needs and voices of citizens are considered during the various stages of public service design, delivery, and evaluation/review. In a citizen-centric service delivery system, the main imperative is not to fit operational structures and processes to the requirements of government departments, but to serve citizens—who are considered the main stakeholders. Emerging literature suggests that working

Box 1.1. Citizen-Centric Service Delivery Indicators: What They Are Not

Citizen-centric indicators are an essential component of assessing the quality of governance and public service delivery, but they only provide information about a segment of the elements comprising effective and fair governance systems. They should therefore be considered a complement to other indicators, such as datasets related to public financial management, public investment management, tax administration, procurement, human resource management, innovation and competitiveness, justice and rule of law, public information systems, and regulatory governance, among others.[a] Given their focus on public sector integrity, some close synergies exist between citizen-centric indicators and indicators related to anticorruption, transparency, and accountability.

a. For a more in-depth consideration of regulatory and public sector governance indicators, refer to the other reports produced under the European Union Actionable Regional Governance Indicators for Public Administrative Performance and Capacity initiative: *Actionable Regulatory Governance Indicators for EU Regions* and *Public Sector Governance Indicators for EU Regions*.

Box 1.2. *Client*, *Beneficiary*, *User*, and *Citizen*: A Clarification of Terminology

While the terms *consumer* or *customer* are often used to describe recipients of private sector goods or services, the terminology used to describe people receiving services provided by the public sector is debated. Commonly used terms include *client*, which emphasizes the fact that the services are being provided by a professional entity; *user*, which reflects the process of using a given service as well as possibly conveying the concept of a continuous enjoyment of a right; and *beneficiary*, although this term implies that someone derives an advantage from something and could thus be construed as a passive recipient with a relational weakness to the public sector as benefactor.

The term preferred in this report is *citizen*, which refers in a broad sense "to all people in a society or country in an inclusive and nondiscriminatory way." The term is used similarly in the *Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement in World Bank Group Operations* (World Bank 2014: 7), which understands citizens to be the ultimate clients of government, an approach slightly wider than the strict legal definition, according to which they are the legally recognized subjects or nationals of a state. For this report, *citizen* best reflects the notion of a social contract between those who govern and those who are governed. The term is meant to encompass a broad variety of people that may be impacted by the delivery of public services, potentially including foreign nationals, refugees, undocumented migrants, and others.

toward a more citizen-centric system allows public administrations to increase their efficiency, thanks notably to early or immediate feedback mechanisms for taxpayer-funded services (World Bank 2015), and "flatter, agile, streamlined and tech-enabled" practices (World Economic Forum 2012). In the reverse case, governments run the risk of seeing resources being diverted or misallocated, thereby diminishing the quality of public service delivery and undermining trust in public institutions.

Putting citizens at the heart of public institutions provides a twofold benefit: it makes public administrations more efficient and increases citizens' satisfaction and trust in government. Citizen-centric service delivery implies that policy makers better understand the needs of and key drivers of satisfaction for citizens, and that they are in a position to "identify sub-groups of users and needs or gaps in accessibility" (OECD 2013). This, in turn, can enable public sector entities to adopt better policies and to provide more responsive services based on citizens' perspectives and empirical evidence. At the same time, tensions may arise when trying to shape service delivery processes in an inclusive way, in a manner primarily directed at problem-solving, and through techniques that foster greater agility and adaptability: politics can influence the willingness of governments to use citizen-focused techniques. Agency staff and administrators must be cognizant of the role that power dynamics can play at any given time. Despite that, proactive learning and the collection of user feedback can support entities in successfully dealing with the challenges of complexity and evolving behaviors. Measuring citizen satisfaction and preferences on a regular basis can help public managers monitor public sector performance over time, continuously improve service delivery, and measure the impact of reforms and service-improvement activities on end users, ultimately allowing for a more citizen-centric allocation of time and resources (HM Government 2007) that can result in a higher likelihood of citizens being satisfied with policy outcomes.

The Evolution of the Theory and Practice of Public Service Delivery

The theory and practice of public administration in democracies have evolved significantly in recent decades. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the emphasis shifted from a traditional public administration perspective focused on the inner workings of the public sector that envisioned politicians primarily as administrators toward the new public management perspective, which introduced an entrepreneurial point of view centered on performance and accountability for outputs. This newer perspective conceptualizes politicians as managers, and citizens as customers. It has, in turn, been updated by the concept of network governance and an approach called new public service or new public governance, which emphasizes the links that exist between organizations within and outside the public sector and seeks to build sustained cooperation and purpose-driven coalitions across an enlarged number of governance actors, including politicians and civil servants as well as individual citizens, nongovernmental organizations, and private service providers (OECD 2009; Holmes 2011). Under this approach, citizens are no longer merely thought of as customers or government targets. Rather, they are considered to be agents in their own right, entitled to participate directly or indirectly in decisions affecting them, for example, by co-creating policies and co-producing service design and service delivery.

New institutional economics provides an alternative view of citizen-centered governance. The perspective explicitly recognizes citizens as governors or principals—rather than clients per the new public management perspective—and governments as undertaking collective action to advance the public interest while minimizing transactions costs for the citizens who extend this mandate to the government. This perspective highlights the importance of final outcomes in the governance environment and for service delivery. Public administration models have therefore evolved from static and bureaucratic (traditional public administration) to competitive and minimalistic (new public management), and finally to plural and pluralist (new public governance) (UNDP 2015). This shift represents:

> "a change from models where the government owns inputs and processes, toward a model where the government and citizens jointly own the outcomes. In other words, the government moves from governing for citizens to governing with citizens. This also implies a shift in terms of the citizen moving closer to the center of governance and an evolving public sector where citizens, politicians, bureaucrats and service providers become co-creators of public goods" (UNDP 2016a: 17).

Increasingly, policy makers are placing citizens at the center of their considerations, with the aim "to develop policies and design services that respond to individuals' needs and are relevant to their circumstances" (Holmes 2011: 1) instead of letting "governments continue to design and deliver services based on his/her own requirements and processes" (McKinsey 2015). In essence, citizen-centric service delivery means that by default, a citizen's interactions with government are based on his/her own specific identity, life situations, and priorities—not on how the government is organized. This idea is linked to the realization by policy makers that citizens are voters and as such, can hold policy makers accountable with elections.

But what does "putting the citizen at the center" mean in practice for government service design and delivery? As expressed by Carson (2011), citizen-centric governments are typically aiming to provide a service quality "inspired by both banks and hotels." This means that they need to provide "integrated public-facing information and service delivery;" gain a clear understanding of citizen segments, preferences, and life events to enhance citizens' experience in their interactions with public agencies; and provide "effective and user-friendly service delivery channels" (for example, through one-stop shops or e-government options). In line with the public sector service value chain model, public agencies can greatly benefit from clearly identifying which of their steps and activities

result in added-value for citizens, stakeholders, and the wider community (Heintzmann and Marson 2005). Research carried out in Canada, for instance, found that higher employee engagement in public sector organizations translated into more satisfied customers and, ultimately, in greater trust and confidence in public institutions (Matheson 2009). Given their limited funds, capacity, and capabilities, public agencies should prioritize key drivers of improved customer satisfaction. This proactive seeking of citizen feedback and the taking of actions based on this feedback will in turn often translate into organizational change because government processes may need to be transformed and integrated to better respond to citizens' expectations (OECD 2013; UNDP 2016a).

Instead of designing processes based on what citizen requirements are assumed to be, public institutions that want to maximize their citizen-centricity should collect data and insights from citizens and let that drive their decisions. For example, Denmark's MindLab is a cross-governmental innovation unit that brings together the municipality of Odense with the ministries of business and growth, education, and employment, and in collaboration with the ministry for economic affairs and the interior, works with a variety of stakeholders at the early planning stages of service delivery. Notably, MindLab worked with citizens to test mobile devices for completing tax returns and collected their feedback, resulting in the government changing its plans, avoiding costly service mistakes and increasing citizen satisfaction with the service.

> "Citizen-centric service delivery is a profession, not simply an objective to achieve. Training is paramount. You need to invest in your people. You need to teach administrators to be willing to seek ongoing feedback in order to improve. You cannot improve what you do not measure. It needs to be built into organizational practices. You need to benchmark. You need to set goals/targets. You need to identify the key drivers that will improve citizen satisfaction. In summary, invest in your people so that they can better serve citizens."
>
> *Dan Batista, Executive Director of the Institute for Citizen-Centered Service, Canada*

Another example is the redesign of a local police station in Chișinău, Moldova, in 2014. With the support of international partners, policemen, citizens, and representatives of nongovernmental organizations were invited to share their views about the building renovation. Based on the insights gathered, the municipality built a prototype of an improved community police station. It then tested the prototype, and after collecting additional feedback, settled a plan that included free public WIFI at the police station, the installation of an information board with useful documents for citizens, and an inviting reception area staffed by an on-duty officer. As these examples demonstrate, by soliciting the views of citizens, public administrations can correct misperceptions and better understand what their constituents are looking for and what they appreciate.

In the same vein, it is important for public administrations to share information and to tell their stories so citizens can better understand public sector challenges. There is often considerable room to set up more effective communication strategies and be more open about public resources, priority areas for action, and results. By enhancing transparency and proactivity, a state institution can improve its image with citizens and might even benefit from citizen initiatives. Releasing government datasets in an open format, for instance, may enable communities and citizen groups to develop solutions to problems related ranging from waste management to road repair.[1] The regular publishing of data can also help create benchmarks and rankings for the offices that are responsible for delivering specific services; it is an inexpensive way to push for improvement. The approach can also be based on location, similar to that adopted by some private sector actors, with scores and rankings provided by online applications (such as, for example, hotels in TripAdvisor).

In short, there is room for a more intentional focus on providing more individualized services, better utilizing new technologies, and reducing the distance to citizens through more effective

1. Datasets should only be publicly released if doing so does not harm the privacy of individuals, that is, they do not include confidential personal data.

Box 1.3. "Life is about Events, Not Agencies": Building Government Services Around the Needs of New and Expectant Parents in New Zealand

SmartStart is an integrated online tool for new and expectant parents in New Zealand. This multi-agency initiative has been supported by the Ministry of Social Development, Internal Affairs, Ministry of Health, Inland Revenue, Plunket, and NZ Midwives. It features a personalized timeline and checklist based on the baby's due date, making it easy for parents to keep track of progress and see what they need to do before and after the baby arrives. Based on the one-stop-shop principle, SmartStart provides step-by-step information and help in one place, saving the time and money of future parents. SmartStart can be used to notify the Ministry of Social Development of an upcoming birth, request an identification number for the new child, and update a *Working for Families* Tax Credit application. In addition, birth certificates no longer need to be purchased, saving new parents $26.50. Overall, the initiative has simplified access to and use of government services online and "is a great example of making sure New Zealanders have services designed around them for when they need them" (New Zealand Government 2017b).

Sources: https://smartstart.services.govt.nz; New Zealand Government 2017a, b.

and regular two-way communication and feedback as part of the public sector's ongoing transformation efforts. Citizen-centric service delivery is a journey; it is a long-term commitment that requires dedicated and determined leadership to stay the course. It is about building capacity and, ultimately, a culture of service excellence. In striving toward this goal, a public administration can leverage limited resources in powerful ways. Part II offers instruments to help with that effort.

How Can Citizen-Centricity Be Measured?

In order to measure the citizen-centricity of service delivery, selected issue areas and indicators need to be approached "with the goal of bringing the citizen's perspective forward." Furthermore, they have to "seek to define and quantify what citizens judge to be good service so that service providers can understand citizens better" (O'Connell 2000: 53). Ivanya and Shah (2010: 2–4) highlight that existing primary indicators of governance quality tend to focus on the governance environment, that is, the quality of institutions and processes, rather than on governance outcomes, especially in terms of quality of life enjoyed by citizens. According to their study, "one of the most important limitations common to all available composite indexes of governance is that they fail to capture how citizens perceive the governance environment and outcomes in their own countries" (Ivanya and Shah 2000: 2). Including indicators that assess the citizens' evaluation of governance to complement those based on data provided by governments or local experts is essential to developing citizen-centric service delivery indicators.

Citizen-focused governance can be measured by indicators that examine the extent to which citizens' needs are considered during the various stages of public service delivery—design, implementation, evaluation, and review. The main difference between a citizen-centric service delivery indicator and a typical service delivery indicator is that the citizen-centric indicator highlights the citizens' point of view. It is not uncommon for government administrations to perceive themselves differently than they are seen by citizens or even to produce data that suggest high-quality service delivery that do not correspond to citizens' perceptions of the administrative efficiency of the government. For example, officially, it may take only three days to deliver a given document, but from the citizens' perspective, the whole process may in fact

Box 1.4. Measuring Citizen Satisfaction: Caveats

Public administrations should be aware of the limitations inherent in measuring citizen satisfaction. They include:

- **Expectations are heavily dependent on context.** In some models, satisfaction is viewed as the difference between expectation and experience, and thus higher satisfaction rates could be more linked to lowered expectations among citizens than to improvements in service delivery.

- **What citizens express as being important in a survey and what actually drives their overall satisfaction may be different.** In the airline industry, for example, users often assert that safety is their prime concern. However, when satisfaction levels for specific items are related to overall satisfaction, the presence or absence of blankets is in fact a much more marked driver of satisfaction. Van Ryzin and Immerwahr (2004) tested this idea in the public sector using stated citizen satisfaction for individual services in New York City and statistically derived satisfaction. Their study revealed that improvements in "the top four stated-importance services (fire, police, schools, and garbage)" would still not lead to the same gains in citizen satisfaction as an improvement in "street cleanliness (clean) alone," and "the statistically derived key services explain(ed) much more variation in overall citizen satisfaction than (did) the services explicitly stated as important."

Source: Van Ryzin, and Immerwahr 2004: 224–25.

be much longer and more cumbersome than that because often the "three days" does not include time required to request, collect, and receive the additional documents and certificates needed to submit an application. Citizens may also differ from the public administration regarding what they consider to be areas of priority.

However, citizens are not in a position to evaluate the back-office processes that are integral to public service delivery. Some of the efforts made by public administrations to streamline their business processes or to put in place incentive structures for customer-facing staff, for example, may not be visible to the front-end user. Similarly, it may be difficult for a citizen to evaluate the complex inter-ministerial cooperation involved in the delivery of certain administrative documents or to get an overall sense of the scope and number of transactions carried out by a given institution.

Based on these observations, a dual assessment is recommended to draw a comprehensive picture of an organization's citizen-centricity. Data should be directly collected from citizens regarding their personal experiences with and evaluation of public service delivery. This is essential to help public agencies understand the public's priorities and how to address them, while also illuminating and expanding information that would otherwise be unavailable or less well reported in government statistics.[2] In addition, the public agency's efforts to reach out to citizens and improve their experience with public services should be reflected through self-reported data. Although government records cannot, by themselves, provide a sufficiently reliable and comprehensive analysis of governance quality, administrative data provide important information on the activity and services of public entities

2. Complementary practices include a range of social accountability tools that put citizen experiences and perceptions at the core of the assessment, such as citizen report cards, citizen charters, community scorecards, and interactive community mapping.

that could not be measured by simply using surveys of the general public. Each type of data complements the other, and they each have strengths and weaknesses.

In the next section, two complementary instruments are introduced—a citizen survey and a checklist for public administrators. The instruments focus on the receiver and the provider of public services, respectively. This approach reflects recent literature that has emphasized the importance of bridging the gap between the demand- and the supply-side of governance (Grandvoinnet, Aslam, and Raha 2015). The survey focuses on the demand side of governance by asking citizens for direct feedback about the performance of a given public entity with which they have been interacting; the checklist examines the supply side of governance—the capacity of the state and public systems in place to serve citizens. The two instruments provide a basic grid that administrations can use to evaluate the level of citizen-centricity of their service delivery processes.

II. The Citizen Survey and Public Administrator Checklist

Objectives and Structure of the Instruments

The citizen survey and the administrator checklist are ready-to-use tools for willing governments at the national, regional, or local level to measure and analyze:

1. How well they are performing from a citizen's perspective, by capturing the experience and perceptions of citizens in their respective constituencies;
2. How well they are performing from their own perspective, by capturing efforts made by the public agency to provide outstanding service delivery; and
3. Any discrepancies between the two.

The questions are designed to solicit actionable information for policy makers, including clear indications of areas needing more attention and the identification of "low-hanging fruits"—easy actions that could improve a citizen's experience with public service delivery. Importantly, any information collected through the assessment, particularly the survey, will be considerably more valuable if it is consistently reported back to users. Such an approach would make citizens realize that their input is being considered and would provide administrators with a benchmark against which changes can be implemented. It would also ensure that the assessment is not merely an extractive exercise but rather a two-way dialogue with an in-built accountability component.

Both the citizen survey and the administrator checklist broadly follow the steps of the citizen's journey in seeking information or receiving a service from a government agency. Each instrument begins with a section that asks for basic information about the respondent, followed by questions divided into four main areas—access, user-centeredness and responsiveness, quality and reliability of service delivery, and public sector integrity; and each concludes with a section for final comments, which is designed to capture any additional suggestions or opinions of citizens and administrators regarding priority areas needing improvement.

The tools echo each other both in terms of structure and types of questions. Any agency seeking to evaluate its citizen-centricity should therefore complete the supply-side administrator checklist and administer the demand-side citizen survey to capture any discrepancies between the government's perspective and that of its citizens, and it should then subsequently address them. The checklist includes frequent prompts to compare the results of the self-assessment with the views expressed by citizens on the same topic.

What Do the Components Capture?

The four key areas of the checklist—access; user-centeredness and responsiveness; quality and reliability of service delivery, and public sector integrity—were selected based on an in-depth literature review of existing indicators of citizen-centric governance and their areas of focus. A paper published by PriceWaterhouseCoopers' Public Sector Research Centre, for

example, identifies speed of service delivery, engagement, responsiveness, value for money, integration, choice, and personalized experience as seven key areas where improvements can be undertaken to enhance customer experience and outcomes (PwC 2007: 9). In addition, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) publishes biennial Government at a Glance reports that provide indicators comparing the political and institutional frameworks of government across OECD countries. The 2013 report's "set of inter-related process components that encapsulate what citizens expect from government" includes openness and inclusiveness, responsiveness, reliability, integrity and fairness (OECD 2013: 29). The 2015 report goes one step further to identify access, responsiveness, and reliability and quality as the three essential pillars of a framework to measure public services. The access pillar includes issues such as affordability, geographic proximity, and accessibility of information. The responsiveness pillar includes topics such as the citizen-centric approach, the matching of services to special needs, and timeliness. And the pillar of reliability and quality includes issues regarding the effective delivery of services and outcomes, the consistency of service delivery and outcomes, and security and safety (OECD 2015: 169). These elements are all incorporated in the two instruments presented here.

Access is a decisive performance criterion for citizen-centric service delivery. It examines a public agency's capacity to create and tailor communication and service delivery channels that answer the needs of citizens. Citizens may face myriad barriers to access, such as difficulties in identifying and/or contacting a relevant interlocutor; an insufficient number of, or inadequate access channels; excessive waiting times or lack of people with whom to interact; and inconvenient opening times, geographic location, and physical layout of facilities—an issue of particular concern to users with special needs, including people with disabilities, nonnative speakers, and minorities. "Such barriers can decrease awareness of eligibility or existence of services or deter potential recipients" (OECD 2013: 150). An examination of accessibility-related issues includes the consideration of the presence of online channels for service delivery because they "can facilitate access to a wide range of users and provide greater convenience, while also reducing costs for all involved, including governments" (OECD 2013: 154). Further, entire segments of populations, including the most impoverished citizens, recent migrants, and youth, are increasingly accessing online services through their mobile phones rather than on computers.

An example of how the citizen survey and the administrator checklist address the same themes with slight variations is the set of questions regarding e-government. The citizen survey focuses on satisfaction with the interface, including ease of use, presentation, and clarity of the website; while the administrator checklist includes a self-assessment of the website as well as considerations related to the use of e-government features, privacy and identity management, cybersecurity, and the collection of online metrics.

Criteria related to user-centeredness and responsiveness evaluate whether public agencies explicitly recognize, adapt, and respond without delay to the various needs of citizens. A citizen-centric approach implies that the service provider offers solutions that are tailored to various citizen segments instead of supplying a "one-size-fits-all" product. This is measured in the citizen survey by asking citizens if they feel they received personalized service and if they believe that public services are attentive to their needs. The corresponding section in the administrator checklist explores if citizens are involved in service design and if the public agency occasionally contacts them proactively. Each instrument includes a dedicated section examining the issue of responsiveness because timeliness "particularly affects citizens' confidence in the ability of public services to meet their needs" (OECD 2013: 158). The survey questions focus on the actual time it takes for a citizen's request to be answered, if time frames are clearly communicated, and the citizen's idea of an acceptable standard for time-bound service delivery. The administrator checklist prompts the agency to describe its current service delivery standards, the extent to which they are being respected, whether communication on time frames

Table 2.1. Summary of Issues Explored in Citizen Survey and Administrator Checklist	
Citizen Survey	**Administrator Checklist**
Access	
• Finding the relevant contact information • Choosing the most convenient access channel • Getting in touch with the administration • Using e-government/digital procedures	• Providing clear contact information • Providing various access channels in line with citizens' preferences • Interacting with citizens • Providing e-government services/digital procedures
User-Centered Service Delivery and Responsiveness	
• Receiving personalized service • Receiving timely service • Service delivery standards in line with expectations	• Providing a personalized service • Providing timely service • Setting service delivery standards in line with expectations
Reliability and Quality of Service Delivery	
• Interacting with staff • Receiving clear, high-quality information • Completing the procedure • Reaching a satisfactory outcome	• Interacting with citizens • Providing clear, high-quality information • Completing the procedure • Reaching satisfactory outcomes for citizens
Public Sector Integrity	
• Interacting with a transparent, corruption-free, and effective public sector • Accessing feedback and complaint handling mechanisms • Benefiting from effective interagency cooperation	• Embodying a transparent, corruption-free, and effective public sector • Providing feedback and complaint-handling mechanisms • Guaranteeing effective interagency cooperation
Final Comments	
• Priority areas • Unmet needs • Comments, suggestions, and questions	• Priority areas • Unmet needs • Comments, suggestions, and questions

with citizens is systematized, and whether clients have been consulted about their expectations regarding timely service delivery.

Measuring the quality and reliability of service delivery to users is a fundamental element of evaluating an organization's citizen-centricity, including the quality of interaction with staff, such as politeness, fairness, helpfulness, knowledge, and competence; the provision of clear, relevant, comprehensive information; affordability/financial accessibility; ease of process; and satisfaction with outcomes. The citizen survey asks users if they were satisfied with the result of their request, while the administrator checklist asks agencies if they have conducted any usability testing, experimented with customer journey mapping, or simplified their processes and procedures in the past year.

Any citizen-centric evaluation of service delivery performance must include a question of whether or not the citizens feel they are treated fairly and equitably, which is related to the broader topic of public sector integrity. A dedicated section in both the survey and checklist consider the citizen's experience with corruption, standards of conduct, ethical principles and practices applicable to the institution as well

as the existence of mechanisms encouraging transparency, accountability, and public participation, including feedback and complaint-handling systems to guarantee the fairness, consistency, and quality of services and offer opportunities for redress in cases where the rights of citizens have been infringed upon.

Table 2.1 provides a summary overview of issues examined by the survey and checklist, including aspects where they mirror one another and areas where they differ.

Question Types

In addition to collecting hard data, there are multiple types of questions that are helpful in developing indicators of a service delivery system's citizen-centricity. The types of questions most frequently used in surveys are experience-based, evaluation-based, and scenario-based.

Experience-based questions ask respondents to relay their own, lived experiences. They are often used in surveys related to the occurrence of corruption or bribery. Their advantage is their ability to provide objective, reliable data and to generate evidence regarding how citizens actually interact with public institutions. Their disadvantage is that they only allow for a limited scope of enquiry. An illustrative example of an experience-based question borrowed from the World Justice Project's *Rule of Law Index Report* (2016) is: "Did you have to pay a bribe (or money above that required by law) to obtain the information?"

Evaluation- or perception-based questions assess the subjective way that respondents acquire, interpret, and organize information. Instead of assessing facts or knowledge, they consider a respondent's personal assessment of a given topic. A typical example of evaluation-based questions are satisfaction ratings. These questions can provide insights into the general views of respondents and produce information about situations for which objective and comparable data are difficult to obtain. However, evaluation-based questions are criticized for being subjective and because a respondent's evaluation can be impacted by unrelated factors, such as the political and economic environment, their trust in or sympathy toward the government, or recent events. An illustrative example of an evaluation-based question (based on OECD 2012) is:

> How would you rate the level of service provided by the tax office staff with whom you had contact over the past 12 months?
>
> ❏ Excellent ❏ Good ❏ Neither good nor poor
> ❏ Poor ❏ Very poor

Some surveys include scenario-based questions, which present the respondent with a hypothetical scenario and several options for answers. For example, consider the following scenario (World Justice Project 2016):

> Assume that a high-ranking government officer is taking government money for personal benefit. Also assume that one of his employees witnesses this conduct, reports it to the relevant authority, and provides sufficient evidence to prove it. Assume that the press obtains the information and publishes the story. Which one of the following outcomes is most likely?
>
> (1) The accusation is completely ignored by the authorities
>
> (2) An investigation is opened, but it never reaches any conclusions.
>
> (3) The high-ranking government officer is prosecuted and punished (through fines, or time in prison).

Scenario-based questions are not as frequently used in surveys. While they invite frank responses due to their non-threatening nature—that is, the respondent may feel free to speak openly because the scenario is hypothetical—their usefulness is debatable because a respondent may not be able to identify with a provided scenario and because they only provide a general sense of the perceived likelihood of events

occurring. Furthermore, it takes a long time to read scenarios to respondents and requires greater levels of comprehension and memory on the part of the respondents.

In addition, hard data provides insights that can enrich an overall picture. They can be measured, traced, and validated. At the same time, they do not provide an understanding of situational nuances. Turkey's annual report of the office of the prime minister provides an example of hard data: "In 2015, the Public Officials Ethical Committee received 126 applications from citizens, 13 of which dealt with conflict of interest claims" (Republic of Turkey 2016). Hard data allow us to quantify results and initiate comparisons over time or across different actors. However, they are primarily focused on outcomes rather than processes, and are therefore best used in combination with other types of questions. And because much data originates from units with a potential interest in inflating accomplishments, a healthy skepticism of their validity and reliability is warranted.

The citizen survey combines experience-based and evaluation-based questions, taking advantage of both methodologies' strengths. For example, *Section 4—Reliability and Quality of Service Delivery*—is composed exclusively of questions asking citizens about the extent to which they *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree*, or *strongly disagree* with a number of statements related to interaction with staff, quality of information provided, procedures, and outcomes. *Section 5—Public Sector Integrity*—asks several experience-based questions, such as if the respondent has been asked to do a favor, give a gift, pay an official a bribe, or provide feedback about a received service. The survey does not include any scenario-based questions per se, but there are a few questions in section 5 that ask if the respondent would know where to file a complaint or where to report corruption in a hypothetical scenario.

The administrator checklist also contains a mix of evaluation-based and experience-based questions, but it is more focused on the collection of hard data. In *Section 2.3—Interacting with Citizens*—for example, administrators are asked to self-evaluate their agencies' performance regarding the ease with which citizens can contact them. Several questions explore past events related to the agency that require an answer of "yes" or "no," such as: "Has the agency ever conducted accessibility testing of its services?" There are also questions that call for the collection of hard data, such as: "In the past 12 months, how many citizens have contacted the agency using the following channels?"

In addition, concrete actions to improve service delivery can be derived fairly easily from the provided answers. The survey and checklist are intended to be used by public institutions to flag areas that are lagging in terms of citizen-centric service delivery and help to improve them. Therefore, the questions were selected based on their potential to highlight the experiences and perceptions of citizens and administrators and to allow the identification of actionable areas within the public agency's control.

All of the survey and checklist questions have either been used before or have been adapted from a variety of sources exploring the interactions of citizens with public agencies, including international questionnaires such as the *Open Government Index*; national-level questionnaires such as those administered by the governments of Canada, France, Ireland, and New Zealand (CCMD 1998; SGMAP 2015; DPER 2015; New Zealand Government 2015); European Union-wide surveys such as the European Commission's *E-government Benchmark*, *Eurobarometers*, and the *European Quality of Life Survey* (EC 2012, 2014; Eurofound 2012); and subnational indices such as the *European Quality of Government Index*, the International Republican Institute's *Ukraine Municipal Survey*, the *Vietnam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index*, Transparency International Slovakia's transparency and openness ranking of cities and regions, and the Center for the Study of Democracy's Monitoring Anticorruption Policy Implementation tool (Charron 2013; IRI 2015; UNDP 2016b; Transparency International 2012; CSD 2015).

Answer Types

Except for *Section 6—Final Comments*, all of the citizen survey questions used are closed-ended to facilitate data collection: respondents are asked to indicate yes or no or choose from a limited set of possible answers. This is also true for the supply-side checklist, although a number of its questions ask for additional information, comments and detail as well. A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of open- and closed-ended questions is presented in table 2.2.

Several questions in the survey and the checklist make use of a Likert measurement scale—a list of items expressing positive or negative attitudes toward a specific issue. The Likert scale typically provides for five different possible answers: *strongly agree*, *agree*, *uncertain*, *disagree*, or *strongly disagree*. This type of scale allows for the delineation of how respondents feel about a given area. One advantage of the Likert scale is the ease with which it can be administered. It also allows for greater differentiation than does a simple *yes/no* or *agree/disagree* option because perspectives can be expressed along a continuum. The use of a Likert scale throughout a survey allows respondents to choose the gradation of their opinions and facilitates its administration, especially if it is self-administered.

Table 2.2. Advantages and Disadvantages of Open- and Closed-Ended Questions

Type of Question	Advantages	Disadvantages
Closed-ended	• Provides uniform responses • Easy to administer; saves time and intellectual energy of the respondent and the interviewer • Helps respondents concentrate on the aspects important to the researcher • Easy to code; significantly reduces transcription errors • Easy to analyze • Allows for comparisons and quantification • More likely to produce fully completed questionnaires while avoiding irrelevant responses	• Respondents can neither clarify nor further express their positions • Respondents are somewhat passive and not encouraged to reflect • If respondents have nothing to say, they may give a nonreasoned or casual answer • Can prevent original contributions that do not fit into preset categories
Open-ended	• Allows respondents to express their answers in their own words • Guarantees greater freedom and spontaneous answers • Invites respondents to share understandings, experiences, opinions, and interpretations	• Requires additional work and incurs additional costs during the data cleaning, analysis, and coding phases • Cognitive effort required from the respondent and greater potential for distortion by the interviewer when recording the response

III. Customizing the Citizen-Centric Service Delivery Assessment

The citizen survey and the administrator checklist can be customized to fit a public entity's particular mandate and characteristics relating to service delivery. The questions included are a first cut from a much wider range of questions that can be considered. They are intended as a basic framework and repository of key aspects for consideration. The four main areas examined—access, user-centeredness and responsiveness, quality and reliability, and public sector integrity—are relevant across various types of public bodies with a service delivery mission. The survey and checklist can be adapted to provide tailor-made indications of public service delivery quality. The assessment should be tailored to the local and national context and to normative regulations.

Objectives

An agency seeking to implement the citizen-centric service delivery assessment should begin by clearly identifying its goals, which should then guide the broad parameters of the survey and checklist. What are the service delivery questions or issues that need answers? What issues is the assessment intended to address? What data are already available, and where are there gaps in the data? What kind of analysis is anticipated? What level of precision is required? What resources are available for carrying out the assessment in terms of finances, personnel, and technology? What are the existing constraints? What limitations would be considered acceptable in terms of target population, coverage, and number of responses? Should the assessment focus on one service delivery process or several? For example, the assessment design will vary depending on if an agency is trying to bolster an argument (regarding for example how to reorganize certain business processes) or just trying to get a sense of how its clients perceive its service delivery. If, for instance, a social security department is seeking empirical evidence to support the claim that the process of delivering medical insurance cards must be remodeled, it might choose to start with a citizen survey narrowly focused on the perceived ease and timeliness of the service. If a municipality wants to get an overall sense of how effective its service delivery is in a given area, it might start with a self-assessment, and then conduct a comprehensive online survey of citizens who have recently requested or used the service in question. If a coordinating agency considers carrying out a citizen-centric service delivery assessment, it might also consider using the instruments to encourage yardstick competition among its subordinate bodies.

Number and Sequencing of Questions

The implementing agency must decide the questions to focus on as well as their sequencing. The length of the instruments can be adapted based on a cost-benefit assessment that considers available resources, the burden on respondents and interviewers, and the usefulness of collected data. The survey example presented here is somewhat thorough; its length may not be well suited to various types of administrations.

For example, a telephone or self-administered survey must be shorter than a face-to-face survey. It is therefore important for the agency to specifically choose the topics to cover and at what depth. Given the fact that, once set up, changing a questionnaire for additional iterations reduces or eliminates the possibility of comparing results across time, starting small and simple with a focus on the very core aspects that are of interest to the agency can be a sensible strategy.

An implementing agency might also consider adapting the sequencing of the survey questions. As with any survey, the order of items asked as well as the headings direct the attention of respondents and influence the fluidity of the questionnaire. Agencies might consider developing a short introduction to the survey, outlining its goals and indicating the approximate amount of time the survey will take to fill out. It can also be useful to complement section changes with brief transition sentences that guide the respondent toward the next topic. Depending on the implementing agency's preference, the collection of respondents' demographic information may be moved toward the end of the survey, as respondents tend to be mentally tired following a series of analytical considerations and appreciate closing on easy questions. Questions about age and income may also be perceived as sensitive by some respondents and discourage them from participating, so asking these questions at the end of the survey could reduce the drop-out rate. The first questions asked should be engaging because many will decide to continue or abandon the survey at an early stage.

Answer Scale

Some types of questions allow for either an even or uneven answer scale, such as a four- or five-point scale, respectively. The main difference between the two is that an uneven scale allows for a central *no preference* or neutral answer option, and thereby legitimizes such a position. Survey specialists have mixed views on this topic. Some suggest that a neutral option should not be provided because respondents might opt for this cognitively easy answer and thus indiscriminately select the central value. Dolnicar and Grün (2014) call this phenomenon *evasion behavior*. Proponents of an even scale argue that respondents should be "forced" to take a stance and provide a clearer indication of their views, either positive or negative. Others argue that providing a neutral response is a valid outcome for some questions and that it is inappropriate to push respondents into taking a side. They further stress that using a four-point scale risks producing an acquiescent response set, that is, reinforce an individual's tendency to want to be agreeable, which could distort the data.

The choice of an even or uneven scale should be influenced by the survey's objectives. Indeed, it appears that even scales are usually more favored by actors with political views, such as a nongovernmental organization that wants to determine the quality of service delivery or a newly elected mayor who wants to assess what is going well and what is not. An even scale can also simplify the summary and presentation of results because the aggregate positive or negative answers can be lumped together—for example, 70 percent of respondents *strongly agree* or *agree* that staff was polite to them, while 30 percent *disagree* or *strongly disagree*.

Another option is to use a four-point scale, plus a *no opinion* category, or to choose the type of scale based on the interviewing method envisaged. Indeed, for phone interviews, it is typical that respondents are given a limited number of answer options, usually around four.

Target Group and Survey Method

A resource-effective way to administer the citizen survey is through a targeted survey of citizens who have had fairly recent contact with the agency (for example, over the past 12 months). For a local police office, this could mean getting in touch with recent crime victims; for a public finance center, citizens who have recently visited the center to receive help with their tax-related questions. Another option is to aim for a

representative sample of the target population, for example, through a general telephone survey of the adult population. Due to its scientific grounding, representative sampling carries greater weight when considering changes based on survey findings. However, this method tends to be more expensive because if service users comprise only a small share of the population, then a large sample might be required. Hence, targeting the subpopulation that has recently used one of the agency's services—such as with an email or phone survey after the use of a specific service—is more likely to produce useful results, is a better use of resources, and allows agencies to extract more actionable data.

At the same time, for issues regarding access, it is important to keep in mind that it may be necessary to include non-users, because users by definition have successfully accessed a service. An implementing agency might also choose to administer the survey to a focus group, that is, a small but diverse group of actual users for a one-off discussion or a service user panel (called a consumer panel in the private sector). Another option is the self-selection of respondents through a website- or social-media-based survey. However, this method is biased in that it draws on the most motivated users of the service, who are keen on participation—the "loudest voices"—a potentially interesting but not necessarily representative group.

Regarding methods used to reach citizens, several options are available, which include face-to-face, telephone, postal, or Internet administration of the survey. A mixed interviewing mode (using two or more of these options) is another possibility, but while this approach can reduce costs associated with the interview process and improve response rates, it can be difficult and expensive to implement where resources are limited. Another aspect of the survey for the agency to determine is an adequate sample size. A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of various survey administration modes are presented in appendix C.

Frequency of Enumeration

An agency might choose to carry out a citizen survey as a standalone initiative or include it in its existing survey vehicles, depending on available infrastructure. If the agency is already administering other types of feedback instruments, adding a selection of citizen-centric questions to the existing tools could prove to be the most cost-effective approach. Depending on its budget, the agency might decide to conduct the survey itself or to outsource its administration to an external agent.

An agency might decide to carry out the citizen survey as a one-off initiative, for example to collect data on a specific aspect of service delivery to inform its decision-making process; on a periodic basis, such as annually; or continuously. Collecting data on a periodic basis allows for comparisons across time and the development of benchmarks. It increases the relevance of the data collected, which can then be used to inform evaluation processes and monitor performance. However, this approach necessitates a regular and considerable budget commitment. Continuous surveying involves the collection of data from users on an ongoing basis. This might mean that every user of a given service is contacted after a transaction and asked to provide feedback. Albania's Ministry of State for Local Issues and Anticorruption used this approach in 2015. A text message was automatically sent out to citizens who had recently received treatment at a state-run hospital, enquiring if they had been asked to pay a bribe (Kunicova 2015). This type of continuous or spot checking is becoming more prevalent and is greatly facilitated by the spread of new technologies. A variety of technology-based methods can be considered in numerous combinations, depending on the goals and needs of the agency. Continuous surveying, such as with follow-up emails to citizens after they receive a service or a customer feedback stand at the exit of a service center with happy- and sad-face buttons, allows for the pooling of data over time. However, this approach requires the regular use of resources and may not be practical for some organizations.

Finally, to guarantee the effective use of the survey tool, it is strongly recommended that administrations pretest the questionnaire (for example, through the use of focus groups or cognitive testing methods) for completeness; ease of use in terms of time required to complete, clarity of instructions and questions, and sequence; perceptions of respondents; and suitability of the data collection channel. Precautions should be taken to avoid creating space or incentives for manipulating results, including paying close attention to the formulation of questions, the timing of and circumstances under which the survey is conducted, the data collection process, and the analysis of results. This is particularly vital because any such manipulation would be a significant step away from citizen-centric service delivery and would likely erode rather than reinforce citizens' trust in public institutions.

Parts IV and V present templates for the citizen survey and administrator checklist, respectively. As noted, these templates are intended as general guidance. They offer a set of ideas to evaluate citizen-centric service delivery, but they can and should be adapted to the mandate and characteristics of the agency conducting the assessment.

Appendixes A and B provide examples of how the citizen-centric service delivery assessment tools might be used by a municipal registry office that issues birth, wedding, and death certificates. The completed checklist is accompanied by comments and a short summary of the insights provided by the agency's self-assessment, which then guides the content of the citizen survey. The appendixes provide a realistic illustration of the type of findings and recommendations that can be drawn from the instruments.

IV. The Citizen Survey

Section 1: Respondent Information

1.1. Gender:

❒ Male ❒ Female

1.2. Year of birth: _____

1.3. Highest educational attainment:

❒ Primary education

❒ Secondary education

❒ Short-cycle tertiary education (e.g., higher technical, community college, technician-level training, and advanced/higher vocational training—usually two years of postsecondary education)

❒ Bachelor's degree or equivalent

❒ Master's degree or equivalent

❒ Doctoral degree or equivalent

1.4. Professional situation:

❒ Working (full-time, part-time, or self-employed)

❒ Homemaker

❒ Retired

❒ Unemployed

❒ Student

❒ Other: _____

1.5. Annual income before tax (in euros):

❒ Less than 10,000

❒ 10,000–20,000

❒ 20,000–30,000

❒ 30,000–40,000

❒ 40,000+

Note: Suggested ranges should be adapted to the local context.

1.6. Postal code: _____

Note: Postal codes can help identify the degree of urbanization and the NUTS (nomenclature of territorial units for statistics) region of the respondent. But asking respondents for their postal codes is not always necessary and can sometimes lead to nonresponses because in some countries, postal codes identify individual houses.

1.7. Recent interactions with public agencies and officials. Over the past 12 months, have you come into contact with [name of agency] either for your own purposes or on behalf of someone else, whether in person; by phone, mail, or email; or on a website?

❒ Yes ❒ No

1.8. Type of interaction with public agencies or officials. Why did you come into contact with [name of agency]?

❒ I was searching for information.

❒ I wanted to submit a question, suggestion, or complaint.

❒ I was looking for a public service.

Elaborate: _____

Note: Agencies administering this survey can code their services and provide closed-ended answer choices to question 1.8.

Section 2: Access

2.1. Finding the relevant contact information

2.1.1. How satisfied were you with the ease of finding the correct website/address/contact person?

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

2.1.2. Did you approach another government agency before finding the one that could actually deal with your enquiry?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Do not remember

If the answer to question 2.1.2. is "yes":

2.1.3. How many different agencies did you approach before you found the one that could actually deal with your enquiry?

❒ 2 ❒ 3 ❒ 4 ❒ 5+

2.2. Choosing the most convenient access channel

2.2.1. When you looked for information or came into contact with [name of agency], which of the following means of interaction did you use? Select all that apply.

❒ In-person, face-to-face contact with public official
❒ Posted letter and/or facsimile
❒ Telephone (fixed line or mobile)
❒ Email
❒ Website
❒ Tablet/smartphone applications
❒ Social media

2.2.2. If you were to come into contact with [name of agency] again in the future, what would be your preferred channel to interact? Select one.

❒ In-person, face-to-face contact with public officials
❒ Posted letter and/or facsimile
❒ Telephone (fixed line or mobile)
❒ Email
❒ Internet/website
❒ Tablet/smartphone applications
❒ Social media

2.3. Getting in touch with the administration

After you identified the correct website/address/contact person, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the following?

2.3.1. Ease of contacting the government entity

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

2.3.2. Overall waiting time to get your query answered (e.g., on the phone, at the facility, or to receive a response by mail or email)

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

2.3.3. Number of public servants required to resolve your request

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

If your contact was in person/face-to-face, how satisfied were you with the following?

2.3.4 Opening hours

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

2.3.5. Time it took you to reach the facility

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

2.3.6. Physical layout of the facility

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied
❒ Do not remember

2.3.7. How many public servants did you interact with?

❒ 1–2 ❒ 3–4 ❒ More than 4 ❒ Do not remember

2.4. Using e-government/digital procedures

If you did not check the boxes for "email," "website," "tablet/smartphone applications," or "social media" in question 2.2.1:

2.4.1. Why have you not used email, websites, tablet/smartphone applications or social media to contact public agencies or officials? Check all that apply.

- ❒ I was unaware of the relevant website or online service.
- ❒ I do not know how to use/am not familiar with online tools.
- ❒ I prefer personal contact.
- ❒ Things get done more easily and/or more quickly through other channels.
- ❒ I am worried about the protection and security of personal data on the Internet.
- ❒ The relevant services will require personal visits or paper submission anyway.
- ❒ Other (please specify): _____

2.4.2. If it were possible, would you like to do everything with [name of agency] online?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If you checked "website" and/or "tablet/smartphone applications" in question 2.2.1:

Thinking of the most recent contact you had online using a personal computer, laptop, mobile device, or tablet, what was your level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the following?

2.4.3. Ease of navigating website/application

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied
❒ Very satisfied ❒ Do not remember

2.4.4. Presentation of website/application

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied
❒ Very satisfied ❒ Do not remember

2.4.5. Ease of downloading material

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied
❒ Very satisfied ❒ Do not remember

2.4.6. Information/documents available on website

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied
❒ Very satisfied ❒ Do not remember

2.4.7. Clarity of online forms

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied
❒ Very satisfied ❒ Do not remember

2.4.8. Instructions, support, and/or help functionalities

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied
❒ Very satisfied ❒ Do not remember

2.4.9. Did you encounter any technical problems while using the website/application?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Do not remember

If yes, please explain: _____

2.4.10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following: I am confident that any personal data I provide to government agencies is securely managed/properly protected.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

Section 3: User-Centered Service Delivery and Responsiveness

3.1. Receiving personalized service

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

3.1.1. The service I received took into account my individual circumstances and preferences.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

3.1.2. Based on my most recent interaction, I would say that public services are attentive to their users' needs.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

If you checked "disagree" or "strongly disagree" in question 3.1.1 and/or 3.1.2:

3.1.3. Why were you dissatisfied? Check all that apply.

❒ The government agency offered you a generic solution that did not match your specific circumstances.

❒ The government agency failed to treat you with proper respect and empathy.

❒ Other, please explain: _____

3.2. Receiving timely service

3.2.1. How much time passed between the moment you requested a service and the moment you considered your problem solved?

❒ Up to 5 minutes ❒ Up to 15 minutes ❒ Up to 30 minutes
❒ Up to 1 hour ❒ Up to half a day ❒ Up to a day ❒ Up to 1 week
❒ Up to 2 weeks ❒ Up to 1 month ❒ Up to 3 months
❒ Up to 6 months ❒ Up to 1 year ❒ Not yet resolved
❒ Do not remember

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

3.2.2. It was clear to me how long the process would take to complete.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree
❒ Not applicable

3.2.3. The service was performed within the indicated time frame.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree
❒ Not applicable

3.2.4. I was satisfied with the time it took to get an answer to my initial query.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree
❒ Not applicable

3.2.5. Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get the service/to deal with my query.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree
❒ Not applicable

3.2.6. How many times did you have to get in touch with [name of the agency] to follow-up on your request?

❒ None ❒ 1 ❒ 2 ❒ 3 ❒ 4+ ❒ Do not remember

3.3. Service delivery standards in line with expectations

3.3.1. If you call with a request, what is a reasonable amount of time to wait before speaking with a government representative?

❒ None ❒ 30 seconds ❒ 1 minute ❒ 2 minutes ❒ 3 minutes
❒ 4 minutes ❒ 5 minutes ❒ Longer than 5 minutes

3.3.2. If you call with a request, what is the maximum number of people you should have to deal with?

❒ 1 ❒ 2 ❒ 3 ❒ 4 or more

3.3.3. If you leave a voice mail message at 10:00 a.m., what is a reasonable amount of time to wait before receiving a return call?

❒ 1 hour ❒ 4 hours ❒ Same day ❒ Next day ❒ Within 3 days
❒ Within 1 week ❒ Longer than 1 week

3.3.4. If you visit a government office, what is a reasonable amount of time to wait in any line?

❒ 1 minute ❒ 2-4 minutes ❒ 5–9 minutes ❒ 10–14 minutes
❒ 15–19 minutes ❒ 20–24 minutes ❒ 25–30 minutes
❒ More than 30 minutes

3.3.5. If you visit a government office, what is the maximum number of people you should have to deal with?

❒ 1 ❒ 2 ❒ 3 ❒ 4 or more

3.3.6. When you write or send paper documents to a government office, what is a reasonable amount of time to wait before receiving a mailed reply?

❒ 1 week ❒ 2 weeks ❒ 3 weeks ❒ 4 weeks or more

3.3.7. When you email or send documents electronically to a government office by 10:00 a.m., what is a reasonable amount of time to wait before receiving an electronic reply?

❒ 1 hour ❒ 4 hours ❒ Same day ❒ Next day ❒ Within 3 days
❒ Within a week ❒ Longer than a week

Section 4: Reliability and Quality of Service Delivery

4.1. Interacting with staff

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

4.1.1. Staff were polite to me.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.1.2. Staff treated me fairly.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.1.3. Staff paid extra attention to me and went out of their way to get me what I needed.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.1.4. Staff were knowledgeable/competent regarding the subject matter.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.2. Receiving clear, high-quality information

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

4.2.1. I received high quality information/advice.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.2.2. I received all the information/advice I needed in one interaction.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.2.3. The information/advice was provided in clear, simple language.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3. Completing the procedure

4.3.1. How difficult was it for you to cover the cost of receiving the service?

❒ Very difficult ❒ A little difficult ❒ Fairly Easy ❒ Very easy

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

4.3.2. The process was straightforward and easy to understand.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3.3. The succession of steps in the process was logical.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3.4. The process was easy to complete.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3.5. The process required little paperwork.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.4 Reaching a satisfactory outcome

4.4.1. Did you ultimately receive the service you requested?

❒ No, not at all ❒ Partially ❒ Yes, completely

❒ The issue is still pending

4.4.2. Thinking about the entire experience, how satisfied were you with the service you got?

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

4.4.3. Was the service provided better or worse than you expected?

❒ Much worse ❒ Worse ❒ Better ❒ Much better

4.4.4. Would you recommend using this service to another citizen?

❒ No, not at all ❒ Not really ❒ Yes, probably ❒ Absolutely

Section 5: Public Sector Integrity

5.1. Interacting with a transparent, corruption-free, and effective public sector

5.1.1. Thinking about your interactions with [name of agency] over the past 12 months (for any service), did you or anyone you know have to do a favor, give a gift, or pay an official extra money to get a service or document?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, please indicate the approximate monetary value of this favor, gift or bribe: _____

5.1.2. Do you think any of the following would have assisted you in receiving easier service from this agency?

Check all that apply.

❒ Better connections to officials who work at or run the agency

❒ Better prior information about what was required from you

❒ Better prior information about your rights and what you are entitled to

❒ Other, please indicate: _____

In your opinion, how serious are the following problems of the public agency with which you interacted?

5.1.3. Corruption—the use of public office for private gain, which can take many forms, such as bribery, extortion, fraud, embezzlement, collusion, abuse of discretion, favoritism, gift giving, nepotism, cronyism, and patronage

❒ Insignificant ❒ Not very significant ❒ Quite significant ❒ Very significant

5.1.4. Lack of a service culture among public sector staff

❒ Insignificant ❒ Not very significant ❒ Quite significant ❒ Very significant

5.1.5. Lack of opportunities for citizens to participate in the design of policies and services

❒ Insignificant ❒ Not very significant ❒ Quite significant ❒ Very significant

5.2. Accessing feedback and complaint handling mechanisms

5.2.1. Were you asked to evaluate the service you received?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Do not remember

5.2.2. If you wanted to submit a complaint about the public service (for example, to report a case of unethical behavior, favoritism, poor service delivery, or unjust outcome), would you know where to file it?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Not entirely sure

5.2.3. Have you ever wanted to complain about a service you received from this government entity?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If the answer to question 5.2.3 is "no," proceed to 5.2.7.

If the answer to question 5.2.3 is "yes":

5.2.4. Did you submit an official complaint?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If the answer to question 5.2.4 is "yes":

5.2.5. How did you complain?

❒ Face-to-face ❒ By letter or facsimile ❒ By email

❒ By phone/calling a hotline ❒ On agency website

❒ Through a nongovernmental organization (NGO)

❒ On social media

❒ Other (specify): _____

If the answer to question 5.2.4 is "no":

5.2.6. Why did you not register a complaint?

❒ I did not know how.

❒ It would be pointless/it would not lead to any change.

❒ It would take too much time/effort.

❒ I was afraid it could have negative consequences for me

❒ Other (specify): _____

If you were to experience or witness a case of corruption, would you:

5.2.7. Be willing to report it?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Not entirely sure

5.2.8. Know where to report it?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Not entirely sure

5.3. Benefiting from effective interagency cooperation

Thinking now about all the times you have personally used or had contact with [name of public service provider] over the last 12 months, have you encountered any of the following?

5.3.1. The agency asked you to provide information it was supposed to have already.

❒ Yes ❒ No

5.3.2. The agency provided you with information contradicting something you had heard or read elsewhere.

❒ Yes ❒ No

5.3.3. The agency redirected to another office or government agency with little positive outcome for you.

❒ Yes ❒ No

5.3.4. The agency contacted you proactively about a useful service or an information you might need in the future.

❒ Yes ❒ No

Section 6: Final Comments

6.1. In your view, what should the public sector's priority area be in terms of improving public service delivery? Check one.

❒ Simplify access to services

❒ Improve quality of services

❒ Reduce cost of services

❒ Improve staff behavior

❒ Improve timeliness

❒ Develop and/or improve online services

❒ Reduce corruption

❒ Reduce red tape and paperwork

❒ Other (please specify): _____

6.2. Is there any demand or unmet need regarding public services that you would like to bring to the attention of any particular public agency? Please explain.

_____

_____

6.3. Do you have any additional comments, suggestions, questions, or concerns you would like to share? Please elaborate.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.

V. The Administrator Checklist

Section 1: Contributor Information

1.1. Primary contributor information

This information is for validation purpose only.
It will not be publically released.

Title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Dr.): _____

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Job title: _____

Highest level of educational attainment:

❒ Primary education ❒ Secondary education

❒ Short-cycle tertiary ❒ Bachelor's degree or equivalent

❒ Master's degree or equivalent

❒ Doctoral degree or equivalent

1.2. Contact details

Name of public entity: _____

Department/office name: _____

Website: _____

Email address: _____

Phone: _____

Mobile phone: _____

1.3. Agency Address

Street: _____

City: _____

Postal code: _____

Region: _____

Country: _____

1.4. Additional contributor(s) to the questionnaire

This information is for validation purpose only.
It will not be publically released.

a. Title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Dr.): _____

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Job title: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Address: _____

b. Title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Dr.): _____

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Job title: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Address: _____

1.5. Explain the agency's overall mandate (for example, the provision of education, health, employment, or social services). Describe any tangible services provided to citizens. This could be, for example, the delivery of residency cards, social insurance registration, professional/vocational training and life-long learning, or support for job seekers.

_____

_____

_____

Section 2: Access

2.1. Providing clear contact information

2.1.1. How do you communicate the agency's mission to users? Check all that apply.

❒ Website ❒ Social media ❒ Display boards or billboards

❒ Magazine or newspaper advertisements

❒ Printed brochures

2.1.2. How do you communicate the agency's contact information to users? Check all that apply.

❒ Website ❒ Social media ❒ Display boards or billboards

❒ Magazine or newspaper advertisements

❒ Printed brochures

If the agency does not have a website, skip to section 2.2.

If the agency does have a website, answer questions 2.1.3–2.1.17.

Does the agency website allow users to identify the following in two or fewer clicks?

2.1.3. The agency's mission and responsibilities in terms of service delivery

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.4. General contact information for the agency

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.5. The responsibilities of specific departments in terms of service delivery

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.6. Contact information for specific departments and officials

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.7. An overall organizational structure and chart that includes the names of units and responsible persons

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

If citizens want to contact the agency regarding the delivery of a specific service can they do so through the following means?

2.1.8. An online form on the agency's website

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.9. A generic email address

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.10. A specific email address that will put the citizen in direct contact with the responsible division or department

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.11. A generic phone number

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.12. A specific phone number that will put the citizen in direct contact with the responsible division or department

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.13. A clearly identified person, including name, position, and division or department

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.14. Online virtual assistance

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.15. Online chat functionality with an actual person

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.16. Does the agency's website include links to other organizations along with an explanation as to why a citizen might want to contact them?

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.17. Does the agency's website include a search function?

❒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

See section 2.1 of the citizen survey to compare this self-assessment with the views expressed by citizens.

2.2. Access channels and citizens' preferences

2.2.1. Which of the following access channels can citizens use to contact the agency? Check all that apply.

❒ In-person, face-to-face interaction at a physical facility

❒ Posted letter and/or facsimile

❒ Telephone

❒ Email

❒ Online form on agency website

❒ Tablet/smartphone application

❒ Social media

2.2.2. Have you asked citizens which access channels they prefer using?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

See question 2.2.2 in the citizen survey to compare currently available access channels with the preferences of citizens.

2.2.3. Is data about access channels used by citizens collected systematically?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.2.4. If yes, in the past 12 months, how many citizens have contacted the agency using the following channels?

In-person, face-to-face: _____

Posted letter and/or facsimile: _____

Telephone (fixed line or mobile): _____

Email: _____

Online form on the website: _____

Tablet/smartphone applications: _____

Social media: _____

Other (specify): _____

Total: _____

2.3. Interacting with citizens

How would you evaluate the agency in terms of the following?

2.3.1. The ease with which citizens can contact the agency

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.2. Overall waiting times at the facility, with postal delivery, on the phone, or by email

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.3. Number of public servants with which citizens must interact to resolve issues

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.4. User-friendly operating hours (such as lunchtime and evening hours that facilitate access for citizens working full-time)

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.5. The ease with which citizens can get to the facility (such as ease of access with public transport)

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.6. User-friendly physical layout of facility (such as a clearly identifiable reception area, waiting areas with comfortable seating, and easy-access ramps for people with disabilities or parents with strollers)

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

See questions 2.3.1–2.3.6 of the citizen survey to compare this self-assessment with the views expressed by citizens.

2.3.7. Are the agency's services tailored to people with special needs, including people with disabilities, the elderly, people living in remote areas, and people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, among others?

❒ Yes ❒ No

2.3.8. If yes, how are services tailored to particular populations or groups (for example, special accessibility mechanisms for the visually or physically impaired, wheelchair-accessible design of facility, mobile service centers that bring services to remote segments of the population, or special efforts to facilitate service delivery to citizens with low literacy levels)?

_____

_____

2.3.9. Has the agency ever conducted accessibility testing of its services to assess how easily users with various disabilities are able to access services, and then used this information to improve service design and implementation)?

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, elaborate: _____

2.3.10. Is the agency's paper documentation available in languages relevant to all population segments (such as other national languages or English if foreigners are likely to use its services)?

❒ Yes, fully available in more than one language

❒ Yes, partially available in more than one language

❒ Not available in other languages

If yes, elaborate: _____

2.3.11. Is the agency's online documentation available in languages relevant to all population segments (such as other national languages or English if foreigners are likely to use its services)?

❒ Yes, fully available in more than one language

❒ Yes, partially available in more than one language

❒ Not available in other languages

If yes, elaborate: _____

2.4. E-government services/digital procedures

Online service delivery

2.4.1. How many agency services are partially or fully provided online? _____

List services partially provided online: _____

_____

_____

List services fully provided online: _____

_____

_____

Note: In the case of a company registering its name, the service would be considered fully available online if the registration and administration approval processes are both possible online—without any paper or in-person visit by the entrepreneur required (European Commission 2012: 83).

If the agency is unable to complete partial or full transactions online, skip to question 2.4.12.

Does the agency use any of the following e-government features identified by the European Commission (2014) as key enablers for public services?

2.4.2. Electronic identification. Can citizens use a government-issued electronic form of identification and authentication for the process?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.3. Single sign-on. Can users access multiple systems without logging on multiple times?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.4. Electronic documents. Are authenticated documents that are recognized by the public administration being used to allow users to send and receive documents online, for example, by e-signature?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.5. Authentic sources. Are base registries used to automatically validate or fetch data related to citizens or businesses, allowing online forms to be prefilled so they are received by the user either partly or fully completed?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.6. Electronic safe (e-safe). Is there a virtual and secure repository for citizens to store and retrieve personal electronic data and documents?

❒ Yes ❒ No

2.4.7. Are online services presented according to various citizen categories, such as student, entrepreneur, employee, and retired?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.8. Are the online services provided by the agency bundled by life event?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.9. Is a citizen's progress openly tracked over the course of an online service delivery transaction—that is, is it made clear how many of the process steps the citizen has already accomplished and how many still remain to be done?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.10. Can users save their work as a draft over the course of an online service delivery transaction, that is, can they return to the draft at a later time?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

2.4.11. Is a demonstration available to help citizens make use of online services while they conduct a transaction, such as a click-through presentation, an online video, or a downloadable manual that explains the necessary steps?

❒ Yes ❒ No Comments: _____

Privacy and identity management

2.4.12. Does the agency's website clearly indicate its privacy policy?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, what is the link? _____

2.4.13. For each online service used, are citizens informed if and why their personal data is being collected?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Not applicable

2.4.14. How often do you implement regular security and management controls to prevent the inappropriate disclosure of sensitive information? _____

2.4.15. Over the past 12 months, have there been any hacking or cyberattack attempts on the agency?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes:

How many attempts were made? _____

How many attempts were successfully spotted and countered by the agency's cybersecurity measures? _____

How many managed to infiltrate the system? _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed by citizens in question 2.4.10 of the citizen survey.

Open data

2.4.16. Does the agency have an open data portal?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, what is the link? _____

If no, is the agency providing at least some datasets to the public in their entirety through bulk downloads and application programming interfaces (APIs)?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, what is the link? _____

Note: An open data portal is a web-based interface, usually with specific search functionalities, designed to facilitate database searches. Application programming interfaces (APIs) are also often available, offering direct and automated access to data for software applications.

2.4.17. Does the agency have a public performance data dashboard, that is, an openly accessible, visual display of its performance data across several key metrics?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, what is the link? _____

Collection of relevant metrics

Is the agency collecting the following common baseline metrics for the agency's website?

2.4.18. Total visits

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.19. Total page views

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.20. Unique visitors

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.21. Page views per visit

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's average: _____

2.4.22. Average visit duration

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's average: _____

2.4.23. Time on page

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's average: _____

2.4.24. Bounce rate

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's bounce rate: _____

2.4.25. New versus returning visitor

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's ratio of new to returning visitors: _____

2.4.26. Visits per visitor in a specified time frame

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, elaborate: _____

2.4.27. Total number of onsite search queries

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.28. Visitor composition

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, elaborate: _____

2.4.29. Total interactions/connections via social media channels

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

Quality of website/applications

How would you evaluate the agency's online interface in terms of the following?

2.4.30. Ease of navigation

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.31. Presentation

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.32. Ease of downloading material

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.33. Information/documents available

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.34. Clarity of online forms

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.35. Instructions, support and/or help functionalities

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

Compare the self-assessment in questions 2.4.30-2.4.35 with the views expressed by citizens in questions 2.4.3–2.49 of the citizen survey.

Are the following elements available on the agency's website?

2.4.36. A page for frequently asked questions

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

2.4.37. A live support functionality (click-to-chat)

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Section 3: User-Centered Service Delivery and Responsiveness

3.1. Providing a personalized service

3.1.1. Under certain circumstances, does the agency proactively contact citizens to bring specific information to their attention?

❒ Yes ❒ No ❒ Not applicable

If yes:

3.1.2. Explain the circumstances under which the agency proactively contact citizens (such as registering on the electoral roll; renewing identification documents; submitting income taxes; or receiving benefits in the event of a birth, loss of employment, or health incident).

_____

_____

3.1.3. How does the agency usually contact citizens?

❒ Posted mail

❒ Email

❒ SMS

❒ Telephone

3.1.4. Over the past 12 months, has the agency involved citizens in the design of its services (that is, tapping into the knowledge of service users by providing them with an opportunity to co-create the service delivery process by, for example, inviting citizens to participate in a role-playing activity to test prototypes)?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

_____

3.2. Providing timely service

3.2.1. List key services provided by the agency, corresponding service standards, and number and type of supporting documents citizens need to access the services. Service standards are specific delivery targets or commitments established by the organization that it promises to honor when delivering a service, such as *delivery of document within three days*, *calls answered in 20 seconds*, and *100 percent of citizens' questions are addressed*.

1. Service: _____

Service standards: _____

Supporting documents required: _____

_____

2. Service: _____

Service standards: _____

Supporting documents required: _____

_____

3. Service: _____

Service standards: _____

Supporting documents required: _____

_____

3.2.2. Are time frames for various services systematically communicated to citizens during interactions/transactions (that is, are citizens clearly informed of how much time it will take to complete the entire process)?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

3.2.3. Do citizens receive status updates on the progress of their requests (either offline or online)?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

3.2.4. Does the agency collect data on the time required for it to deliver its services to citizens?

❒ Yes ❒ No

3.2.5. If the answer to question 3.2.4 is "yes," indicate the percentage of services delivered within stipulated time frames (for example, 87 percent of identity cards are provided within a 15-day time frame, or 55 percent of health insurance cards are provided within a 7-day time frame). _____

3.2.6. In the last six months, how many citizens contacted the agency to request a status update on a request?

_____

3.3. Setting service delivery standards in line with expectations

3.3.1. Has the agency consulted with citizens to identify what they view as timely service?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

3.3.2. Does the agency's service standards reflect citizens' expectations?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in questions 3.1.1–3.3.7 of the citizen survey.

Section 4: Reliability and Quality of Service Delivery

4.1. Interacting with citizens

Evaluate the agency's citizen-facing staff in terms of the following:

4.1.1. Politeness

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.2. Fairness

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.3. Helpfulness

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.4. Knowledge/competence

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.5. Do front-office staff have training opportunities in customer service?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in the questions in section 4.1 of the citizen survey.

4.2. Providing clear, high-quality information

4.2.1. Quality of information and advice provided to citizens

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.2.2. Effectiveness of information delivery

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.2.3. Clarity of language used to provide information and advice (for example, is content conveyed in plain language that citizens find easy to understand?)

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in the questions in section 4.2 of the citizen survey.

4.3. Completing the procedure

Evaluate the agency's performance in terms of the following:

4.3.1. Value-for-money/cost for services

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.2. Paperless procedures

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.3. Streamlined internal processes

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.4. Ease of processes for citizens

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.5. Number of documents citizens must submit

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.6. Over the last 12 months, has the agency taken any steps toward administrative simplification, such as process reengineering activities?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in the questions in section 4.3 of the citizen survey.

4.4. Reaching a satisfactory outcome for citizens

4.4.1. Is the agency capturing data about citizen satisfaction?

❒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, elaborate (for example, through user surveys, focus groups, or user panels): _____

4.4.2. Does front-line staff report insights gathered through direct interaction with users for continuous improvement purposes?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

4.4.3. Is the agency testing the suitability and strength of its service delivery through mystery shopping, usability testing, and/or customer journey mapping?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Note: Mystery shopping is a technique where trained individuals pretend to be potential customers or service users and report back on their experiences in a detailed and objective way. It differs from other research techniques in that evaluators do not declare themselves to the service provider during the interaction.

Usability testing consists of small-scale (3–5 users) or large–scale (20–100 users) qualitative tests for service providers to observe user behavior and ability to complete tasks. It is commonly used to measure metrics such as error rate, number of clicks, and time spent as well as to collect general feedback on the experience of users.

Customer journey mapping provides an overview of the user experience by telling the story of a customer from initial contact, through the process of engagement, and into a long-term relationship. It identifies key interactions between the customer and the organization, and examines the user's feelings, motivations, and questions relating to these touchpoints. It is a useful tool for identifying potential pain points, such as gaps between devices, departments, or channels; and it puts users at the center of the organization's thinking.

Section 5: Public Sector Integrity

5.1. Embodying a transparent, corruption-free, and effective public sector

Does the agency publish any of the following documents online?

5.1.1. Current budget figures

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.2. Current budget figures in a clear and understandable way (citizens' budget format)

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.3. Past budget figures for the last three years at minimum

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.4. Contracts signed with third parties, including names of parties, contract value, subject, date of publishing, and termination

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.5. Search tools for contracts (for example, by date and supplier)

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.6. Annual report

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.7. User fees for each service provided

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.8. Job openings

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Regarding access to information requests:

5.1.9. Is there an established institutional mechanism through which citizens can request the agency's records?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.10. If the answer to question 5.1.9 is "yes," please indicate the legal basis for this. _____

_____

5.1.11. How many access-to-information requests regarding agency information or records has the agency received over the past 12 months? _____

5.1.12. How many access-to-information requests were denied over the past 12 months? _____

Does the agency have any of the following?

5.1.13. An ethics officer

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.14. A clear whistleblower protection policy

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.15. A code of ethics/conduct for staff

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

If the answer to question 5.1.15 is "yes," does the code of ethics/conduct address the following?

5.1.16. Conflict of interest resolution

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.17. Abuse of public power, information obtained in office, and/or trust of superiors to gain undue advantage

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.18. Gifts and benefits

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.19. Postemployment behavior and limitations

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.20. Code of conduct for public procurement

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.21. Sanctions for breach of the code of ethics/conduct?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.1.22. How likely are staff members who are involved in delivering services to accept (or ask for) something in return for carrying out the transaction? List all services below.

Service 1: _____

❒ Not likely at all ❒ Rather unlikely ❒ Neither likely nor unlikely

❒ Rather likely ❒ Very likely ❒ Do not know

Service 2: _____

❒ Not likely at all ❒ Rather unlikely ❒ Neither likely nor unlikely

❒ Rather likely ❒ Very likely ❒ Do not know

Service 3: _____

❒ Not likely at all ❒ Rather unlikely ❒ Neither likely nor unlikely

❒ Rather likely ❒ Very likely ❒ Do not know

How effective are the agency's policies and mechanisms in place to avoid the following:

5.1.23. Favoritism within the organization

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.1.24. Bribes

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.1.25. Flawed public procurement

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.1.26. Discrimination toward users

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.2. Providing feedback and complaint-handling mechanisms

5.2.1. Is there an established institutional mechanism through which citizens can provide feedback about any services received that goes beyond the provision of detailed contact information, such as user satisfaction monitoring, polls, or surveys?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.2.2. If yes, through which of the following channels can citizens express their views?

❒ Face-to-face Elaborate: _____

❒ Website Elaborate: _____

❒ Text message (SMS) Elaborate: _____

❒ Email Elaborate: _____

❒ Telephone Elaborate: _____

❒ Social media Elaborate: _____

❒ Paper form Elaborate: _____

5.2.3. Does the agency use social media and other third-party platforms to listen to and serve citizens?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

If yes, specify: _____

5.2.4. Does the agency analyze the citizen feedback it receives?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.2.5. Does the agency provide citizens with a dedicated way to file complaints about service delivery, such as a hotline or online form to report dissatisfaction or illegal/corrupt practices?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

If answer to question 5.2.5 is "yes":

5.2.6. Are time frames for resolution stipulated?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.2.7. How many complaints were received over the past 12 months? _____

5.2.8. How many of these complaints were resolved over the past 12 months? _____

5.2.9. How many complaints were resolved within the stipulated time frames? _____

5.3. Improving interagency cooperation

5.3.1. With which other entities, if any, does the agency coordinate to deliver the services for which it is responsible? _____

5.3.2. How would you evaluate the quality of cooperation between the agency and other involved entities?

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.3.3. Are the existing legislation, memoranda of understanding, and bilateral agreements adequate to foster effective cooperation?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.4. Does the agency share the same business processes as the other involved entities?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.5. Does the agency share the same strategic vision as the other involved entities?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.6. Does poor cooperation sometimes cause delays?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.7. Do technical problems/incompatibilities (such as the use of multiple information technology systems) slow down cooperation?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.8. Is there an interagency management information system that enables coherent data management and avoids replication of data or repeated submission of documents for citizens?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Section 6: Final Comments

6.1. What do you think the agency's priority area should be for improving the delivery of public services? Select one.

- ❒ Simplify access to services (such as through one-stop shops)
- ❒ Improve quality of services
- ❒ Reduce cost of services
- ❒ Motivate staff
- ❒ Improve timeliness
- ❒ Mainstream/improve digital procedures
- ❒ Improve transparency/reduce corruption and nepotism
- ❒ Simplify processes (including reduction of red-tape and paperwork)
- ❒ Other (please specify): _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in question 6.1. of the citizen survey.

6.2. What support does the agency need to improve the priority area selected in question 6.1?

_____

_____

_____

6.3. Are there any additional comments, suggestions, questions, and concerns you would like to share?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of checklist.

Appendix A.

Administrator Checklist as Filled Out by a Municipal Registry Office: Illustrative Example

Section 1: Contributor Information

1.1. Primary contributor information

This information is for validation purpose only.
It will not be publically released.

Title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Dr.): Ms.

First Name: Imaginary

Last Name: Magistrate

Job title: Registry Officer

Highest level of educational attainment:

❒ Primary education ❒ Secondary education

❒ Short-cycle tertiary ❒ Bachelor's degree or equivalent

☒ Master's degree or equivalent

❒ Doctoral degree or equivalent

1.2. Contact details

Name of public entity: Municipal government

Department/office name: Registry Office

Website: www.oldtown.org

Email address: imaginary.magistrate@municipality.org

Phone: +123456789

Mobile phone: _____

1.3. Agency Address

Street: 10 Old Town Street

City: Capital City

Postal code: 12345

Region: Main region

Country: Illustrative

1.4. Additional contributor(s) to the questionnaire

This information is for validation purpose only.
It will not be publically released.

a. Title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Dr.): _____

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Job title: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Address: _____

b. Title (e.g., Mr., Ms., Dr.): _____

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Job title: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Address: _____

1.5. Explain the agency's overall mandate (for example, the provision of education, health, employment, or social services). Describe any tangible services provided to citizens, such as residency cards, social insurance registration, professional/vocational training and life-long learning, and support for job seekers.

Our agency is providing administrative services to citizens. Specifically, we are providing them with marriage, birth, and death certificates.

Section 2: Access

2.1. Providing clear contact information

2.1.1. How do you communicate the agency's mission to users? Check all that apply.

☒ Website ❒ Social media ❒ Display boards or billboards
❒ Magazine or newspaper advertisements
❒ Printed brochures

2.1.2. How do you communicate the agency's contact information to users? Check all that apply.

☒ Website ❒ Social media ❒ Display boards or billboards
❒ Magazine or newspaper advertisements
❒ Printed brochures

If the agency does not have a website, skip to section 2.2.

If the agency does have a website, answer questions 2.1.3–2.1.17.

Does the agency website allow users to identify the following in two or fewer clicks?

2.1.3. The agency's mission and responsibilities in terms of service delivery

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: www.oldtown.org/registryoffice

2.1.4. General contact information for the agency

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.5. The responsibilities of specific departments in terms of service delivery

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.6. Contact information for specific departments and officials

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.7. An overall organizational structure and chart that includes the names of units and responsible persons

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

If citizens want to contact the agency regarding the delivery of a specific service can they do so through the following means?

2.1.8. An online form on the agency's website

❒ Yes ☒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.9. A generic email address

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.10. A specific email address that will put the citizen in direct contact with the responsible division or department

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.11. A generic phone number

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.12. A specific phone number that will put the citizen in direct contact with the responsible division or department

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.13. A clearly identified person, including name, position, and division or department

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.14. Online virtual assistance

❒ Yes ☒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.15. Online chat functionality with an actual person

❒ Yes ☒ No
Link and/or comments: _____

2.1.16. Does the agency's website include links to other organizations along with an explanation as to why a citizen might want to contact them?

☒ Yes ❒ No
Link and/or comments: Only partly. Our website includes links to the Ministry of Interior but it could include more (e.g., archives, immigration police, department of labor). For now, advice on where else citizens can go is given only face-to-face.

2.1.17. Does the agency's website include a search function?

☒ Yes ❒ No

Link and/or comments: _____

See section 2.1 of the citizen survey to compare this self-assessment with the views expressed by citizens.

2.2. Access channels and citizens' preferences

2.2.1. Which of the following access channels can citizens use to contact the agency? Check all that apply.

☒ In-person, face-to-face interaction at a physical facility

☒ Posted letter and/or facsimile

☒ Telephone

☒ Email

❒ Online form on agency website

❒ Tablet/smartphone application

❒ Social media

2.2.2. Have you asked citizens which access channels they prefer using?

❒ Yes ☒ No Comments: _____

2.2.3. Is data about access channels used by citizens collected systematically?

❒ Yes ☒ No Comments: _____

2.2.4. If yes, in the past 12 months, how many citizens have contacted the agency using the following channels?

In-person, face-to-face: 6,500

Posted letter and/or facsimile: 300

Telephone (fixed line or mobile): 18,000

Email: 3,600

Online form on the website: X

Tablet/smartphone applications: X

Social media: X

Other (specify): X

Total: 28,400

See question 2.2.2 in the citizen survey to compare currently available access channels with the preferences of citizens.

2.3. Interacting with citizens

How would you evaluate the agency in terms of the following?

2.3.1. The ease with which citizens can contact the agency

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.2. Overall waiting times at the facility, with postal delivery, on the phone, or by email

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.3. Number of public servants with which citizens must interact to resolve issues

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.4. User-friendly operating hours (such as lunchtime and evening hours that facilitate access for citizens working full-time)

❒ Poor ☒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: Opening times are Mondays and Wednesdays 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., with a break from 12:00 p.m. to 12:30 p.m.

2.3.5. The ease with which citizens can get to the facility (such as ease of access with public transport)

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ☒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

2.3.6. User-friendly physical layout of facility, such as a clearly identifiable reception area, waiting areas with comfortable seating, and easy-access ramps for people with disabilities or parents with strollers

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ☒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Comments: _____

See questions 2.3.1–2.3.6 of the citizen survey to compare this self-assessment with the views expressed by citizens.

2.3.7. Are the agency's services tailored to people with special needs, including people with disabilities, the elderly, people living in remote areas, and people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, among others?

❒ Yes ☒ No

2.3.8. If yes, how are services tailored to particular populations or groups (for example, special accessibility mechanisms for the visually or physically impaired, wheelchair-accessible design of facility, mobile service centers that bring services to remote segments of the population, or special efforts to facilitate service delivery to citizens with low literacy levels)?

_____

_____

2.3.9. Has the agency ever conducted accessibility testing of its services to assess how easily users with various disabilities are able to access services, and then used this information to improve service design and implementation)?

❒ Yes ☒ No If yes, elaborate: _____

2.3.10. Is the agency's paper documentation available in languages relevant to all population segments (such as other national languages or English if foreigners are likely to use its services)?

❒ Yes, fully available in more than one language

☒ Yes, partially available in more than one language

❒ Not available in other languages

If yes, elaborate: A few years ago, we developed a multilingual document in partnership with the International Organization for Migration that explained procedures in Vietnamese, Chinese, English, Russian, and Arabic.

2.3.11. Is the agency's online documentation available in languages relevant to all population segments (such as other national languages or English if foreigners are likely to use its services)?

❒ Yes, fully available in more than one language

☒ Yes, partially available in more than one language

❒ Not available in other languages

If yes, elaborate: We can refer users to the website of the migration information center, which contains information about many common situations in English.

2.4. E-government services/digital procedures

Online service delivery

2.4.1. How many agency services are partially or fully provided online? 3

List services partially provided online: _____

List services fully provided online: Citizens can request and receive duplicates of (1) birth, (2) marriage, and (3) death certificates online. However, this service was established only one year ago, and it is sometimes still faster to receive duplicates in person than online.

Note: In the case of a company registering its name, the service would be considered fully available online if the registration and administration approval processes are both possible online—without any paper or in-person visit by the entrepreneur required (European Commission 2012: 83).

If the agency is unable to complete partial or full transactions online, skip to question 2.4.12.

Does the agency use any of the following e-government features identified by the European Commission (2014) as key enablers for public services?

2.4.2. Electronic identification. Can citizens use a government-issued electronic form of identification and authentication for the process?

☒ Yes ❒ No Comments: They can use the latest form of citizen identification card issued, which contains an electronic chip.

2.4.3. Single sign-on. Can users access multiple systems without logging on multiple times?

☒ Yes ❒ No Comments: Citizens can use the national e-government platform.

2.4.4. Electronic documents. Are authenticated documents that are recognized by the public administration being used to allow users to send and receive documents online, for example, by e-signature?

❒ Yes ☒ No Comments: _____

2.4.5. Authentic sources. Are base registries used to automatically validate or fetch data related to citizens or businesses, allowing online forms to be prefilled so they are received by the user either partly or fully completed?

❒ Yes ☒ No Comments: _____

2.4.6. Electronic safe (e-safe). Is there a virtual and secure repository for citizens to store and retrieve personal electronic data and documents?

❒ Yes ☒ No

The registry office itself does not have the responsibility for the national e-government platform that delivers the duplicates. Therefore, questions 2.4.7–2.4.15 on the quality of online service delivery and privacy and identity management do not apply. They should be raised with the ministry of interior, which is in charge of e-government services, and they have therefore been deleted from this self-assessment. The registry office did receive approximately 4,500 requests for duplicates in the last year, and only 3 of them were submitted online.

Open data

2.4.12. Does the agency have an open data portal?

❒ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what is the link? _____

If no, is the agency providing at least some datasets to the public in their entirety through bulk downloads and application programming interfaces (APIs)?

❒ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what is the link? While we do not have an open data portal, the statistics office publishes the number of services offered by the registry office on a regular basis. In addition, the registry office sends an annual report to the Ministry of Interior that includes data about the year's activities.

Note: An open data portal is a web-based interface, usually with specific search functionalities, designed to facilitate database searches. Application programming interfaces (APIs) are also often available, offering direct and automated access to data to software applications.

2.4.13. Does the agency have a public performance data dashboard, that is, an openly accessible, visual display of its performance data across several key metrics?

❒ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what is the link? _____

Collection of relevant metrics

Is the agency collecting the following common baseline metrics for the agency's website?

2.4.14. Total visits

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.15. Total page views

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.16. Unique visitors

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.17. Page views per visit

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's average: _____

2.4.18. Average visit duration

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's average: _____

2.4.19. Time on page

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's average: _____

2.4.20. Bounce rate

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's bounce rate: _____

2.4.21. New versus returning visitor

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's ratio of new to returning visitors: _____

2.4.22. Visits per visitor in a specified time frame

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, elaborate: _____

2.4.23. Total number of onsite search queries

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

2.4.24. Visitor composition

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, elaborate: _____

2.4.25. Total interactions/connections via social media channels

❒ Yes ❒ No If yes, previous month's total: _____

These metrics can be accessed by the IT team but they are currently not being used for analysis.

Quality of website/applications

How would you evaluate the agency's online interface in terms of the following?

2.4.26. Ease of navigation

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.27. Presentation

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ☒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: While our website contains all the necessary information, its design is a bit outdated.

2.4.28. Ease of downloading material

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

☒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.29. Information/documents available

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.30. Clarity of online forms

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

☒ N/A Elaborate: _____

2.4.31. Instructions, support and/or help functionalities

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ☒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

❒ N/A Elaborate: _____

Compare the self-assessment in questions 2.4.30-2.4.35 with the views expressed by citizens in questions 2.4.3-2.49 of the citizen survey.

Are the following elements available on the agency's website?

2.4.32. A page for frequently asked questions

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: _____

2.4.33. A live support functionality (click-to-chat)

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: However, citizens with unanswered questions can "ask the mayor" on the same website. The municipality also has a Facebook page with information for the public.

Section 3: User-Centered Service Delivery and Responsiveness

3.1. Providing a personalized service

3.1.1. Under certain circumstances, does the agency proactively contact citizens to bring specific information to their attention?

❒ Yes ❒ No ☒ Not applicable

If yes:

3.1.2. Explain the circumstances under which the agency proactively contact citizens (such as registering on the electoral roll; renewing identification documents; submitting income taxes; or receiving benefits in the event of a birth, loss of employment, or health incident).

_____

_____

3.1.3. How does the agency usually contact citizens?

❒ Posted mail

❒ Email

❒ SMS

❒ Telephone

3.1.4. Over the past 12 months, has the agency involved citizens in the design of its services (that is, tapping into the knowledge of service users by providing them with an opportunity to co-create the service delivery process by, for example, inviting citizens to participate in a role-playing activity to test prototypes)?

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: Because the process is set by the law.

3.2. Providing timely service

3.2.1. List key services provided by the agency, corresponding service standards, and number and type of supporting documents citizens need to access the services. Service standards are specific delivery targets or commitments established by the organization that it promises to honor when delivering a service, such as *delivery of document within three days*, *calls answered in 20 seconds*, and *100 percent of citizens' questions are addressed*.

1. Service: Wedding certificate

Service standards: Delivered immediately (under 30 minutes)

Supporting documents required: Identification card and birth certificate; in special cases, certificates of past divorces and death certificate for widows

2. Service: Birth certificate

Service standards: Delivered immediately (under 30 minutes)

Supporting documents required: Identification card of parents and wedding certificate or declaration of parenthood

3. Service: Death certificate

Service standards: Delivered immediately (under 30 minutes)

Supporting documents required: Doctor's certificate, identification card

3.2.2. Are time frames for various services systematically communicated to citizens during interactions/transactions (that is, are citizens clearly informed of how much time it will take to complete the entire process)?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

3.2.3. Do citizens receive status updates on the progress of their requests (either offline or online)?

❒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: Not applicable

3.2.4. Does the agency collect data on the time required for it to deliver its services to citizens?

❒ Yes ☒ No

3.2.5. If the answer to question 3.2.4 is "yes," indicate the percentage of services delivered within stipulated time frames (for example, 87 percent of identity cards are provided within a 15-day time frame, or 55 percent of health insurance cards are provided within a 7-day time frame). All documents are delivered immediately, assuming the citizen has brought the correct documentation. Waiting times can vary seasonally but are always under 1.5 hours.

3.2.6. In the last six months, how many citizens contacted the agency to request a status update on a request?

Not applicable

3.3. Expected service delivery standards

3.3.1. Has the agency consulted with citizens to identify what they view as timely service?

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: _____

3.3.2. Does the agency's service standards reflect citizens' expectations?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in questions 3.1.1–3.3.7 of the citizen survey.

Section 4: Reliability and Quality of Service Delivery

4.1. Interacting with citizens

Evaluate the agency's citizen-facing staff in terms of the following:

4.1.1. Politeness

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.2. Fairness

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.3. Helpfulness

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.1.4. Knowledge/competence

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in the questions in section 4.1 of the citizen survey.

4.1.5. Do front-office staff have training opportunities in customer service?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: These do not take place regularly, but staff have had the opportunity to take part in a one-off training for all municipal employees, which included team-building exercises, coaching on presentation skills, and conflict and crisis management, and which mixed different departments, including social affairs and information technology. We think such trainings could be beneficial every two years, notably to improve cross-departmental cooperation.

4.2. Providing clear, high-quality information

4.2.1. Quality of information and advice provided to citizens

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.2.2. Effectiveness of information delivery

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.2.3. Clarity of language used to provide information and advice (for example, is content conveyed in plain language that citizens find easy to understand?)

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in the questions in section 4.2 of the citizen survey.

4.3. Completing the procedure

Evaluate the agency's performance in terms of the following:

4.3.1. Value-for-money/cost for services

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.2. Paperless procedures

❒ Poor ☒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.3. Streamlined internal processes

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.4. Ease of processes for citizens

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

4.3.5. Number of documents citizens must submit

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ☒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

Elaborate: _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in the questions in section 4.3 of the citizen survey.

4.3.6. Over the last 12 months, has the agency taken any steps toward administrative simplification, such as process reengineering activities?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: The online delivery of duplicates was introduced.

4.4. Reaching a satisfactory outcome for citizens

4.4.1. Is the agency capturing data about citizen satisfaction?

☒ Yes ❒ No

If yes, elaborate (for example, through user surveys, focus groups, or user panels): Paper-based feedback forms can be completed at the information desk. This takes place in the framework of a survey of the whole municipality evaluating overall citizen satisfaction.

4.4.2. Does front-line staff report insights gathered through direct interaction with users for continuous improvement purposes?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: During weekly meetings of the whole team (staff of six), suggestions can be brought forward to improve processes (e.g., handling complex cases or changes to legal framework).

4.4.3. Is the agency testing the suitability and strength of its service delivery through mystery shopping, usability testing, and/or customer journey mapping?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: Every four years, the municipality uses mystery shopping to measure the quality of its service delivery, including with the registry office.

Note: Mystery shopping is a technique where trained individuals pretend to be potential customers or service users and report back on their experiences in a detailed and objective way. It differs from other research techniques in that evaluators do not declare themselves to the service provider during the interaction.

Usability testing small-scale (3–5 users) or large–scale (20–100 users) qualitative tests for service providers to observe user behavior and ability to complete tasks. It is commonly used to measure metrics such as error rate, number of clicks, and time spent as well as to collect general feedback on the experience of users.

Customer journey mapping provides an overview of the user experience by telling a story of a customer from initial contact, through the process of engagement, and into a long-term relationship. It identifies key interactions between the customer and organization, and examines the user's feelings, motivations, and questions relating to these touchpoints. It is a useful tool for identifying potential pain points, such as gaps between devices, departments, or channels; and it puts users at the center of the organization's thinking.

Section 5: Public Sector Integrity

5.1. Embodying a transparent, corruption-free, and effective public sector

Questions 5.1.1 to 5.1.21 regarding the publication of budget figures, contracts, access-to-information requests, and code of ethics are not specifically relevant to the registry office but instead to the whole municipality. The same applies to the question on flawed public procurement. These questions have therefore not been included in this self-assessment.

5.1.22. How likely are staff members who are involved in delivering services to accept (or ask for) something in return for carrying out the transaction? List all services below.

Service 1: Delivery of birth certificate

☒ Not likely at all ❒ Rather unlikely ❒ Neither likely nor unlikely ❒ Rather likely ❒ Very likely ❒ Do not know

Service 2: Delivery of marriage certificate

☒ Not likely at all ❒ Rather unlikely ❒ Neither likely nor unlikely ❒ Rather likely ❒ Very likely ❒ Do not know

Service 3: Delivery of death certificate

☒ Not likely at all ❒ Rather unlikely ❒ Neither likely nor unlikely ❒ Rather likely ❒ Very likely ❒ Do not know

How effective are the agency's policies and mechanisms in place to avoid the following:

5.1.23. Favoritism within the organization

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

5.1.24. Bribes

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

5.1.25. Flawed public procurement

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ☒ Average ❒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.1.26. Discrimination toward users

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ❒ Good ☒ Excellent

5.2. Providing feedback and complaint-handling mechanisms

5.2.1. Is there an established institutional mechanism through which citizens can provide feedback about any services received that goes beyond the provision of detailed contact information, such as user satisfaction monitoring, polls, or surveys?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: Customer satisfaction is collected through the periodical paper-based surveys mentioned earlier.

5.2.2. If yes, through which of the following channels can citizens express their views?

❒ Face-to-face Elaborate: _____

☒ Website Elaborate: The municipal website allows citizens to get in touch with the mayor for comments, complaints, and suggestions.

❒ Text message (SMS) Elaborate: _____

☒ Email Elaborate: _____

❒ Telephone Elaborate: _____

❒ Social media Elaborate: _____

☒ Paper form Elaborate: Only periodically

5.2.3. Does the agency use social media and other third-party platforms to listen to and serve citizens?

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: _____

If yes, specify: _____

5.2.4. Does the agency analyze the citizen feedback it receives?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.2.5. Does the agency provide citizens with a dedicated way to file complaints about service delivery, such as a hotline or online form to report dissatisfaction or illegal/corrupt practices?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: Citizens can email the mayor directly.

Questions 5.2.6–5.2.9 are deleted because the complaint handling mechanism goes through the mayor's office.

5.3. Improving interagency cooperation

5.3.1. With which other entities, if any, does the agency coordinate to deliver the services for which it is responsible? Primarily the social and culture departments

5.3.2. How would you evaluate the quality of cooperation between the agency and other involved entities?

❒ Poor ❒ Below average ❒ Average ☒ Good ❒ Excellent

5.3.3. Are the existing legislation, memoranda of understanding, and bilateral agreements adequate to foster effective cooperation?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.4. Does the agency share the same business processes as the other involved entities?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.5. Does the agency share the same strategic vision as the other involved entities?

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.6. Does poor cooperation sometimes cause delays?

☒ Yes ❒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.7. Do technical problems/incompatibilities (such as the use of multiple information technology systems) slow down cooperation?

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: _____

5.3.8. Is there an interagency management information system that enables coherent data management and avoids replication of data or repeated submission of documents for citizens?

❒ Yes ☒ No Elaborate: Due to the confidential nature of the information that the registry office deals with, this data cannot be shared.

Section 6: Final Comments

6.1. What do you think the agency's priority area should be for improving the delivery of public services? Select one.

- ❒ Simplify access to services (such as through one-stop shops)
- ❒ Improve quality of services
- ❒ Reduce cost of services
- ❒ Motivate staff
- ❒ Improve timeliness
- ☒ Mainstream/improve digital procedures
- ❒ Improve transparency/reduce corruption and nepotism
- ❒ Simplify processes (including reduction of red-tape and paperwork)
- ❒ Other (please specify): _____

Compare this self-assessment with the views expressed in question 6.1. of the citizen survey.

6.2. What support does the agency need to improve the priority area selected in question 6.1?

To improve digital procedures, cooperation with the ministry of interior should be improved. Indeed, the registry office's requirements are not necessarily taken into consideration. Two examples are the fact that the paper form for wedding requests could be digitalized and the online forms could be prefilled once the social security number of the person is indicated into one category. This would save time and simplify the process for citizens, who would have less paperwork to fill out manually. However, because the e-government portal is managed by an external agency, each required change involves a money and time commitment that the ministry of interior may not be willing to make.

6.3. Are there any additional comments, suggestions, questions, and concerns you would like to share?

See summary of insights on following page.

End of checklist.

Summary of insights gathered through the self-assessment checklist

Based on this self-assessment of the registry office, the following conclusions can be drawn:

Access

- The registry office's website provides all the necessary information for citizens to find out who to get in touch with. The level of detail of the information provided seems adequate.
- The website may benefit from an improvement in terms of presentation.
- The website could include more links and advice to citizens regarding where to turn to for various enquiries related to life events that the registry office handles (births, weddings, and deaths).
- The website does not provide an equivalent level of information for nonnative speakers and could benefit from a more developed translation into English to facilitate access to information for foreigners.
- Opening hours (Mondays and Wednesdays 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) are below average and could be extended to facilitate access to working citizens.
- Access for people with disabilities could be improved.
- The registry office could communicate its activities and results more clearly to citizens.

User-centered service delivery

- The registry office seems to be performing well in terms of timeliness.
- The registry office does not seem to impose too much of a burden on citizens in terms of documentation to provide for the delivery of certificates.

Reliability/quality of service delivery

- Levels of customer service seem to be high (self-assessed as excellent).
- Paperless procedures have been scored as below average and could thus be improved.
- There seem to be opportunities to have more trainings for staff.
- The registry office appears to make an effective and regular use of mystery shopping techniques.

Public sector integrity

- The registry office is conducting irregular citizen satisfaction surveys in paper form as part of an evaluation exercise conducted on behalf of the whole municipality.
- Overall, there do not seem to be major issues with corruption, bribes, or favoritism.
- Cooperation with other services seems good, but communication channels with the ministry of interior could be strengthened.

Based on these findings, the registry office could consider:

- Adding some questions from the citizen survey template to the periodical satisfaction surveys it conducts in paper form.
- Conducting a quick, one-off, or an ongoing/rolling survey of citizens immediately after receiving the certificate they were seeking to examine if citizens' opinions confirm impressions from the self-assessment.
- Adding some questions to the citizen survey to evaluate the perceived burden of paper procedures and reasons for the low uptake of e-government procedures.

Concretely, the registry office could, for example, decide to administer the following, shortened citizen survey, which consists of a selection of 30 questions deemed most relevant for its services. Some sections (e.g., section on public sector integrity) have been left out, as they do not seem to be burning issues for the agency. The focus of the selected questions is on understanding the drivers of citizen satisfaction with the registry's services. Any variable not directly relevant to the registry office has been dropped (e.g., in the section collecting information about the respondent, the categories of *income level* and *postal code* have been deleted). A special question has been added to probe whether the registry's perception that the digitalization of data entry would be beneficial is also shared by citizens: "I had to fill out too many forms manually." Two questions also enquire about citizens' awareness of the possibility to request duplicates of certificates online and examine possible reasons why citizens may not want to use this channel.

Appendix B.

Citizen Survey as Customized by a Municipal Registry Office: Illustrative Example

Section 1: Respondent Information

1.1. Gender:

❒ Male ❒ Female

1.2. Year of birth: _____

1.3. Highest educational attainment:

❒ Primary education

❒ Secondary education

❒ Short-cycle tertiary education

❒ Bachelor's degree or equivalent

❒ Master's degree or equivalent

❒ Doctoral degree or equivalent

1.4. Professional situation:

❒ Working (full-time, part-time, or self-employed)

❒ Homemaker

❒ Retired

❒ Unemployed

❒ Student

❒ Other: _____

Section 2: Access

Finding the relevant contact information and getting in touch with the registry office

2.1.1. How satisfied were you with the ease of finding the correct website/address/contact person?

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

❒ Do not remember

Once you had identified the right website/address/contact person, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the following?

2.1.2. The ease of getting in touch with the registry office?

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

❒ Do not remember

2.1.3. Overall waiting times at the facility; waiting times on the phone or by email

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

❒ Do not remember

If you went in person/face-to-face, how satisfied were you with the following?

2.1.4. Opening hours

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

❒ Do not remember

2.1.5. Time it took you to reach the facility

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

❒ Do not remember

2.1.6. Physical layout of the facility

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

❒ Do not remember

Using e-government/digital procedures

2.1.7. Are you aware of the fact that duplicates of birth certificates, wedding certificates and death certificates can be requested and delivered online through the national e-government portal?

2.1.8. Would you consider using this online channel in future?

❒ Yes ❒ No

2.1.9. If not, for what reasons? Please check all that apply.

❒ I do not know how to use online tools/I am not familiar with it

❒ I prefer personal contact

❒ Things get done more easily and/or more quickly face-to-face

❒ I am worried about the protection and security of personal data on the Internet

❒ The service's website or application might have technical problems

❒ Other (specify): _____

Section 3: User-Centered Service Delivery and Responsiveness

3.1. Receiving timely service

3.1.1. How much time passed between the moment you requested a service and the moment you considered your problem solved?

❒ Up to 5 minutes ❒ Up to 15 minutes ❒ Up to 30 minutes

❒ Up to 1 hour ❒ Up to half a day ❒ Up to a day ❒ Up to 1 week

❒ Up to 2 weeks ❒ Up to 1 month ❒ Up to 3 months

❒ Up to 6 months ❒ Up to 1 year ❒ Not yet resolved

❒ Do not remember

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

3.1.2. I was satisfied with the time it took to get an answer to my initial query.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

❒ Not applicable

3.1.3. Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of time it took to get the service/to deal with my query.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

❒ Not applicable

3.2. Are service delivery standards in line with expectations?

3.2.1. If you call with a request, what is a reasonable amount of time to wait before speaking with a registry offier?

❒ None ❒ 30 seconds ❒ 1 minute ❒ 2 minutes ❒ 3 minutes

❒ 4 minutes ❒ 5 minutes ❒ Longer than 5 minutes

3.2.2. When you visit the registry office, how many minutes is it acceptable to wait before speaking to a registry officer?

❒ 1 minute ❒ 2–4 minutes ❒ 5–9 minutes ❒ 10–14 minutes

❒ 15–19 minutes ❒ 20–24 minutes ❒ 25–30 minutes

❒ Longer than 30 minutes

3.2.3. When you email or send documents electronically to a government office by 10:00 a.m., what is a reasonable amount of time to wait before receiving an electronic reply?

❒ 1 hour ❒ 4 hours ❒ Same day ❒ Next day ❒ Within 3 days

❒ Within a week ❒ Longer than a week

Section 4: Reliability and Quality of Service Delivery

4.1. Interacting with staff

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

4.1.1. Staff were polite to me.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.1.2. Staff treated me fairly.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.1.3. Staff paid extra attention to me and went out of their way to get me what I needed.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.1.4. Staff were knowledgeable/competent regarding the subject matter.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.2. Receiving clear, high-quality information

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

4.2.1. I received high quality information/advice.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.2.2. I received all the information/advice I needed in one interaction.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.2.3. The information/advice was provided in clear, simple language.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3. Completing the procedure

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

4.3.1. The process was straightforward and easy to understand.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3.2. The process was easy to complete.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3.3. The process required little paperwork.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.3.4. I had to manually fill out too many forms.

❒ Strongly disagree ❒ Disagree ❒ Agree ❒ Strongly agree

4.4 Reaching a satisfactory outcome

4.4.1. Thinking about the entire experience, how satisfied were you with the service you got?

❒ Very dissatisfied ❒ Dissatisfied ❒ Satisfied ❒ Very satisfied

4.4.2. Was the service provided better or worse than you expected?

❒ Much worse ❒ Worse ❒ Better ❒ Much better

4.4.3. Would you recommend using this service to another citizen?

❒ No, not at all ❒ Not really ❒ Yes, probably ❒ Absolutely

Section 5: Final Comments

5.1. In your view, what should the public sector's priority area be in terms of improving public service delivery? Check one.

❒ Simplify access to services

❒ Improve quality of services

❒ Reduce cost of services

❒ Improve staff behavior

❒ Improve timeliness

❒ Improve online services

❒ Reduce corruption

❒ Reduce red tape and paperwork

❒ Other (please specify): _____

5.2. Do you have any additional comments, suggestions, questions, or concerns you would like to share? Please elaborate.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.

Appendix C.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Various Surveying Methods

Advantages	Disadvantages
Face-to-face/in-person interviews	
• Positive identification of respondents (e.g., address-based sample) • Possible higher response rates and lower drop-out rate due to personal contact between interviewer and respondent • Enables use of interviewing aids such as information cards • Enables use of longer, more complex questionnaires • May enable more privacy than other modes • Can motivate participants • Questions can be clarified • Question sequence is controlled • Vague responses can be probed	• More costly than other modes of data collection (in terms of time, money, travel and human resources required) • Spatially restricted • Answers may be filtered or censored • Repeated attempts to contact respondents can be expensive • May afford less supervision of interviewers than telephone interviewing • Concerns for privacy or lack of anonymity may result in lower response rates, especially on sensitive topics • Cultural and social conditions may also constrain the use of face-to-face interviewing. For example, in small communities, interviewers may know respondents • Interviewer's presence may influence respondents' responses, thereby introducing bias into the survey results.

(continued)

Advantages	Disadvantages
Telephone interviews	
• More cost-effective than face-to-face interviewing • Enables repeated attempts to contact respondents at lower cost • If conducted from centralized facilities, enables greater supervision of interviewers • Affords greater anonymity which may encourage reporting on sensitive subjects • Eliminates need to cluster sample to reduce enumeration costs • May enable more flexibility in arranging interview times • Appropriate for service-specific surveys where there is a contact number for each person from which to draw a sample • Questions can be clarified • Question sequenced controlled • Vague responses can be probed	• Requires high telephone saturation nationwide or in region to avoid creating a biased sampling frame • Cannot be as long or complex as face-to-face interviews because both respondents and interviewers tire more quickly • Does not allow the use of visual aids • Increased use of mobile phones may create problems for creating sampling frames and conducting interviews • Increased use of technology such as caller ID and call blocking may inhibit ability to contact respondents • Some categories of people will be systematically under-represented • Number of responses in closed questions limited • Telephone surveys are becoming unpopular
Self-administered interviews (e.g., mail-out–mail-back questionnaire)	
• Cost effective • Affords more privacy and anonymity than other modes which may prompt a better response rate, especially for sensitive topics • Like telephone interviews, surveys need to be shorter than face-to-face surveys and use mainly simple, 'tick box' types of questions to achieve a reasonable response rate. • Greater coverage area • Time to consider response • Interviewer cannot shape responses	• More limited length and more limited complexity: questions should be brief and self-explanatory, construction and content should be simpler to be easily understood by respondents who may not be familiar with the concepts the survey is attempting to convey or with questionnaire structures. • Generally have higher item non-responses and more inappropriate responses than in interviewer conducted surveys • Greater opportunity for respondents to opt out of participation • Response rates tend to be low, and therefore require large numbers of questionnaires to be sent out. Mail out/mail back surveys require extensive enumeration period. This may also affect the representativeness of the achieved sample • Limited scope to ask qualitative questions • High risk that some citizen groups will be over or under-represented, such as those with language, literacy difficulties or with support needs • No control over who completes the survey • Interviewer cannot shape questions

(continued)

Advantages	Disadvantages
Internet-based questionnaires	
• Could reduce costs of processing data, can be very cost-effective • Afford more privacy and anonymity • May facilitate asking more sensitive questions • Can allow for more detailed questions than shorter telephone surveys • May be particularly useful when surveying specific target groups • Electronic surveys can have a high response rate for users which are easy to target through the internet • Respondents have more time to consider responses	• More difficult to achieve a representative sample: Requires high internet saturation nationwide or in region to avoid creating a biased sampling frame • Need to avoid survey fraud and capture of the survey by interest or advocacy groups • Interviewer cannot shape questions.

References and Bibliography

Afrobarometer. 2010. *What Can the AfroBarometer Tell Us About Service Delivery in Africa?* Briefing Paper 92. Afrobarometer.

AmericasBarometer. 2014. *Core questionnaire.* Latin Ameri5can Public Opinion Project. http://www.vanderbilt.edu/lapop/core-surveys.php.

Andrews, Rhys, and Steven Van de Walle. 2012. "New Public Management and Citizens' Perceptions of Local Service Efficiency, Responsiveness, Equity and Effectiveness." Working paper 7, Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future (COCOPS).

Andrews, R., G. A. Boyne, J. Law, and R. M. Walker. 2005. "External Constraints on Local Service Standards: The Case of Comprehensive Performance Assessment in English Local Government." *Public Administration* 83(3), 639–56.

Arndt, Christiane, and Charles Oman. 2006. *Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicators.* OECD Development Centre.

———. 2010. *Measuring Governance*. Policy Brief 39. OECD Development Centre.

Australia Information Victoria, Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development. 2010. *On the Road to Satisfaction: Using the Canadian Common Measurements Tool to Measure Satisfaction with Government Services.*

Baig, Aamer, Andre Dua, and Vivian Riefberg. 2014. *Putting Citizens First: How to Improve Citizens' Experience and Satisfaction with Government Services*. McKinsey Center for Government.

Berntzen, Lasse. 2013. "Citizen-Centric eGovernment Services: Use of Indicators to Measure Degree of User Involvement in eGovernment Service Development." Paper Presented at the Sixth International Conference on Advances in Human-oriented and Personalized Mechanisms, Technologies, and Services, Venice, Italy.

Bouckaert, Geert, and Steven Van de Walle. 2003. "Comparing Measures of Citizen Trust and User Satisfaction as Indicators of 'Good Governance': Difficulties in Linking Trust and Satisfaction Indicators." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 69 (3): 329–44.

Bryson, J. M., B. C. Crosby, and L. Bloomberg. 2014. "Public Value Governance: Moving Beyond Traditional Public Administration and the New Public Management." *Public Administration Review* 74 (4), 445–56.

Carson, Richard. 2011. *Citizen Centric Service: Changing the Way Government Does Business.* Toronto: Deloitte.

Carson, Richard, and Suboh Abdelhamid. 2015. *Service Delivery Trend Outlook: The Potential Future of Government Customer Service Delivery.* The Government Summit Thought Leadership Series. The Government Summit/Deloitte. https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/ca/Documents/technology/service-delivery-trend.pdf.

CCMD (Canadian Centre for Management Development). 1998. *Citizens First.* Canadian Centre for Management Development.

Charron, Nicholas. 2013. *European Quality of Government Index*

2013 Survey Questions. https://nicholascharron.wordpress.com/european-quality-of-government-index-eqi/.

Charron, Nicholas, et al. 2010. *Measuring the Quality of Government and Subnational Variation. Report for the European Commission Directorate-General Regional Policy Directorate Policy Development.* University of Gothenburg, Sweden: Quality of Government Institute, Department of Political Science.

Charron, Nicholas, Victor Lapuente, and Lewis Dijkstra. 2012. *Regional Governance Matters: A Study on Regional Variation in Quality of Government within the EU.* Working Paper 01/2012. European Commission, DG REGIO.

———. 2015. "Mapping the Regional Divide in Europe: A Measure for Assessing Quality of Government in 206 European Regions." *Social Indicators Research* 122 (2): 315–46.

Christensen, Tom, and Per Lægreid. 2002. "Trust in Government—The Relative Importance of Service Satisfaction, Political Factors and Demography." Working Paper 18. Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, Bergen University Research Foundation.

CSD (Center for the Study of Democracy). 2015. *Monitoring Anti-Corruption in Europe—Bridging Policy Evaluation and Corruption Measurement.* Sofia: Bulgaria.

De Weerd, Marga, Mireille Gemmeke, Josine Rigter, and Coen van Rij. 2005. *Indicators for Monitoring Active Citizenship and Citizen Education.* Amsterdam: Regioplan, Report for the European Commission, DG EAC.

Dolnicar, Sara, and Bettina Grün. 2013. "'Translating' Between Survey Answer Formats." *Journal of Business Research* 66 (9), 1298–306.

DPER (Department of Public Expenditure and Reform). 2015. *Irish Civil Service Customer Satisfaction Survey 2015 Report of Findings.* IPSOS MRBI. Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, Ireland.

Duggan, Martin, and Cathy Green. 2008. *Transforming Government Service Delivery: New Service Policies for Citizen-Centered Government.* IBM Global Social Segment.

EC (European Commission). 2012. "e-Government Benchmark Framework 2012–2015." Method Paper (July). European Commission.

———. 2014. *Eurobarometer 397 Corruption Report*.

Eurofound (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions). 2012. *European Quality of Life Survey*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

———. 2013. *Third European Quality of Life Survey—Quality of Society and Public Services*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Institute for Public Administration. 2006. *The Common Assessment Framework (CAF)— Improving An Organisation Through Self-Assessment*. European Institute for Public Administration.

Foresti, Marta, and Leni Wild. 2014. *Governance Targets and Indicators for Post 2015: An Initial Assessment.* London: Overseas Development Institute.

GovLoop. 2014. *Your Citizen Engagement Checklist: 18 Strategies for Success.* Washington, DC: GovLoop.

Grandvoinnet, Helene, Ghazia Aslam, and Shomikho Raha. 2015. *Opening the Black Box: The Contextual Drivers of Social Accountability.* New Frontiers of Social Policy. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Heintzman, Ralph, and Brian Marson. 2005. "People, Service and Trust: Is There a Public Sector Service Value Chain?" *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 71 (4), 549–75.

HM Government. 2007. *How to Measure Customer Satisfaction—A Tool to Improve the Experience of Customers.* United Kingdom: Her Majesty's Government.

Holmes, Brenton. 2011. "Citizens' Engagement in Policymaking and the Design of Public Services." Research paper 1, 2011–12, Parliamentary Library, Australia.

Hydén, Göran, and John Samuel (eds). 2011. *Making the State Responsive: Experience with Democratic Governance Assessments.* New York and Oslo: United Nations Development Program.

Institute for Citizen-Centered Service. 2010. *Common Measurement Tool Case Studies: Using the CMT to Move from Research to Results.* Institute for Citizen-Centered Service.

———. 2013. *Understanding Dimensions of Client Satisfaction and Enabling Actionable Service Performance Management.* Institute for Citizen-Centered Service.

IRI (International Republican Institute). 2015. *Ukraine Municipal*

Survey. IRI. http://www.iri.org/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/2015-05-19_ukraine_national_municipal_survey_march_2-20_2015.pdf.

Irish Reform and Delivery Office, Department of Public Expenditure and Reform. 2015. *Irish Civil Service Customer Satisfaction Survey 2015 Report of Findings.* IPSOS MRBI.

Ivanya, Maksym, and Anwar Shah. 2010. "Citizen-Centric Governance Indicators: Measuring and Monitoring Governance by Listening to the People and Not the Interest Groups." Policy Research Working Paper 5181. World Bank, Washington DC.

———. 2015. *Towards Greater Objectivity in Governance Measurement: Second Generation Citizen-Centric Governance Indicators.* Joint Vienna Institute, Michigan State University, and Brookings Institution, World Bank and SWUFE, China. https://msu.edu/~ivanynam/research/cgi2/Ivanyna_Shah_CGI2_2015.pdf.

Kunicova, Jana. 2015. *Building Trust in the Government One Text at a Time.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Le Masson, Bernard and Khalid Al-Yahya. 2014. *Digital Government Pathways to Delivering Public Services for the Future: A Comparative Study of Digital Government Performance Across Ten Countries.* Accenture.

Matheson, Angela. 2009. *The Public Sector Service Value Chain—Revisiting the First Link with BC Public Sector Works Units.* Canada: British Columbia.

McKinsey. 2015. *Implementing a Citizen-Centric Approach to Delivering Government Services.* Public Sector Insights.

Mizzell Lee. 2008. "Promoting Performance: Using Indicators to Enhance the Effectiveness of Sub Central Spending." Working Paper 5, Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate, OECD.

Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina. 2015. *Public Integrity and Trust in Europe.* Berlin: European Research Centre for Anti-Corruption and State-Building (ERCAS), Hertie School of Governance.

Natasa, Miklic, Marko Derca, and Branko Zibret. 2009. *How to Become a Citizen-Centric Government.* Study of Public Institutions in Eastern Europe, A. T. Kearney.

New Zealand Government. 2015. *New Zealanders' Satisfaction with Public Services: "Kiwis Count" Annual Report.*

———. 2017a. "SmartStart Helping Parents and Babies Get Off to the Best Start. Lessons Learnt from the First Cross-agency Life Event Project." Case Study. https://www.ict.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/DIA-SmartStart-Case-Study.pdf.

———. 2017b. "SmartStart—Making Life Easier for Kiwi Parents." Press release. http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA1702/S00399/smartstart-making-life-easier-for-kiwi-parents.htm.

O'Connell, Isobel Alice. 2000. "Building a Public Sector Benchmarking Framework for Citizen Satisfaction Results." Submitted to the University of Victoria, Canada.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2009. *Donor Approaches to Governance Assessments 2009 Sourcebook.* OECD Publishing.

———. 2012. *Practitioner's Guide to Perception Surveys*. OECD Publishing.

———. 2013. *Government at a Glance 2013*. OECD Publishing.

———. 2015. *Government at a Glance 2015*. OECD Publishing.

Oracle. 2012. "Eight Steps to Great Customer Experiences for Government Agencies." White paper, Oracle.

Peppers and Rogers Group. 2010. *Integrated Public Service Delivery: Achieving Efficiency While Delivering Exceptional Constituent Experiences.* Peppers and Rogers Group.

PwC (PriceWaterhouseCoopers). 2007. *The Road Ahead for Public Service Delivery: Delivering on the Customer Promise.* Public Sector Research Centre, PwC.

Petty, Kate Reed. 2017. "Is It Time to Retire the Word 'Citizen'?" Los Angeles Review of Books (blog). https://blog.lareviewofbooks.org/essays/time-retire-word-citizen/.

Reeves, Rachel, and Stephen Bruster. 2009. *Better Together: Scotland's Patient Experience Programme: Patient Priorities for Inpatient Care.* Report 5. Scottish Government Social Research.

Republic of Turkey. 2016. *Office of the Prime Minister Annual Report 2015.* Republic of Turkey.

Rodriguez-Pose, Andres, and Enrique Garcilazo. 2013. "Quality of Government and the Returns of Investment: Examining the Impact of Cohesion Expenditure in European Regions." Regional Development Working Papers 2013/12. OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k43n1zv02g0-en.

Santiso, Carlos, Jorge von Horoch, and Juan Cruz Vieyra. 2014.

Improving Lives Through Better Government: Promoting Effective, Efficient, and Open Governments in Latin America and the Caribbean. Technical note. Inter-American Development Bank.

Scott, Rodney, and Ross Boyd. 2017. *Interagency Performance Targets: A Case Study of New Zealand's Results Program.* Collaborating Across Boundaries Series. IBM Center for the Business of Government.

SGMAP (*Secrétariat général pour la modernisation de l'action publique*). 2015. *Baromètre 2014 de la qualité de l'accueil : un accueil multicanal toujours plus satisfaisant.* Secretariat-General for Government Modernization, France.

Thijs, Nick. 2011. *From Citizen/Customer Satisfaction Measurement to Management.* Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration.

Tinholt, Dinand, Niels van der Linden, Michiel Ehrismann, et al. 2015. *Future-Proofing eGovernment for a Digital Single Market. Final Insight Report.* European Commission, Directorate-General of Communications Networks, Content and Technology. https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/system/files/ged/egovernmentbenchmarkinsightreport.pdf.

Transparency International. 2012. *Slovakia*: *Cities Ranked on Their Transparency*, Transparency International. https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/slovakia_cities_ranked_on_their_transparency.

———. 2017. *Monitoring Corruption and Anti-Corruption in the Sustainable Development Goals—A Resource Guide.* Transparency International.

Trapnell, Stephanie. 2015. *User's Guide to Measuring Corruption and Anti-Corruption.* United Nations Development Program.

UK Cabinet Office. 2004. "The Drivers of Satisfaction with Public Services." Research Study Conducted for the Office of Public Services Reform.

UNDP (United Nations Development Program). 2015. *From Old Public Administration to New Public Service—Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries*. Global Center for Public Service Excellence, UNDP.

———. 2016a. *Citizen Engagement in Service Delivery—The Critical Role of Public Officials*. Global Center for Public Service Excellence, UNDP.

———. 2016b. *The Vietnam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI 2015): Measuring Citizens' Experiences.* UNDP.

Van Ryzin, G. G., and S. Immerwahr. 2004. "Derived Importance-Performance Analysis of Citizen Survey Data." *Public Performance and Management Review* 27 (4): 144–73.

World Bank. 2014. *Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement in World Bank Group Operations.* Washington, DC: World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/21113 License: CC BY 3.0 IGO."

World Bank. 2015. *Enabling Citizen-Driven Improvement of Public Services: Leveraging Technology to Strengthen Accountability in Nigerian Healthcare.* ICT4SA project. World Bank: Washington DC.

World Economic Forum. 2012. *Future of Government—Fast and Curious. How Innovative Governments Can Create Public Value by Leading Citizen-Centric Change in the Face of Global Risks.* World Economic Forum.

World Justice Project. 2015. *Open Government Index Report*. World Justice Project.

———. 2016. *Rule of Law Index Report*. World Justice Project.