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Introduction

Citizen-centric service delivery is core to the World Bank approach to GovTech, and many governments are undertaking efforts to modernize publicly-provided services to citizens and businesses. These include using technology to better target, track, and deliver services. Putting the citizen at the center of service design and delivery implies focusing design of services around the needs and preferences of the user. Migrating to digital service delivery provides governments with opportunities to redesign services with the user in mind, identify redundancies, and automate decision-making for more inclusive services. These services can, in turn, raise citizen satisfaction with service delivery, a key indicator under Sustainable Development Goal 16.6.

Internet technologies and applications are effective mechanisms to deliver public administrative services to citizens and businesses. The rapid pace of digitalization brought important opportunities to expand access to and improve the quality of administrative services. As of 2020, over 140 countries had deployed government-provided e-services and unified service portals, ranging from information only to fully transactional and integrated services. The COVID-19 pandemic made digital service delivery even more relevant in times of remote government, lockdowns and social distancing. Governments around the world deployed solutions and services to meet citizen needs. However, these solutions and services may be limited in their user-centricty, quality and efficiency.

2. Sustainable Development Goal 16.6 aims to “develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels,” measured by indicator 16.6.2, the “proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services.”
4. The concept of e-service includes different terminology including e-government service, public e-service, electronic services, digital services, et al (see Lindgren and Jansson, 2013; Jansen and Olnes, 2016). For the purposes of this report, e-service will be used to reference public sector e-services. It is important to note that e-services include those provided by government to citizens and to businesses. For the purposes of this note, the focus will be on modernizing government to citizen (G2C) services. But the lessons and process are similar and applicable to both types of e-services.
With e-services, the face-to-face interaction between government service providers and citizens is complemented or replaced by digital interfaces accessed through websites, e-service kiosks, and mobile devices such as smartphones. To be successfully used by citizens, these new interfaces and e-services must be designed with consideration for user characteristics: who will access them, where and how they will access them, and the levels of their digital skills, literacy, and expectations. Users need to trust and feel confident in their interactions. If tech-enabled services do not inspire confidence and trust, and if citizens find it difficult to obtain services online, they may very quickly revert to the traditional offline means of access. E-services therefore need to be designed with the user in mind, and tested and perceived as a good alternative to traditional options if they are going to be widely used.

To meet the needs and expectations of users, governments are adopting citizen-centric approaches to service design and delivery. While services largely were designed and deployed based on the process, form, and function of the agency, there is a fundamental shift towards user-centric service delivery, where governments are collaborating with citizens to co-design and co-create services. These approaches include the application of design thinking or other methods such as co-creation, participatory design, journey mapping, and creation of personas among others. While governments may have used different approaches or methodology (using different tools), the aims and objectives are similar: to create better value for service recipients and beneficiaries.

The purpose of this note is to provide practical guidance on service modernization to governments, practitioners, and task teams, and how citizen centricity can be incorporated into each stage of the process. The note introduces a four-stage model to design and deliver a citizen-centric services reform program that increases access, efficiency, and quality of e-services. The guide provides information on how to incorporate citizen centricity in the four stages: rationalization, re-engineering, digitization, and delivery to increase quality of services to meet citizen needs and preferences. While service modernization is an iterative process that is contingent on country context, the note relies on the four stage model to outline necessary steps that are applicable to many reform efforts. Governments may go through these stages more than once, depending on the scope of the reform. The note identifies potential challenges, both technical and non-technical, that countries may face in each stage and provides tips to encourage citizen engagement into each stage of the reform.

---

5. "Co-creation- and crowdsourcing based innovation both have high levels of participation and have an external component, as information is gathered outside of government with the goal of giving input on public developments." (Giest, 2017).
6. Personas are fictional characters that represent different user types that can be used to model a specific user experience. A persona can help to create empathy by enabling designers to understand the attitudes, skills, and challenges of specific target groups.
Service Modernization: Why and How?

Service modernization has many aims that vary across countries. They include increasing access, quality, and efficiency of services. Additionally, there can be improvements to governance through reducing administrative burden, reducing corruption, increasing legal compliance, improving decision-making, increasing accountability and transparency, improving data security, and promoting re-use of data, etc. In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, digitizing services became a higher priority to ensure service continuity in times of social distancing and remote work and education. Further, there is a demand side aspect: rising expectations of citizens based on their experience with top private sector digital service providers such as Google, Amazon, Netflix, Apple or Uber, is increasing pressure on governments to reform services to meet high standards of efficiency, convenience or personalization.

The implementation of e-services provides a number of benefits to users such as convenience, efficiency, lower costs and increased transparency. E-services also reduce any face-to-face discrimination that might occur, eliminate requests for “facilitation fees” or other bribes, and can level the playing field for access for users. When accompanied by appropriate policies for data access and transparency, digitalizing government services enables the rest of the economy to benefit from both the efficiency gains and the data generated, which can result in a boost for local tech ecosystems and small-scale businesses.

E-services increase reach by enabling access online or on mobile phones. These e-services and alternative means of access can reduce travel time, costs, delivery times, and the administrative burden of gathering documents; facilitate faster applications and approval processing; promote accessibility for those with disabilities or other challenges with physical access; and foster transparency in terms of better access to information including service tracking. Further, e-services promote inclusion by reducing the bias and stigma attached to certain social services such as social welfare, unemployment benefits, refugee stipends, and other services.

While e-services can increase reach, it is important to ensure that migration to e-services does not exacerbate existing digital divides. These divides include unequal access to connectivity, devices, skills, and literacy, which facilitate access and adoption of e-services. Good practices around the world focus on multichannel access to services that provide users with choices, for example, online, mobile, and face-to-face modalities. Providing services through multiple channels can help to bridge these divides and promote more inclusive services.

Greater efficiency gains occur through redesigning processes and procedures augmented by technology, often referred to as business process re-engineering or simplification. Reforming services can reduce time to deliver through, for example, removing document requirements, streamlining approvals, linking parallel processes, applying technology, and automating information processing. Interoperability platforms, catalogs, and frameworks can enable real-time data exchange, verification, and validation that can significantly cut time to deliver. Further, interoperability can enable organization of services around life events, scenarios, or life journeys such as having a baby, opening a business, and preparing for retirement. The consolidation of services provides a better experience for users by enabling service provision through one point of contact.

E-services eliminate face-to-face interaction, reducing discretion of service providers. This can be enhanced by ensuring that rules and accountability mechanisms are applied to track and monitor the behavior and actions of service providers. For example, an integrated e-government system can provide a high level of transparency in service delivery by identifying who is responsible for specific steps of the administrative processes to complete a service request. These tracking systems can foster accountability across bodies as they can identify and document the agency or person who causes a delay or mistake.

However, there are challenges to modernizing and digitizing services. These challenges include technical challenges as well as non-technical aspects. Specifically, technical challenges may include issues around information technology, legacy systems, data management, data interoperability, and integration. Non-technical challenges encompass political and institutional, legal and regulatory, change management and incentives at the institutional, organizational, and beneficiary levels. These challenges differ across countries and across stages of the modernization process. This guide provides additional information on these challenges, organized according to steps in the modernization framework outlined below.

### A Framework of Service Modernization

This guide follows a four-stage model of modernization (see Figure 1). The four stages align to the key principles of efficiency, inclusivity, and quality. Stage 1 is *Rationalization*, which includes planning the service reform. Stage 2 is *Re-engineering*, which promotes efficiency through streamlining processes, re-engineering business processes, and eliminating unnecessary documents and data requirements. Stage 3 is *Digitization*, and focuses on the technical aspects of service delivery, including automation, integration, and interoperability. Stage 4 is *Delivery*, which focuses on inclusivity and quality, and includes the delivery mechanisms, user interface, quality and delivery standards, and continuous improvement. It is worth noting that Stage 4 should not be seen as an endpoint, as e-services can be continuously improved, and monitoring of take-up and feedback is key, once services are launched. As noted above, service modernization is an iterative process, and countries may go through these stages multiple times depending on the number of services on scope to be modernized.

---

The four stages are underpinned by several cross-cutting activities. These are: coordination and project management; mainstreaming citizen engagement and feedback; monitoring and control, and communication and training. Coordination has been noted as a key barrier and facilitator for integrated service delivery, ensuring data exchange, roles and responsibilities, and accountability for service delivery. Mainstreaming citizen engagement includes including users in the design of the services (such as through co-creation, etc.) and creating mechanisms for feedback that can be used for service and process improvements. Monitoring and control of performance and compliance of service providers with specific service delivery standards, indicators, and targets is necessary to measure impact of reforms and foster accountability. Communication and training are necessary throughout the reform effort to create momentum, increase buy in, and raise awareness of reform efforts and projected outcomes.
To support application of the modernization model, global experience points to the need for an institutional framework and coordination mechanism. This framework is needed to drive modernization reform of services and facilitate whole-of-government coordination of policymaking, implementation, and monitoring. The establishment of an inter-institutional and cross-sectorial mechanism in charge of coordinating services digitization with the necessary capacity and political support is beneficial to push necessary legal and policy updates, would ensure development of implementation capacities, technical expertise, adaptability to change, and continuous implementation progress—both short-term quick wins and sustainable change. It could ensure the coordination of effective implementation to avoid fragmentation and silo approaches. Further guidance on establishing governance models for the whole-of-government approach, developing digital skills for transformation, and fostering innovation in the public sector is provided in other GovTech insight publications.

Applying Citizen Centricity to E-Services

More and more government administrations are employing design thinking and other methodologies to ensure services are well designed, efficient, user friendly, and accessible to those with disabilities. The importance of citizen-centered service design is a shift from early efforts at digitizing services when services were designed around the needs, processes, and functions of the service providers. A citizen-centric approach also implies that the service provider offers solutions that are tailored to various citizen segments instead of supplying a “one-size-fits-all” product. To achieve this, administrations need to develop a clear view and understanding of different citizen groups intended to access the services: their needs, preferences, and capabilities to provide an effective and high-quality user-friendly experience, and improve their utilization and satisfaction with e-services. Ensuring services meet the needs of users is critical as it impacts user uptake of e-government services. It is important for the approach to take into account the digital divide concerns mentioned above, and to design the rollout of an e-services program carefully to ensure that key groups are not excluded or marginalized.

User centricity is defined as “a design philosophy in which the needs and expectations of the end user of an interface are the center of focus.” The literature and practitioners use different terms, such as user centric, citizen-centric, and human centered, to refer to services that are reflective of different end-user needs. This report will use the term citizen centered throughout for simplicity. As defined by the World Bank (2021), “Citizen centered public services incorporate citizens’ needs and concerns at every stage of the service design and delivery by interacting and communicating with the people involved.” These interactions can inform policymakers, service providers, and service designers’ understanding of the range of needs for different user groups, including the poor, vulnerable, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities to guide design and deliver better services that increase citizen satisfaction.

There are a number of design methodologies and approaches that can be used to create and develop citizen-centric services. These include the Brown model, and those from the Darden School of Business and Stanford Design School. Design thinking includes five stages: empathizing and interacting with users; defining the problem; ideating to develop solutions; prototyping the services; and testing the service. Design thinking has been applied in government innovation in Australia, Denmark, Malaysia, Moldova, New Zealand, Singapore, the United Kingdom, and the United States, among others.

Citizen centered design goes further than simply consulting users during prototyping or testing. This design approach involves users to provide guidance and feedback on their expectations and needs at each stage of the process, from design to requirements engineering to prototyping to testing. In many cases, agencies conduct user acceptance testing at the end of the development cycle to determine its fit for purpose and identification of any bugs, errors, or issues before rollout. But only including the user at the final stages of development can result in services or applications that do not meet the needs and preferences of a wider group.

14. IGI: https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/taxonomy-grid-systems/31261#:~:text=1.,are%20the%20centre%20of%20focus.
15. Human-centered design is an approach to interactive systems development that aims to make systems usable and useful by focusing on the users, their needs and requirements, and by applying human factors/ergonomics, and usability knowledge and techniques. This approach enhances effectiveness and efficiency, improves human well-being, user satisfaction, accessibility and sustainability; and counteracts possible adverse effects of use on human health, safety and performance. ISO 9241-210:2019(E).
There are a number of benefits stemming from applying a participatory approach at each stage of service design and development. For example, engaging potential users gives an opportunity to learn more about the needs, objectives, preferences, and characteristics that can enable definition of design specifications and processes. At the development stage, this knowledge can identify errors and inform improvements that can be made before a service is launched, leading to cost savings.\(^\text{19}\) Overall, the use of citizen centered approaches can result in services that better meet needs and have improved usability and reliability from a greater range of users.\(^\text{20}\) From the supply side, research by IBM on the United States showed that employees reported a better understanding of beneficiaries and their needs, improvements in decision-making, and better employee engagement.\(^\text{21}\) By actively engaging service providers and agents in design thinking and co-creation workshops, stakeholder buy-in can increase, as seen in Indonesia (see Box 1).

---

**BOX 1 - Applying Design Thinking to Service Delivery in Indonesia**

The Government of Indonesia is undertaking a whole of government digital transformation. In 2021, as part of the World Bank’s GovTech Global Partnership knowledge platform, the Government of Indonesia participated in a design thinking workshop with the Government of Austria’s Federal Ministry of Digital and Economic Affairs and the Federal Computing Agency (BRZ). The aims of the workshop were to introduce design thinking concepts and apply them to two focus areas: user-centricity in public services and building digital talent in government. These two aspects were identified as those most in need of development by government counterparts.

Nine ministries and agencies at the central and local levels, including representatives from the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, the Ministry of Communications and Informatics, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, West Java Provincial Government’s Jabar Digital Service, the National Civil Service Agency, and other institutions participated in the workshop.

The session began with an introduction of Design Thinking concepts and use-cases from the Austrian government. Participants were then assigned to one of two breakout rooms that focused on citizen-centric public service delivery, and digital talent development. In each breakout room, the participants were presented with a persona for the respective theme. For service delivery, the persona represented a citizen needing to access social assistance from home in the face of COVID-19. For digital talent, the persona was a government official in need of staff with requisite skills to develop and maintain beneficiary registries. Both personas embodied end users facing real problems. The teams then used the Miro interactive collaboration platform to brainstorm on (1) defining the problem, (2) envisioning a way forward, and (3) identifying challenges and solutions.

The participants were eager to try out the frameworks and processes presented, including empathizing with personas to discover needs and problems, jotting down ideas around these problems, and grouping them based on similarities. Participants were actively engaged in prototyping solutions using tools such as storyboards, customer journey mapping, concept cards, and cover stories. The service delivery group prototyped integrated government service systems with a mobile app and chat system that would provide a simple and integrated process of application for public services – health, social, education – and easily accessible information on the status of those services. The digital talent group concluded their session with several ideas for implementation, such as creating a digital-friendly work environment, mentorship and scholarship programs, developing incentive systems for digital skills, and working with universities.

At the end of the workshop, participants used tools such as a sailboat exercise to identify challenges in implementation and to find the way forward. Participants expressed willingness to use these frameworks and exercises to work collaboratively, to empathize with users more, and to solve problems in the future.

---

There are a few challenges with applying design principles to government e-services. These include limited incentives to adopt user centricity concepts. Most administrative services are provided only by the relevant ministry, department or agency (MDA), with no private sector alternative, as happens, for example, with social benefits such as pensions, passports, or driver’s licenses. Another issue is that e-services may only be used once, for example property registration or birth registration, so public administrations may be less focused on usability.22 A related challenge is that, in many cases, services are designed from the standpoint of the MDA, and service providers’ preferences and priorities may differ from citizens and users.23 The application of design thinking may be challenging in terms of cost, time to design, and change management to implement new processes and ways of thinking. It can increase costs and time for e-service development as it calls for participation from a broader group of internal and external stakeholders with different skills, needs, and preferences to be successful.

Overcoming these challenges requires a focus on incentives, change management, and communication and outreach. On the government side, incentives may be needed at several levels, from the top down to front line service providers to drive new behaviors. These incentives may be monetary, such as salary increases or bonuses applied on the basis of performance, or non-monetary, such as rewards and recognition awards and perks, training programs, and mentorship and development opportunities. On the citizen side, incentives may also be necessary to solicit participation in co-creation workshops, focus groups, and other activities. For the citizens, it is important to ensure the feedback provided is acted upon or responded to in a timely manner, so they feel valued in the process.

Applying the Framework Step by Step

A service modernization initiative is a journey. The framework above consists of four separate phases: rationalization, re-engineering, digitization, and delivery. This section presents a detailed summary of activities in each stage, guidance on how to complete these activities, and challenges that may arise.

Before embarking on a service modernization project, it is important to identify the aims of the reform, costs and resources needed, and potential benefits. Any public sector reform needs to have clear objectives. In the case of service reforms, these may include increased citizen satisfaction, increased efficiency of services, and lower costs of service delivery. Applying a problem-based approach to the reform can support the development of a business case. Having a strong business case can identify costs, contingencies, risks and benefits, key stakeholders, and support reform planning and implementation.\(^{24}\) The business case should not only capture aspects of technology but also analog complements. As highlighted in the 2016 World Development Report on Digital Dividends, these complements include institutions, rules and regulations, and skills to leverage technology for better productivity.\(^{25}\) Completing a business case and conducting a cost-benefit analysis should consider these aspects, along with existing divides; it may cost more to reach a certain population, for example, those in rural areas or without internet access.


\(^{25}\) World Bank, 2016.
Institutions play a key role in these reforms. Lessons from many countries reveal that adequate reform management and coordination mechanisms are key success factors for reform implementation. Strong leadership and interagency coordination are essential for implementation of the reform, especially those aiming at changes in business processes. Governments need to dedicate sustainable resources to strengthen coordination and reform management. Therefore, the governments should adopt a problem-solving approach based on the principles of empowerment, communication, integration, and collaboration among various stakeholders.

As part of the planning process, client countries and task teams can conduct preparatory assessments to identify gaps, determine entry points, and foster policy dialogue. These assessments may employ global data from the GovTech Maturity Index (GTMI) and other sources. Teams may undertake a Digital Government Readiness Assessment (DGRA) or Digital Economy Country Assessment (DECA) to identify gaps and opportunities for reform. The DGRA methodology covers 67 questions, including those on leadership and governance, user centered design, technology and data infrastructure, legislation and regulation, and the digital ecosystem. The DECA includes aspects of infrastructure, digital public platforms, digital payments, digital skills, and entrepreneurship that can provide a snapshot of the overall ecosystem, reform landscape, and technical readiness for service modernization.

It is important to pay attention to the sequencing of reforms to show rapid results and maintain momentum for reform. Potential activities might include: (i) implementation of a reform management and coordination mechanism; (ii) approval and implementation of Change Management Strategy and Action Plan; and (iii) leadership training, institutional communication, and social inclusion and citizen engagement checklists for activities on modernization of services.

Stage 1: Rationalization of Administrative Services

This stage of the modernization process can be seen as preparatory. The stage highlights the development of a whole-of-government service inventory, rationalizing services to remove those that are obsolete or redundant, consolidating services, and grouping services by life scenarios or events. The four steps of this stage are outlined below.

Stage 1, Step 1: Create an Inventory of Services

To start the process, it is important to gather the information on all services provided by government to citizens and businesses. Since government services tend to be provided independently by numerous government ministries and agencies, these are not automatically registered at the central level. Governments tend to underestimate the number of services they provide as well as the time their citizens have to spend dealing with such services. A comprehensive inventory makes it easier to estimate the administrative burdens on citizens and private sector, and can also identify overlaps and opportunities to revise or cancel services that are no longer needed.

To start the inventory phase, the objectives must be clearly defined. Just like when conducting larger surveys, it is crucial to get the inventory data fields of the inventory right from the onset. All stakeholders who will later use the inventory must be involved in the design of the forms used for data collection. Objectives of the inventory typically include to collect as much information about the particular service as possible in order to populate a registry. The inventory will often have data on legality, institutional reform efforts, and its economic impact on the population. An example of potential service questions to complete the inventory is provided in Annex 1. A request for information should include those working on implementing the reforms, legal specialists, staff responsible for calculating administrative burdens, and IT specialists working on the web portal.

The data collection form is distributed across government. Provided that the government has an updated list of all agencies providing services, the actual request can be circulated to ministries and agencies through government communication channels. Data can be collected through face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, postal mail, or self-administering questionnaires delivered by e-mail or via online platforms. Usually, letters of request are addressed to heads of agencies or similar institutions to ensure that the issues get necessary attention and are dealt with by the correct officials. In many countries, requests circulated to ministries and agencies are signed by a centrally located minister, or even the head of government. The letter will set a deadline by which the information is to be submitted, and should ask for a contact person within the ministry or agency for follow up actions.

Government agencies may need assistance in submitting the requested information. As the responses are received from ministries and agencies, they are screened by the project
team and requests for additional information made, as needed. It is not unusual, notably in low-capacity administrations, for agencies to have problems to collect and submit the requested information. Additional support by the project team should therefore be provided, if needed to complete the inventory.

For the user side of government services, there are many other ways to collect information on the experience of such services. Some countries have used mystery shopping and exit interviews to determine how services are actually conducted. For example, exit interviews were conducted in Albania to understand the time to prepare documentation, apply for, and obtain services such as motor vehicle registration and old age pension. Many countries such as have set up web portals for citizens to submit feedback on service delivery, general business processes, and also on specific initiatives such as draft inventories. As the government should have information on recent users of services, it should be relatively easy to reach out to these beneficiaries.

It is crucial for the users of the services, including government officials, businesses, and citizens to validate the inventory. Government respondents may have forgotten to include certain services in the inventory, or external users may be able to provide other experiences regarding issues such as fees, processing times, and other issues experienced in requesting the service. This type of data validation is most efficiently carried out in focus groups, where any contradiction in information provided by nongovernmental stakeholders or government officials can be discussed openly, and conclusions on the actual process can be reached before participants leave the table. However, in many developing countries, stakeholders’ dialogue with government is in early stages, and stakeholders’ views may have to be collected in separate consultations, focus groups, or by online surveys.

Stage 1, Step 2: Eliminate Unnecessary Services

Following the completion of the data collection phase, every service needs to be reviewed before being formalized in an electronic registry. This is called a horizontal review. In contexts where there was no prior inventory, the likelihood is high that many of the formalities, licenses, or other type of government services are outdated and, in some cases, unnecessary. An analysis of the inventory often reveals that many of the services can be eliminated. Overall, the streamlining of regulations and reduction of administrative burdens should be a politically neutral process, aiming to retain policy objectives of existing services but allowing for more efficient processes. Any removal should be guided by clear and simple review criteria, including:

- **Legality**: Some ministries or agencies may offer services without a legal basis. These services should stop and be marked for elimination unless there is a need for the service, in which case the service should be formalized.

- **Obsolescence**: Some services may be obsolete or out of date, with no purpose. These should be marked for removal.

- **Overlap or duplication**: Overlap or duplication means they meet the same purpose, is achieved by a different service, or in case two or more services have the same scope. In this case one may be marked for removal.

- **Necessity**: Even if a service is legal, it may be marked for removal if it is considered unnecessary. Analysis may show that certain services are outdated or are not being used. Such services should either be removed, or be significantly reformed, for instance by being combined with other services. A category requiring particular attention are licenses and other types of ex ante permits. These are some of the most powerful types of regulation, allowing governments to approve activities prior to their commencement. However, if misused or overused, they also have the potential to be severely damaging to the economy and to vital functions of society. This includes the limiting of new business activities, preventing formalization of private firms, and limiting supply of important goods. Hence, business licenses should not be used if a certain activity can be regulated using other types of regulatory tools. As a general rule, licensing should only be used to regulate activities with potential impact in the areas of environment, health, and safety.

- **Proportionality**: This applies more often, but not exclusively, to business-related services. When a public service is created, it has a reason behind it, meaning it needs to achieve a purpose, to protect a public interest, for instance. In the case of environmental permits, for example, the goal is to protect the environment to ensure a healthy life for the current inhabitants of the locality and conserve it for future generations. Table 1 below presents an example of how this can be done in practice.
### Table 1 - Example of Proportionality Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The service</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Eliminate</th>
<th>Keep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto-Service Authorization</td>
<td>Is the service <strong>appropriate/adequate</strong> (effectively achieve its goal) to ensure the protection of the targeted public interest?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could the goal of the service be achieved by another less restrictive service?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the service be provided efficiently by the market?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage 1, Step 3: Consolidate and Organize Services by Life Events/Scenarios

Following the rationalization stage, the next step is to identify citizens’ needs regarding public services considering their personal situations and life events. This step is where design thinking and other methods can inform new approaches to service processing and delivery by identifying pain points from both the supply and demand sides. Citizens’ needs depend on their individual characteristics – for example, age, gender, residence, job, education, employment, marital and family status, income, and ability – and their life events, such as a birth or adoption of a child, relocating, getting married, entering education, losing a job, retiring, and the death of a family member. Figure 2 below presents the concept of identifying citizen’s needs and related public services.

### Figure 2 - Identifying Citizen’s Needs and Related Public Services

**Citizen’s Needs**

- **Individual Characteristics**
  - Age
  - Sex
  - Residence
  - Job
  - Income
  - Race

- **Life Events/Situations**
  - Birth
  - Marriage
  - Move
  - Education
  - Employment
  - Retirement
  - Death

**Public Services**

- **Federal Government Agencies**
  - A Service
  - B Service
  - C Service

- **Local Governments**
  - D Service
  - E Service
  - F Service

- **Public Institutions**
  - G Service
  - H Service
  - I Service

*Source: Authors.*
Governments can provide more integrated and customized services by arranging public services related to each specific situation. For example, if the government provides a list of services needed around life events, such as relocating to a new city, the city can provide information about the exchange of a driver’s license, utilities, school registration, public library, tax, etc., without any requests from a new resident. See Box 2.

---

**BOX 2 - Packaging Services by Life Events in the Republic of Korea**

In 2015, the Republic of Korea launched the “One stop package service on a life cycle” that provides information on customized services needed for every milestone of one’s life, such as childbirth, child-care, employment, and death, at once and in advance on the government portals. This service increased the convenience of using public services through providing information proactively, allowing the integrated application to the related services, and minimizing documents by information sharing.

In the past, citizens could not access some public services because there were a wide range of services, and it was difficult for citizens to find out related services and eligibility by themselves. For example, expectant parents were eligible to receive 14 services from the national level and about three or four services from their local government, but information was difficult to find. After introducing the one stop package service on a life cycle, the government provides the integrated information proactively and they can apply to all related services at once.

In 2020, coverage expanded to include seven sub-services: pregnancy, childbirth, child-care, adolescents, veterans, inheritance, and moving. The Korean government has a plan to expand the service coverage to nine more sub-services based on citizen’s life events, as shown below in Figure B2.1.

---

**FIGURE B2.1 - Plan to Expand Service Coverage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Expand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pregnancy</td>
<td>2. Job information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Childbirth</td>
<td>3. Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adolescent</td>
<td>5. Business turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Patriots &amp; Veterans</td>
<td>6. Immigrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inheritance</td>
<td>7. People with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Move-in</td>
<td>7. Seniors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021

2022

1. Housing

2. Returning to farm

---

The government’s effort to provide more proactive public services can contribute to citizen satisfaction. Eighty three percent of respondents who have experienced the one stop package service on a life cycle said that they were satisfied with the service according to the survey in 2020.

Since many federal ministries and local governments’ participation was important for the information sharing and successful implementation of this service, the Korean government has tried to include this approach into key government innovation initiatives and strengthen the institutional arrangements.
Another tool to find out citizens’ needs is analyzing their comments from various feedback channels with a user experience perspective. For example, the US Department of State developed ideas for improving its passport application process based on the almost 1,000 comments received through the website, tell-us.usa.gov, in 2017. Governments can increase their efficiency in public service delivery by finding out and considering citizens’ expectations and needs. Digital platforms enable governments to process and analyze this feedback more easily.

Stage 1, Step 4: Prioritize Services for Business Process Reengineering and Simplification

The fourth step is to prioritize services on the basis of getting the “biggest bang for the buck.” Since administrative reforms take time, and often require fundamental changes to regulation, organization, and culture, one key consideration is the speed and complexity of the reform. If the inventory of services is large, all services cannot be reformed at once. The reform will have to prioritize among the services in place, and possibly create a staged reform effort over time.

After developing the comprehensive inventory of public services, a prioritization of the services to be re-engineered can be performed. This will help the project concentrate on a substantive and critical number of services to have a bigger reform impact. The prioritization can be applied to the total number of services inventoried, or it can be done by sector of services or by beneficiary category—citizen- or business-related services. Consequently, a set of criteria for a rapid diagnostic of the most problematic ones will help the government to determine which public services to prioritize for re-engineering. These criteria may include:

- **Low-hanging fruit:** Some services are easier to reform than others. Starting with these reforms can help achieve quicker impact with less time and/or resources and increase citizen appetite for deeper reforms across government. Low-hanging fruit may include reforms that can be conducted with limited regulatory, legal, or organizational reforms inside government, or reforms that are less-controversial or limit the number of “losers” in the process – see Box 3.

- **High demand services:** A focus on services that have the highest number of annual transactions or the highest number of beneficiaries can generate large buy-in and support for administrative reforms, and maximize the benefits of the reform.

- **Financial savings:** Many regulatory reform practitioners accept the assumption that roughly the top 20 percent of most expensive licenses or regulations represent around 80 percent of the total administrative costs in a society. A service can be considered costly if the number of transactions is very high, and/or if individual efforts and costs associated with each transaction is important.

- **Most problematic services:** These are the services with the highest number of complaints from beneficiaries, or that may have evidence of corruption or excessive discretion.

- **Services considered most important by citizens:** Sometimes citizens feel that certain services offered by government are associated with overly testing processes, even though these services may not be found among the services listed above. In fact, they may not show up as being an important cost factor since citizens avoid applying for them due to process requirements. Reform of such services can provide a high level of satisfaction among citizens. To identify these services, there will be need for consultation with a broad range of stakeholders.

- **Horizontal prioritization:** Some governments have focused on reforming certain stages of the functions before embarking on others. For instance, the Netherlands decided to first focus on reducing administrative burdens in the government’s back-office work, and only thereafter did they go into simplification of the external user-side processes.

BOX 3 - Identifying Low Hanging Fruit in Moldova

In some cases, prioritization is done based on country-specific criteria. As part of the World Bank's Governance e-Transformation Project (GeT), the Government of Moldova planned to implement five new e-services annually. These services were to be selected based on the following criteria established by the Moldova eGovernment Center (eGC) to determine priorities.

Following this approach, in 2010, the eGC with technical assistance provided by IDA International Singapore, USAID, and Estonian experts conducted a comprehensive e-services prioritization exercise. The eGC evaluated 73 e-services that could potentially be digitized and prioritized five of them to be implemented in 2011 as "quick wins." They included:

(i) e-Criminal Record (Ministry of Internal Affairs); (ii) e-Licensing (Ministry of Economy); (iii) e-Library of Construction Norms (Ministry of Regional Development and Construction); (iv) e-Registration for Medical Insurance (National House of Medical Insurance); and v) Emergency SMS alerts (Ministry of Internal Affairs).

Digitization of this initial set of services relied on existing databases for their delivery and did not require fundamental process re-engineering. But their implementation required employee training and amendments to existing internal regulations (procedures, job descriptions, policy) to support a smooth transition from a manual to an electronic mode of service delivery.

Potential Challenges in Stage 1

There are several potential political, institutional, and organizational challenges at this stage of the reform effort. Applying and integrating design to administrative services necessitates change across many dimensions, and benefits from strong leadership, management support, and a culture of innovation. Adaptive challenges should be considered alongside technical challenges when outlining obstacles to the implementation of services reform.

Creating buy in from line ministries, service providers, and citizens to participate can be a challenge. This is especially true for projects which involve modernization efforts and the introduction of innovation, which might generate resistance by stakeholders, both inside and outside of the government. For example, ministries, agencies, and individual civil servants may not welcome the elimination of redundant administrative services. Governments should therefore adopt a problem-solving approach based on the principles of empowerment, communication, integration, and collaboration among various stakeholders.

Applying citizen centric principles implies a fundamental change in how services are designed and delivered. Changing “how it has always been done” is a challenge for any modernization and digitization effort. Focusing on the process from the perspective of the citizen can also face resistance. However, research and practice show that service providers can be open to change, and applying these methods once introduced to them, as seen in Indonesia, Moldova, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, and other countries.

There may be conflicting ideas and definitions of what constitutes an administrative service. In some cases, government service providers may not share the same definition of what a service is. In practice, this can complicate the inventory process unless there is a shared understanding of what constitutes a service. For inventories, it is important to focus on government to citizen (G2C) and government to business (G2B) services. Government to Government (G2G) services enable these front facing services, but should not be considered services for the inventory process. To move beyond this potential confusion, the following definition may be applied:

**Administrative public services are services that are issued by or on behalf of the public administration to private subjects (natural or legal persons) that involve information obligation, issuance of administrative acts or ensuring fulfillment of duties towards the state (or local government) of individuals or organizations, as defined in the law. Examples of such services include issuance of permits, registration of a person or property, applying for benefits, etc.**

Mapping of subnational services is often relevant but difficult. Even when reforms focus on central government services, it is often relevant to get a grasp of the role and impact of subnational processes. For instance, many services processed at central government level may require documents such as birth certificates that are issued by local government. But it is typically a herculean task to attempt to map subnational processes in countries with hundreds of municipalities, all having their own procedures. Depending on the context of the reform, it may be relevant to look at one or two subnational governments, and possibly extrapolate results to better understand how they impact central government procedures.

If the government already has existing e-services, prioritization may also examine the current maturity level of the services on offer. Governments should focus on the services that create the highest value for citizens, companies, and governments, and transform those first. But based on the scale and scope of the reform effort, it may be more beneficial to focus on existing e-services and increasing their functionality for quick wins.

**Stage 2: Reengineering Services for Efficiency**

New information technologies (IT) have drastically improved the way citizens can interact with government, including by cutting lead times, administrative burdens to users, and costs to government. When implementing new IT systems to help improve government processes, it is usually crucial to also change underlying processes and organization. There are numerous examples of organizations having invested millions in new technology, but having achieved none or limited gains due to failure to change the underlying organizational practices.

**IT and business process reengineering (BPR) reforms are heavily integrated.** New IT systems typically require reengineering of processes, and BPR projects typically involve introduction of technological systems. While early e-government efforts attempted to merely introduce web-based interfaces for existing government services, more recent attempts to offer true “one-stop-shop” types require radical change of underlying organizational structures. Data shows that around 70 percent of e-Government initiatives have failed to live up to their initial targets, primarily because the back-office process reengineering efforts have failed.
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BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Business process reengineering (BPR) is the term used to describe the reform of business processes within an organization. BPR has its background in private sector attempts to streamline production processes. But as part of the New Public Management approaches that were applied to governments in the early 1990s onwards, BPR made its entrance in the public sector. Placing the customer in focus, process reengineering projects are top-down reforms, defined as “fundamental rethink and radical redesign of business processes to generate dramatic improvements” (Hammer and Champy, 1993), as it is generally difficult to achieve larger cross-organizational change without pressure from the top. In this way, BPR contrasts with approaches such as Total Quality Management, which aim for gradual improvements based on incremental reforms of individual processes.33

BPR is diverse, but the process is often quite similar. Kettinger et al (1997) identified 72 different methods used to implement BPR.34 Even if the activities may vary among practitioners and scholars, they typically have a few stages in common. This includes an analysis phase, a stage of analysis and redesign, and a testing and implementation phase.

1. **Defining processes:** The term “process” comes from the private sector and was introduced in reforms involving BPR and process-oriented management in government. In reforms involving government services, a single government service or a part thereof are often considered a process. The process will typically include a large set of activities conducted by citizens and by the government, depending on the scope of reform. It will often make sense to identify which services have identical or similar processes, as they can often be bundled and reformed together.

2. **Mapping of as-is processes:** After processes have been defined, they are mapped by activity, to show time and resources required. Processes are often visualized using flowcharts that define all activities and process owners involved including approvals, transfers, and reviews.

3. **Definition of to-be scenarios:** A to-be scenario will use the process maps to define a future scenario, including what reforms are to be made and how this will affect time and resources. Sometimes several sets of future scenarios are developed, requiring various amounts of efforts that can be developed over different time horizons.

4. **Testing and implementation:** After proposals have been developed and approved, the implementation phase can start. However, the reform may require massive organizational, cultural, legal changes and it is thus crucial to test different proposals prior to a full-scale implementation. There should always be scope for some experimentation, simulation and adaptation before final decisions are made.

BPR in governments differs from that in the private sector. Radical BPR methodologies such as “clean slate” – where the optimal processes for achieving a certain outcome are designed with no regard to existing processes – have proven more difficult to use than in private sectors.35 Such approaches will usually require a drastic rethink of organizations across several levels, but typically also come with higher levels of risk than gradual streamlining.36 Overall, research has shown that implementing BPR reforms in public sector tends to be more difficult than in private firms.37 In addition to mere organizational and management differences between public and private sectors, the public sector is less exposed to external market pressure requiring improvement of internal efficiency. The reform pace can be slowed due to intricate legal frameworks, political pressure, and requirements for equity and accountability.

---

33. Ibid.
Stage 2 builds on the first stage and includes activities including service redesign, service mapping, and identifying opportunities for optimization. These may include eliminating unnecessary documentation, streamlining approvals and back-office procedures, and reviewing the legal framework. The stage includes four steps outlined below.

**Stage 2, Step 1: Map the Processes**

The process map will describe the entire process required for the service, showing the time and resources required for each step. It will help to determine all actors and institutions involved, as well as data needs, time consumption and information flows. The information needed for this step is typically collected through focus groups with involved stakeholders, including service providers, frontline staff, approvers, and external clients. This may also involve the discussion of already identified problems, and how they are to be solved—for instance, using problem trees and similar tools. The objective is to obtain a full account of both of the effort and time spent by the citizen and the government in the process.

Figure 3 below shows a simplified flowchart of a process for obtaining a government service. The main steps constitute activities that must be carried out by the government and citizen, and represents time and costs by either of the actors. These steps will usually be more granular, consisting of numerous activities, and combined with more detailed calculation of actual monetary cost using the standard cost model to estimate a number based on annual number of transactions.

---

**FIGURE 3 - Simplified Process Map of Business Licensing Procedure**

[Diagram showing simplified process map of business licensing procedure]

Source: Authors.
Stage 2, Step 2: Measure Existing Administrative Burden

There are different approaches to business process reengineering that can be applied to e-services. These may be established methodologies such as the Standard Cost Model (SCM), Enterprise Engineering, BreakPoint, Process Reengineering Life Cycle Methodology, or countries may establish their own model for simplification. For this note, we apply the SCM, as it has been applied by member governments of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in search of a simple methodology to guide their simplification efforts. SCM has also been used by the European Union to reduce burdens imposed by EU regulation by 25 percent. The World Bank has used SCM in regulatory reform projects in around 100 developing countries over the last 20 years, including Albania, Kenya, Nepal, and Vietnam. It is important to note that BPR is not only automation of existing systems and services, but a holistic approach to redesigning services.

The standard cost model measures administrative burdens related to government services. The original version of SCM focused on private sector costs of government regulation, but later iterations have been expanded to additionally cover costs on citizens and on the government itself. SCM works very well with process mapping, and can be used in process reengineering for prioritizing, evaluating, and communicating reforms. There are several reasons why SCM became a tool of choice for process reengineering for governments around the world:

- It is a simple yet robust method for mapping and quantifying administrative processes.
- It enables setting quantitative targets for burden reduction, which significantly improves accountability. Previous simplification efforts tended to have vague qualitative targets such as “reducing unnecessary burdens,” often allowing agencies to claim all procedures stemming from processes they were administering were necessary and hence no simplification could be achieved.

- SCM is perceived as politically neutral and, unlike pure deregulation, it can be accepted on any side of the political spectrum. SCM measures costs related to processes users have to go through but aims to keep policy objectives of regulation intact. This makes administrative burden reforms attractive across the political spectrum.

- The fact that in SCM compliance costs and burden reductions are measurable and can be described as monetary values make up a powerful communication tool. It can be used by politicians and civil society to communicate reform efforts, build momentum, and show the return on investment.

The starting point of SCM is a breakdown of processes into manageable components called services or information obligations. Information obligations make up the core analytical components of SCM and are analyzed to identify the related required services for compliance. A regulation or a service may contain one or several information obligations and will result in at least one activity among users. There are commonly also other requirements that explain how the applicant is supposed to carry out the task. For instance, a requirement may include the submission of a particular application form, a tax clearance certificate, or a birth certificate. Depending on the context, data requirements may be found in a primary law, but also in secondary legislation and other instructions by the service provider.

Each of the data requirements infer administrative activities or tasks that users must complete. The administrative activities are tasks completed by citizens and businesses to comply with service application or information obligations. A data requirement for an applicant to submit a particular form may trigger administrative activities such as collecting relevant documents, completing forms, getting necessary signatures, and submitting it to the service provider. A common example is seen in vehicle safety or roadworthiness certificates: in order to obtain the certificate a user needs to make an appointment, complete an inspection, submit the inspection and apply to the relevant ministry, as illustrated in Figure 4.

---

A next step is to convert the time measurement to monetary figures on the supply and demand sides. On the government side, this is done by multiplying the required working time to process, approve, and deliver a service with the average salary cost of the civil servants’ hours or days required. On the demand side, multiply the required time by per capita Gross National Income (for citizens) or mean salary costs (in case of firms). This will help monetize time spent for each information obligation from both perspectives.

While the cost for one individual may be of interest, it is important to evaluate the total compliance cost to adequately estimate the effects of simplification. This extrapolation is done by multiplying the cost of the typical (that is, normally efficient) process by the annual number of services delivered. This means that if a particular legal obligation is highly time-consuming for the individual, it may not come across as expensive to the overall population unless the number of beneficiaries affected is high. Similarly, the total administrative costs can appear relatively low in countries where salary costs are low. To have a more holistic view, it is prudent to examine other cost categories, such as the costs incurred when businesses or citizens have to wait for government’s approval of applications, and the cost to reach different beneficiary segments.

If more data is available on the number of annual occurrences of the procedure, it could also be used to determine the size of different user segments or user groups. Different segments of citizens or firms could be affected by the same procedure in different ways. If, for instance, services are made available online, this may significantly streamline processes in theory. However, if only a few individuals have access to computers, then the population must be divided into two segments: one submitting online and one submitting through other means – face-to-face or mediated access – in order to create a fair calculation of administrative costs. Similar segmentation may be done for other groups,
including gender, age, and income, in cases where this would be relevant for the reforms. However, excessive segmenting should be avoided.

In order to make the reengineering effort more efficient, similar services can be categorized and clustered. The cluster of services would require the same or similar processes, such as making a payment, authorizing a license, or basic information validation. Services can be categorized by the type of beneficiary, those that have an authorization scheme (such as a license), those that certify facts (such as a civil registration certificate), and other services such as information submission or payment obligations (such as a parking fine). These types of services may be reengineered as a package if the same ICT solutions are needed (such as a payment module) to facilitate the service.

Stage 2, Step 3: Identify Opportunities for Reform and Define To-Be Maps

Once processes are mapped as-is, these can be used to identify reform proposals and develop to-be scenarios. The standard cost model can be very helpful in simulating how certain changes will impact the government budget or citizens’ time, by producing overall costs of individual activities. This way, the project team may experiment with different solutions and determine how they impact the individual processes and the economy as a whole. It is crucial to keep external stakeholders involved when discussing improvements, as they often see processes from a different perspective and may identify additional pain points to be resolved. Figure 5 below illustrates this point.

> > >

**FIGURE 5 - Developing Scenarios for Improvement Using SCM and Process Maps**

- Process Mapping provides the necessary information about the Procedures required for government services
- Analyse the collected data and identify the possibilities for eliminating bottlenecks and improving the application procedures for government services
- Apply the SCM and quantify the administrative burdens for government, firms, and citizens for the Present Situation
- Combine results of AB-qualification with the possible improvements of government services
- Prepare one or more Improvements Scenarios
- Quantify the AB for the Improvement Scenario’s (the Future Situation) and evaluate the Improvements Scenarios
- Decide about the implementation of the improvements
- Are the scenarios feasible?

Source: Authors.
The scenarios can then be formalized in to-be maps. These maps identify potential areas for simplification and process changes that can be prototyped and tested. The to-be maps can be complemented with information on the impact on administrative burden, if available. Figure 6 below shows an example of a reformed service proposal to obtain a driver’s license.

**Stage 2, Step 4: Test and Implement Reforms**

After reform proposals have been developed and approved, the implementation phase can start. As BPR may require massive organizational, cultural, and legal changes, it is important to test different proposals prior to a full-scale implementation. There should always be scope for some experimentation, simulation and adaptation before final decisions are made. This experimentation and simulations can benefit from citizen engagement such as co-creation workshops and user acceptance testing to pilot test the redesigned service and identify new issues, bugs, errors or challenges.

**Potential Challenges in Stage 2**

To create true citizen-centric services, reforms typically must cross traditional organizational boundaries. In many cases there will be a need to rethink services in functional ways, rather than earlier organizational structures. Box 5 captures an experience from Madhya Pradesh, India. This is often extremely difficult, as government organizations tend to be territorial and lack traditions of working together to improve services. Bureaucratic resistance could stifle efforts to improve back-office functions. Moreover, there are also often technological hurdles that must be overcome. Many countries lack common or interconnectable IT systems across agencies, or they may require developing new unique identifiers for case management.
As part of the World Bank supported ‘Citizen Access to Responsive Services’ Project, the “samadhan ek din” or the ‘one day governance’ initiative by Government of Madhya Pradesh has been a game changer in providing responsive services to citizens in the state. Breaking departmental silos that characterize administrative systems, this scheme empowers an officer from any one state department (on rotation basis) posted at the one-stop service delivery centers on a given day to play the role of the authorized signatory across services offered by different departments. H/she is empowered to issue certificates across departments, policies and schemes, thereby drastically reducing the time required to deliver the requested service. This initiative has changed the playing field at the district level and below by creating convergence and coordination required between departments to successfully deliver services to citizens. The re-engineering initiative on the top ten services resulted in a cumulative savings of 59 million person-days in 33 months which translates into a citizen surplus of approximately USD 47 million.

Driving this type of reforms is challenging and requires strong political commitment and leadership. Each service that undergoes reengineering may reveal political and administrative obstacles that may hinder the reform. In many cases, there are also legal challenges that must be addressed. These may include regulations around data sharing, data protection, devolution or decentralization of service delivery, or simply providing a legal basis for services to be delivered online. Although there are examples of multi-agency reforms that have taken place through a bottom-up approach – notably the regional BizPal one-stop-shop in Canada – many reforms require high level push, and a clear framework for cooperation, funding, and responsibilities. Many governments decide to create separate organizational entities to be responsible for centralized governance of one-stop-shops or similar operation. Examples include the Agency for the Delivery of Integrated Services (Albania), the State Agency for Public Service and Social Innovations (Azerbaijan), and the e-Governance Agency (Moldova).

The measurement of administrative burdens requires some statistics and analytic capacities that are not always available in developing country contexts. It is not unusual to find that agencies lack complete data on the number of requests for their services, number of beneficiaries, or collected fees, making quantification of administrative costs difficult. However, the aim of process mapping and measurement of burdens is to benchmark for comparison across processes and measure reform results, rather than producing scientifically valid calculations. Hence, estimates can often be made based on fractions of available data and judgements of experts within and outside government, and if more accurate statistics becomes available it can easily be introduced at later stages.

In many countries, stakeholders reported at least an initial limited impact of simplification efforts. Even when total burdens were reduced by 25 percent or more, beneficiaries affected by the reductions have often appeared indifferent to improvements. This can be due to numerous reasons:

- It takes time to implement reforms. Just because improvement measures have been approved by parliament, there may be an implementation gap. Citizens and private sector may not have experienced the reformed processes.
- In some cases, governments have reported impressive monetary savings or revenue generation, but actual individual firms or citizens report that they observe fairly limited improvements. For a very common license or service, a rather small improvement can show high monetary impact even though it translates to barely noticeable changes on the individual procedure level. For example, decreasing the time to deliver by one day may not be noticed by the beneficiary, but over several million transactions the government’s savings in terms of man-hours increase significantly.
- Services with a high monetary cost may not be perceived as the most burdensome by users. Regulated subjects may find some processes unnecessary or overly burdensome, while having more understanding for others, even if quantifiable costs may be different. If reforms fail to
target the processes considered irritating by stakeholders, the actual impact can often be considered lower than what figures show.

- In some cases, depending on the maturity and complexity of the e-services, and level of existing automation BPR can reduce time to deliver to minutes. For some services, only modest improvements may be possible.

**BPR may trigger necessary changes in the legal and regulatory framework, which can be challenging and time consuming to achieve.** To migrate to e-services, it may be necessary to pass new laws and regulations—for example, an e-transaction law—for services to be delivered online. It may also be necessary to enshrine devolution or decentralization of service delivery online or through one-stop shop models. In addition, the changes proposed in a to-be map may also need to be formalized. This can be done for multiple services through omnibus legislation.

**Stage 3: Digitization**

This stage is where the real action takes place, and the implementation of digitization in practice varies significantly across countries. The process of digitization of services is contingent on IT assets, platforms, shared services, procedures, processes, organization, and coordination. In many cases, this part of the process may be outsourced to private sector providers or a team of consultants that include IT specialists to ensure proper integration of technologies and align to the needs and requirements of relevant MDAs/service providers. The digitization process implies automation of processes, and it should follow the to-be maps created in Stage 2. It is important to utilize automation in tandem with BPR in order not to simply digitize a poor service. Automation using algorithms can speed up verification, confirm eligibility, and streamline approvals, optimizing cost savings and improving service quality.

**While a full description of steps for digitizing services is outside the scope of this report, there are a number of aspects to be considered in this stage of modernization.** First, it is important to have in place enablers for digital government. These enablers include strategies, policies, skills, and platforms and services such as e-signature, unique ID, digital payment modules, single sign-on and authentication systems that can be reused across each service. Many countries are missing a common digital infrastructure for services modernization. In the absence of this infrastructure, each ministry and agency usually operates in its silo, with its own data center at differing level of sophistication from agency to agency. Fragmentation of computing resources and siloed services modernization increases investment and operational costs, creates duplication, and necessitates the employment of more numerous and widely distributed IT staff. To address these challenges, governments need to consolidate the number of data centers and consider deployment of a single whole-of-government virtual environment, based on cloud technologies, which would be used as a base for creation of an interoperable enabling environment to facilitate services modernization across sectors. Establishment of cloud-based computing infrastructure to be shared by all ministries and agencies enables them to deliver digital services faster and more efficiently.

The design of digitization includes deciding on the format and type of technology as well as the organizational structure connected to it. In some countries such as Albania and Moldova, new institutions tasked with service delivery can support institutional coordination and data management, in addition to training of civil servants and beneficiaries. These institutions work in tandem with eGovernment agencies or teams that focus on the IT aspects of the change including interoperability, maintenance, and upgrading of systems. In the end, all MDAs have a role to play in change management to ensure that civil servants understand the technology and have the skills to apply it in their day-to-day work.

**Another important conceptual element to consider prior to a comprehensive services digitization effort is implementation of enabling shared platforms.** These shared platforms and services can be used across the government to enable and facilitate development and delivery of a broad range of sector specific services. Implementation of such an approach will help to reap economies of scale and reduce fragmentation through standardizing and re-using of cross-cutting digital solutions. Shared platforms help remove duplication of resources, and redundancy of cost and effort, across disparate parts of the sector. Examples of shared platforms include government cloud, interoperability platforms, public services portals, and open data portals. Such shared platforms and solutions can also cover functionalities that are repetitive from service to service such as identification, authentication, logging and tracking, notification, payment, and signature.

---

40. There is a growing role for private sector in public service modernization. The organization of public sector services can vary in regard to ownership, financing and production, meaning that public sector services can, for example, be public with regards to the ownership and financing but private concerning the production of e-services.
Having in place key enablers that can be reused, such as shared infrastructure and platforms for identification, authentication, payment, and notification, can speed up digitization. In addition to data governance policies to enable data exchange, employing these reusable modules can result in a greater number of transactional services at lower cost. Creating and utilizing the same modules such as unified applications, authentication, e-identification, e-signature, and payments that can be applied for all services can reduce costs for implementation, maintenance, and upgrading while providing a consistent look and feel for the user.

In many instances, governments are focused mainly on the modernization of the front-offices for service delivery, such as the development of a service portal. This type of portal is a quick way to enable Level 1 informational services—see Box 6. However, it can take more time to digitize mature transactional e-services as many back-office processes may be paper-based. In many cases, most of back-end processes are only partially digitized, some of the back-office systems might be considered obsolete and lacking interoperability. This leads to inefficiencies and lengthy internal processing.

> > >

**BOX 6 - E-Services Are Not Created Equal**

While there are a number of e-service maturity models available the most widely recognized is the United Nations’ (UN) four-stage model of e-government evolution. The UN model, shown below in Figure B6.1 presents four stages of e-service maturity from Level 1: emerging information services to Level 4: connected information services. As countries modernize services, they can increase sophistication and maturity of existing e-services. As part of World Bank projects on service modernization, the number of available Stage 3 e-services is a common project outcome indicator. For example, the number of new e-services is a results indicator of projects in Albania, Jordan, Moldova, Serbia, and Sint Maarten.

Transactional services are the most common “advanced” services in developing countries, where users can be authenticated and pay for services online. Some examples include e-filing for taxes, school registration, business and vehicle registration, and other administrative services.

> > >

**FIGURE B6.1 - UN Stages of E-Service Maturity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Basic informational services</td>
<td>- More sophisticated informational services, searchable websites, larger archives, and downloadable forms</td>
<td>- Two-way interaction between government and visitors, fully transactional services including payment, etc.</td>
<td>- Integrated G2G, G2C, and C2G interactions, citizen participation and engagement embedded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from UN E-Government Survey, 2008

The 2021 GovTech Maturity Index (GTMI) shows that 77 percent (152 economies) across the globe have an online public service portal for citizens and businesses. Of these, 105 have mostly transactional (Stage 3) services including single sign on and other advanced features, while the portals for 47 economies have mostly information or downloadable forms. Many of the 46 economies that are yet to launch an online service portal are low income and fragile states. The GTMI shows that while integrated national portals are becoming commonplace, more can be done to improve service delivery by enabling two-way information flow between government and citizens/businesses, and expanding transactional services for citizens and businesses.

43. Dener et al 2021, p. 81.
Services digitization needs to be supported by back-office digitization and integration when necessary. Back-office integration might consist of upgrading, integration, and conversion of existing databases and systems; migration to the cloud based whole-of-government infrastructure, if such exists or when it becomes available; and digitization of paper-based archives. To start back-office digitization and integration, countries can undertake a government-wide comprehensive study to assess back-office readiness. The outcomes of such a study can then be used for selection and prioritization of systems to upgrade or replace. Additionally, the results of the study can inform selection of quick wins if case back-offices systems are sufficiently mature for deployment of digital services.

Interoperability frameworks and platforms create a favorable environment for public services optimization by reusing information resources and services and facilitating online data exchange between the government authorities in a unified technical and contractual way. When there is robust interoperability in place, government saves costs and time for processing due to faster interconnection and avoidance of the direct bilateral relation between data consumer and each data provider. Interoperability allows for using of the existing system’s connectivity capabilities with no need to redesign them. With a modern technological solution for interoperability, the interconnection of systems can facilitate data exchange with increased confidentiality and security of data. Exchange of data between various systems and registers is based on specific data exchange scenarios that are easy to reuse and update.

To enable trustworthy data exchange, a data exchange or interoperability framework is needed. Typically, a government agency collects, maintains, and manages different kinds of information about citizens and businesses. When government agencies can exchange information with other agencies and access other institution’s data electronically, they can provide more integrated as well as personalized public services. However, it is important that the rules of access, use, reuse, storage, and destruction are clear and respected.

Governments should therefore pair interoperability with additional legislation and regulations on personal data protection to build public trust in e-service applications. The development of a data-driven administration for an integrated service design and delivery requires that citizens’ rights of data protection and ownership can be guaranteed. Security, acknowledgement, and consent about how their data is being managed by the administration is a fundamental condition for a citizen-driven transformation of the public sector.

When using shared platforms and services, the citizen can navigate seamlessly across services. More than informative services, transactional fully integrated services are able to anticipate and respond in simple ways to citizens’ needs based on information available in different sectors of the administration. Box 7 presents an example from Korea.

>>>
BOX 7 - Anticipating Needs through Data Driven Services in Korea

Traditionally, citizens approach the government for public services, but new approaches in integrated service delivery are shifting the model from responsive to proactive service delivery. The development of digital technologies such as the Big Data Analysis and Artificial Intelligence enables governments to anticipate citizens’ needs and provide more personalized public services without requests from citizens. Governments can notify citizens what services they can receive before citizens make a request, improving the responsiveness of public services.

Multiple types of predictive and proactive public services are available, based on the data integration and application. Governments can notify citizens of upcoming payments, renewal of licenses, and other certifications. For example, governments can use their administrative data to inform citizens of the expiration of their passports or driver’s license, or to notify them of benefits they may be eligible for, such as old age pension or maternity benefits.

In 2021, the Republic of Korea launched the Public Secretary service that uses the concept of a personalized secretary for every citizen. The Public Secretary provides customized public service information in advance via the private apps that citizens use frequently. Citizens can receive information they need for their everyday life, such as a COVID-19
vaccination, driver license renewal, health check-up, and public assistance under COVID-19, without any request when they agree with the data sharing. Furthermore, citizens can ask questions about public services to their Public Secretary and get answers based on a chatbot function at anytime and anywhere.

Potential Challenges in Stage 3
The key challenges in this stage include technological, data related, and legal issues. Main technological challenges may include integration of legacy systems into new architectures, and the possibility of finding incompatible systems may need upgrading or replacement. The alignment of data sources—for example, ensuring data is named and in the same format across different data registries—can be a big challenge. Data may be in the wrong format, or have different descriptions and use. Legal issues may arise on data privacy and protection, data sharing, use, and disclosure.

Breaking down the institutional silos can be difficult when digitizing multisectoral services. Many services may require multi-MDA coordination to deliver. Services may include applying for social payments, which may touch on civil registry, social insurance, and employment; or old age pension, which touches civil registry, employment and social insurance, health insurance, and disability. The changes outlined in the to-be maps require government departments and back offices to exchange information and make certain data accessible to other MDAs. Having a clear data exchange and interoperability framework, along with data governance policies, can enable MDAs to share necessary information within a trusted environment.

Stage 4: Delivery

Stage 4 focuses on delivery mechanisms, the user experience, and continuous improvement and adaptation. As noted in Box 3, Stage 4 is not a true endpoint as e-services can be continuously improved. These improvements may include back-end process changes or data connections, eliminating the need for data entry and validation. They may also include front end service improvements such as for accessibility, adoption of delivery standards, and application of new shared services for beneficiaries such as mobile payment modules, e-archives, e-document vaults, and others.

Other changes may be implemented based on changes in citizen demand over time. Similar to Stage 3, the steps vary by country or locality, but recommendations can be made to improve service inclusivity, efficiency, and quality by applying citizen-centric principles.

Principles of Citizen-Centric Service Delivery and Performance Metrics
A number of key principles can be applied to develop more citizen-centric services. These principles include aspects such as universal accessibility, transparency, accountability, openness, responsiveness, quality, integrity, efficiency, and speed of delivery. Global bodies examine a number of these principles to measure e-services. The European Union e-Government Benchmark (2017) user-centric government indicator focuses on the availability, usability, ease, and speed of e-services. The OECD’s Government at a Glance (2015) focuses on access, responsiveness, reliability, and quality. 44 Citizen centricity is reflected in the responsiveness pillar which also captures timeliness and matching of services to special needs. 45 Other characteristics noted by Price Waterhouse Coopers’ Public Sector Research Centre that could be targeted for improvements include speed of service delivery, engagement, responsiveness, value for money, integration, choice, and personalized experience. 46 The World Bank’s (2018) citizen survey and public administrator checklist tool focuses on four key areas: access; user-centeredness and responsiveness; quality and reliability of service delivery, and public sector integrity. This guide focuses on incorporating citizen centricity for three aspects of service delivery: inclusivity, efficiency, and quality—transparency and accountability.

Inclusivity captures principles of equal access, equity, and fairness. E-services need to be available to all citizens, including those with different needs and abilities. In many countries, such as Cambodia, Chad, France, India, Nepal, the United Kingdom, United States, and Vietnam, universal access to services is enshrined in their constitutions or other legal acts (see Box 8). Access also comprises aspects such as cost and affordability. Access can be measured in a myriad

44. An earlier version of the OECD Government at a Glance report from 2013 targeted openness and inclusiveness, responsiveness, reliability, integrity and fairness (OECD 2013: 29).
45. OECD 2015, p. 169.
46. PWC 2007, p. 9.
of ways, but many countries track indicators on use as a proxy. These indicators may include the number of unique users on the e-service platform, number of transactions, or number of beneficiaries.

---

**Box 8 - The Madhya Pradesh Public Service Guarantee Act, 2010**

Following a trend in India to legislate citizens’ rights on information, food, education, and housing, among others, in 2010, the Madhya Pradesh government passed a Public Services Guarantee Act (PSGA). The PSGA, which was the first of its kind in the world, guaranteed that citizens would receive specified public services within certain time frames. It initially covered 26 services and allowed further services to be added over time. The PSGA set a maximum number of days within which a government official had to either provide a service or reject an application for that service, and provide a written reason for doing so. If the deadline was not met, or the application wrongly rejected, the PSGA gave citizens the right to appeal. Through the appeals process, the official responsible could be fined for not providing the service in a timely manner or for wrongly rejecting an application.

As of 2021, 560 services come under the ambit of the Public Services Guarantee Act of which 440 services are being provided online. By 2020, over 10 million citizens had accessed services, of which over 40 percent are citizens from historically underprivileged backgrounds who have routinely faced challenges in accessing state services. Ninety-five percent of applications have been disposed of within the legal time frames consistently since 2018.


---

**Efficiency captures aspects such as speed of processing and delivery, administrative burden, and timeliness.** As discussed in Stage 2, efficiency is largely dependent on the supply side/back office functions of the relevant MDA. Efficiency can be measured as time to deliver, from the time of application, and can be monitored via tracking the process from submission to approvals to delivery. This is a more objective measure than including the time to obtain necessary documents, travel, queuing, etc., which can vary widely by beneficiary. Indicators may include reduction of time to deliver, as measured from the as-is maps and compared to the implemented e-service.

**Quality captures aspects of usability, design, and performance.** Quality and user adoption are often tied together. While the main benefits of e-services for end-users have been greater and easier access to information, improved transparency and quality of service delivery or agency interactions, and increased options for end-user participation, they do not all correspond to an increase in uptake of services.

Although these aspects are applicable to administrative services, additional or different attributes are important and necessary for e-service satisfaction and uptake. These include usability of services, technical/computer resource requirements, availability of technical support, and security of services such as data protection and data security.

**Increasing uptake of e-services is more complex.** Uptake is impacted by many factors, including digital divides, awareness, integration and personalization of services, and user preferences. Security provision and trust in technology are drivers of satisfaction and key factors of interest for end-users. A high level of trust assures end users of safety of their information and security of the online environment.

**To measure e-service quality, a number of indicators can be used.** From administrative data, countries can measure the percentage of successful transactions or percentage of break offs—when a user abandons a service application. To be more citizen-centric, governments may track citizen...
satisfaction with services by an end of service survey that could be implemented via SMS, email, web, or follow-up call. Requesting their level of satisfaction can be complemented by open-ended questions on issues or suggestions for improvement that can be used by service providers to refine and update services.

**Increase Access through Multiple Delivery Channels**

Increasing service access is a primary goal of service digitization as well as a key performance indicator of citizen-centric service delivery. Citizens may face a number of barriers in accessing administrative services such as distance, travel, cost, access to intermediaries, inadequate access channels, information gaps, waiting times, and physical barriers for those people with disabilities, in addition to digital divide aspects such as connectivity, devices, and digital literacy. Increasing access to e-services can be accomplished through using multi-or omnichannel approaches leveraging a myriad of modalities, including websites or unified service portals, kiosks, assisted access terminals, interactive voice response or call centers, mobile applications, physical service centers, television, and telephone.

Many governments have evolved their service models from a unichannel experience, where citizens had to go physically to a public office to request a service, to a multichannel service delivery model. A multichannel model is one where citizens can opt for different channels (e.g. portal, app, phone, service center) to manage their service (see Figure 7). As of 2020, 61 percent of the countries surveyed had adopted a multichannel approach in the design of digital services (OECD Digital Government Index, 2020). A few examples are provided below.

---

**FIGURE 7 - From Unichannel to Omnichannel Service Design and Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unichannel</th>
<th>Multichannel</th>
<th>Omnichannel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Services</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Mediated</td>
<td>Mediated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>SMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors.
• **Portugal** developed an extensive multichannel service delivery network including physical Citizen Shops (*Lojas do Cidadão*) and Citizens Spots (*Espacos do Cidadão*) to provide face-to-face or mediated service delivery throughout the country. This network of physical access points is complemented by a national services portal, an app, and a telephone contact center, providing Portuguese citizens with much flexibility in obtaining services.

• **Chile** launched its *ChileAtiende* initiative in 2012, combining the delivery of services through a physical network of one-stop-shops, a national services portal, a call center, and vehicles that reach remote and rural areas to provide public services.

• **Azerbaijan** established the Azerbaijan Service and Assessment Network (ASAN) of service centers in 2012 to reduce costs and time of citizens to access services, reduce corruption, and promote use of e-services. The centers operate on the principles of efficiency, transparency, courtesy, responsibility, and convenience and are supplemented by a public services portal, call center, and mobile units to reach rural populations. As of 2021, over 7.5 million applications had been submitted, with a 99 percent satisfaction rate from 2018-2021.

• **Brazil** launched its government service platform, *gov.br*, in 2019 and has digitized over 1300 services since inception. The migration to digital services is estimated to have generated US$440 million in savings in 2019-2020.

• **The Republic of Korea** increased access to public services through diversifying service delivery channels using a Private-Public-Partnership model. In 2019, the Ministry of the Interior and Safety launched the local tax mobile notification and payment service by establishing a partnership with three companies, KakaoTalk, Naver, and Payco. Citizens can receive the national and local tax notification and pay tax via private mobile payment platforms on their smartphones. They can also choose to use government portals and private platforms.

• **India** increased access to services in the state of Madhya Pradesh through a multichannel model. Apart from “Lok Sewa Kendras” – one stop shops, the government leveraged existing kiosks run by private operators that focused on Government to Business and Business to Citizen services to deliver administrative services covered under the 2010 Public Service Guarantee Act. These physical locations were complemented by a mobile application, a dedicated website, and a state level helpline for service delivery support. Between 2015 and 2021, the channels reached over 30 million unique beneficiaries and completed over 41 million transactions. This is noteworthy, as the population of Madhya Pradesh is about 15 million households, therefore the number of unique beneficiaries translates to two people per household or every adult member in a household.

These examples show the impact of channel choice and providing citizens different service delivery alternatives. However, full integration of data and application of digital by design principles can enable omnichannel service delivery. An omnichannel service design and delivery approach allows citizens to take the full benefit of digital-by-design practices, where processes and services are embedded from start with all the benefits of efficiency and interchangeability brought by digital technologies and data. The citizen can navigate seamlessly across different channels benefiting from advanced data exchange that generates full responsiveness, customization and proactiveness in the delivery of services by the public sector. This channel neutral approach requires the administration to make the hard work of integrating and interconnecting registers, simplifying procedures and providing citizens with efficient and pleasant user experience. The omnichannel approach is most flexible and citizen-centric as it permits a user to start a service in one channel such as via telephone, proceed on it in another channel, such as a web portal, and eventually finalize it in a third one, such as an app.

Accessibility is defined as use by the widest range of users possible, regardless of their functional capacities. According to the World Health Organization, 15 per cent of the World population (one billion persons) have a disability, facing additional barriers when trying to socially participate and access to public services (WTO, 2011). Data from ITU indicates that 4 out of 5 persons with disabilities reside in the developing world. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities includes access to ICTs as a fundamental component of accessibility rights, together with physical environments and transportation. While access to services through websites, portals, and mobile applications are on the rise, accessibility of these technologies remains limited.

While inclusivity is a key principle of service delivery, accessibility should be a systematic feature of digital public services to provide opportunities to citizens with special needs. Persons with limited mobility can access services today remotely. Blind citizens or citizens with reduced vision can today benefit from text-to-speech software or magnification tools, as well as braille keyboards that can help them navigate public service portals. However, more needs to be done to ensure government websites meet accessibility requirements. According to a recent 2020 survey, 51 percent of countries do not have any policy in place for implementing ICT accessibility and, where they are in place, only 46 percent of those policies are being implemented. As of 2020, only 71 countries had service portals that meet the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines are accessible for persons with disabilities (UN, 2020).

To improve awareness on incorporating accessibility in GovTech, the World Bank (2021) published the Guidebook for Accessible GovTech. This guidebook promotes user centric design as a core government capability. Ensuring participation of those with disabilities in stakeholder groups and co-creation workshops and developing personas that reflect those with disabilities are ways to incorporate voice and develop services for those with a wider range of needs. A key recommendation is to collect, analyze, and understand customer data along the customer journey, but also formulate and validate assumptions on the way the service will be used by users with disabilities. This includes interviewing users with disabilities, observing users with various disabilities performing actions with their personal assistive technology devices, and including these users in usability and user acceptance testing protocols.

Another recommendation is to adopt a consistent user look and feel to make them clear and easy to learn for those with cognitive or learning disabilities. Accessible by default web-design options are also able to generate more efficient websites, implying less processing power and easier navigation by all segments of the population.

Adapted from World Bank 2021, Universally Accessible GovTech Handbook.
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**BOX 9 - Improving Accessibility of E-Services**

Accessibility is defined as use by the widest range of users possible, regardless of their functional capacities. According to the World Health Organization, 15 per cent of the World population (one billion persons) have a disability, facing additional barriers when trying to socially participate and access to public services (WTO, 2011). Data from ITU indicates that 4 out of 5 persons with disabilities reside in the developing world. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities includes access to ICTs as a fundamental component of accessibility rights, together with physical environments and transportation. While access to services through websites, portals, and mobile applications are on the rise, accessibility of these technologies remains limited.

While inclusivity is a key principle of service delivery, accessibility should be a systematic feature of digital public services to provide opportunities to citizens with special needs. Persons with limited mobility can access services today remotely. Blind citizens or citizens with reduced vision can today benefit from text-to-speech software or magnification tools, as well as braille keyboards that can help them navigate public service portals. However, more needs to be done to ensure government websites meet accessibility requirements. According to a recent 2020 survey, 51 percent of countries do not have any policy in place for implementing ICT accessibility and, where they are in place, only 46 percent of those policies are being implemented. As of 2020, only 71 countries had service portals that meet the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines are accessible for persons with disabilities (UN, 2020).

To improve awareness on incorporating accessibility in GovTech, the World Bank (2021) published the Guidebook for Accessible GovTech. This guidebook promotes user centric design as a core government capability. Ensuring participation of those with disabilities in stakeholder groups and co-creation workshops and developing personas that reflect those with disabilities are ways to incorporate voice and develop services for those with a wider range of needs. A key recommendation is to collect, analyze, and understand customer data along the customer journey, but also formulate and validate assumptions on the way the service will be used by users with disabilities. This includes interviewing users with disabilities, observing users with various disabilities performing actions with their personal assistive technology devices, and including these users in usability and user acceptance testing protocols.

Another recommendation is to adopt a consistent user look and feel to make them clear and easy to learn for those with cognitive or learning disabilities. Accessible by default web-design options are also able to generate more efficient websites, implying less processing power and easier navigation by all segments of the population.

Adapted from World Bank 2021, Universally Accessible GovTech Handbook.

---

56 Davids, Natheer, Salah Kabanda, and Millicent Agangiba. (2017). Accessibility of African E-Government Services for Persons with Disabilities. For example, an accessibility evaluation of 19 E-Government portals and websites in Ghana that they were all inaccessible to persons with disabilities (PWDs). Their findings showed that PWDs will encounter difficulties perceiving the content and operating the interface of most E-Government portals and websites. Similar results are reported in several African countries. The G3ict 2020 DARE Index report (submitted for publication) is designed to provide an overall assessment of the progress made by States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in implementing its provisions on the accessibility of information and communication technologies – also referred to as digital accessibility.
Apply Quality and Delivery Standards
Development of service standards and enforcement mechanisms can assist in fostering accountability for timely delivery. These include service standards that provide users with information about duration of the processing time (such as three days for delivery), information for redress, and appeals procedures. The standards communicate the expected process to the user and set expectations on the beneficiary side. Adhering to these standards is an aspect of quality and accountability. If services are not delivered within the time frame, the process for lodging complaints and redress should be well communicated. From the government side, tracking the percentage of services that are delivered within the stated time frame is useful to identify errors or issues in processing and procedures. If services are consistently delivered in a shorter (or longer) time frame, these standards can be updated.

Monitor and Evaluate for Continuous Improvement
Monitoring the reform efforts is critical to determine impact from both supply and demand sides. The selection of indicators should be focused on those that reflect reform objectives and that do not overwhelm the capacity of the client. Many indicators as noted above can be translated to counts. However, it is important to include indicators that are themselves citizen-centric – that is, that they highlight the citizen’s point of view. The World Bank published a comprehensive guide on indicators for citizen-centric service delivery in 2018 that can be referenced.

Employing citizen engagement mechanisms can provide real-time data on the user experience and inform refinements in service design and delivery. These mechanisms may include multi-functional citizen engagement platforms such as those seen in Brazil, crowdsource initiatives, SMS, email, Point of Service and call center surveys, chatbots, and social media. The existence of these mechanisms is not enough, however. The feedback should be paired with response systems for follow up action. Ensuring the feedback loop is closed increases accountability, transparency, and citizen centricity.

Potential Challenges in Stage 4
Delivering e-services that are considered high quality and convenient requires governments to have an inclusive mindset during the reform and digitization processes, to ensure e-services do not inadvertently increase access gaps and digital divides. Many countries still face barriers in infrastructure deployment such as broadband availability, and access to devices such as computers and mobile phones. Further, citizens may lack the necessary digital skills to navigate e-services. Governments must therefore pay attention to these characteristics and engage with at-risk and vulnerable stakeholders as their needs are likely to differ from other groups. In these contexts, multichannel and omnichannel models are beneficial to increase reach of services and provide necessary assistance to those who may need help to use these e-services.

Communicating broadly to government officials, citizens, and businesses through outreach programs is a key factor to increase uptake of e-services and develop and maintain reform momentum. In this context, effective communication is critical to the success of services modernization and will improve citizens’ trust and perception of government responsiveness. Citizens need to know about the availability of services in order to access them. This information needs to be provided across multiple channels (television, radio, news, social media, etc.) in a manner understood by citizens. The United Kingdom developed the Government Digital Service (GDS) Style Guide to provide clear and detailed indications on numerous communication methods. Different articles and instructions are also available underlining how people read differently on the web, how to meet user needs, and how to write easy-to-read content (GDS, 2021). Norway launched the Plain Language (Klarsprak) project in 2009 with the purpose of promoting user friendly public sector communication. Such initiatives can support usability, enhance accessibility, and increase public awareness, which in turn, may increase the potential for reform success.

Developing demand side skills and digital literacy of beneficiaries may be necessary to increase uptake of e-services. In some countries, cultural norms and preferences, levels of digital skills, and comfort with technology may lead to suboptimal uptake of e-services on offer. Alongside the service reforms, it is important for countries to invest in training, communication, and outreach to support use, acceptance, and uptake. These may include assisted access terminals with agents who can walk citizens through the e-service process, providing training programs or online video guides, informational step by step brochures, and other tools.

Conclusions

A cohesive citizen-centric service delivery approach can shorten the distance between the public sector and its users. By reducing the burdens of interaction through re-engineering, progressive data exchange, simplicity, and user-centered design, the administration can respond to citizens expectations and needs in a more efficient and effective way. This approach over time can foster better knowledge of citizens needs and preferences. This knowledge can inform better policies, programs and services for all citizens, but particularly more vulnerable groups. All can benefit from an administration that better knows its citizens, adapting and anticipating its delivery models to meet the specific needs of special segments of its population, in a secure and trusted manner.

This guide provides information for practitioners and policymakers involved in service modernization and digitization on how to better incorporate citizen centricity. Using a four stage model of modernization, the report provides entry points and recommendations on how to incorporate user feedback for service validation, design, re-engineering, digitization and delivery. Research and practice shows that applying citizen-centric approaches to e-services can increase citizen satisfaction, improve user experience, and foster adaptation as countries modernize their services.
Applying citizen centricity in the service reform process is reliant on willingness of MDAs, policymakers, and citizens themselves to engage in the process. Adopting these approaches requires sensitization, change management, and active participation of stakeholders on both supply and demand sides. While it may add time to the reform process, in the end, the result of having high quality error free e-services may save the government valuable time and resources. Recent experiences show that participation in design thinking workshops can be useful to change mindsets and build empathy towards service beneficiaries.

Applying BPR and digitizing services can take time. They are not short term initiatives and require coordination across MDAs, front line service providers, and users. Legal and regulatory changes may be required to ensure legality of services, particularly that they can be delivered online. Coordinating multi-sectoral services that touch several MDAs can be complex, but can simplify services for the end user through robust interoperability and data exchange platforms.

Migrating to digital services is supported by robust institutional coordination mechanisms. Service reform programs are complex, touching on many different sectors, institutions, and stakeholders. Ensuring good institutional coordination at a high level of government is a key factor for success. Strong political leadership can unblock barriers and incentivize and enforce the collaboration necessary for multi-sector service digitization.

Each country will need to develop its own approach to citizen-centric service reforms. While this guidebook outlines key steps and considerations, each journey will differ. There are common activities countries can undertake, but the actual implementation and digitization processes will be country-specific, based on its own needs and objectives. Bringing citizens into the reform can result in greater impacts for government and citizens alike.
***
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Annex 1.
Sample Service Inventory Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Title of the service</td>
<td>How it is called in the respective legal act and how is it known by the beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Function/Objective</td>
<td>The event that drives the applicant to seek the service (i.e. childbirth, aim to build an object, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Service owner</td>
<td>Full name of the higher-level institution (i.e. ministry) to which the law recognizes the relevant service function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Institution which provides the service directly to the public or issues a license (i.e. an agency or a delegated-body), type of agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Applicant of the service: a) citizen; b) businesses; c) mix (other). Identify specific target beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Purpose of the service</td>
<td>Why is this service of any value for the citizen/business? Why is it necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Legal basis</td>
<td>List all the legal grounds which directly and clearly enables the provision of this service (laws, bylaws, orders of the Minister, departmental guidelines, regulations, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Connected services</td>
<td>To receive a public service-the main service-the customer often is required or able to receive other connected public services or should have already received another authorization, certification or approval (the Life event concept).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Similar Services</td>
<td>It is one service or a group of services with only minor differences from the main service. The process of delivery is the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What are the eligibility criteria for this service</td>
<td>The criteria which determine who is eligible for the service such as age, gender, passage of tests, (e.g. &quot;should have been in business for 5 years&quot;, &quot;Must have passed the driving license test and have health insurance&quot;, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Documents needed to obtain the service</td>
<td>List the title of each of the documents that a person must submit to obtain the service, coupled with the respective issuing authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>The necessary number of visits for the beneficiary to obtain the services (including obtaining information).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Number of applications per year or how often the applicant needs to reapply for the service</td>
<td>How many applications are filed in one year (including successful or not) for the last two years  Alternatively, how often the applicant needs to reapply for the service (e.g. renew a driving license, an electronic signature etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Fee for the service</td>
<td>The fee or tax to be paid to obtain the service (if not fixed, include the range: minimum-maximum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Other elements</td>
<td>Other elements can include standard service delivery time, redress mechanism, renewal interval, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>