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QUALITY MANAGEMENT

An introduction:

The Response: Good Governance

Under the circumstances, effective governance within the available frame of power and resources appears to be the only solution to minimizing the managerial stress and maintaining an adequate level of urban services and facilities appears to be.

The response to these challenges lies in good governance. "Wherever change is for the better, wherever the human condition is improving, people point to good governance as the key. This better governance is not just national - it is local, regional and it is global. Few things are more sensitive - and more challenging - than improving governance." (James Gustave Speth, UNDP). Good governance makes accountability, transparency, participation and rule of law mandatory administrative functions. They are vital pre-requisites for sustainable urban development.

Governance - A Human Rights issue

Governance is a human rights issue. All human beings are born equal in dignity and rights. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. According to Art- 21, everyone has a right to take part in the government of his/her country, directly or through elected representatives. The will of the people shall be the basis of authority of government. Everyone has the right to social security and to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family. Enjoying all these rights is possible only if societies nurture and ensure that their governments are responsive to their needs and aspirations, effective in helping everyone meet such needs, participatory in decision-making, transparent in whatever they say and do and, accountable for and equitable in all their actions. For all this, governments must have a long-term vision and strategy.

The foundation of G-Governance is Dharma (righteousness) as made out in our ancient scriptures. The King, his ministers and state employees who have taken the oath of their offices to uphold Dharma and to act in accordance with the common good, must not act unjustly or unethically so as to secure their private good through selfishness. If they don’t behave appropriately, they all will surely go to hell along with destroying the moral basis of governances. Vidura advises Dhrtrarastra to engage in the welfare of the people.

Good governance conceptualized in the past as ideal state of ‘Ram Rajya’ has been ideal of political thought over the ages; but the end of G-Governance has changed from the strength of the State or king and his cohorts and men on the horse-back to protect its citizens and provide security to them and thereby justify ruler ship to limited, controller and constitutional State serving by being subservient to the public or publics or the masses in general.
Governance is the manner in which authority, control and power of government is exercised in mobilizing a society’s economic and social resources to address the issues of public interest. It is the art of governing, associated with the exercise of authority within specific jurisdiction, and is embedded in the structure of authority. Good governance is epitomized by, among other things, predictable, open and enlightened policy making. It can be secured by sound, responsive and competent administration, respect to basic human rights and values, strengthened democratic, institutional as well as structural framework to ensure accountability and transparency.

The tests of good governance lie in the goals and objectives of a government, in its policies and programs in the manner of their execution, in the results achieved and above all, in the general perception of the people about the quality of functioning of its various agencies, their attitudes and behavior towards the public, their sincerity, honesty, and commitments towards attitudes public duties. It is also important to see that there is no undue concentration of power.

Governance implies a degree of control to be exercised by key stakeholders. Governance is about governing. It is not merely about ownership. Even an owner has to learn to govern. Good governance implies that the institution is run for the optimal benefit of the stakeholders in it.

Since the early Nineties, the United Nations have pointed out that member countries need to pay greater attention to the way their government systems and procedures have been operating in order to ensure that theirs was good governance. They introduced the term 'governance' to the development vocabulary and made a conscious effort to popularize the concept of good governance. Today, the concept has gained currency in many development arenas and agencies and nations have begun to work on improving their governance.

What is G-Governance?

Government is described as the repository of confidence and power of the people delegated by them for a fixed period of time for the express purpose of identifying, mobilizing, organizing, guiding and directing all available resources, human and other, to facilitate planned and participatory transformation of their society towards enhanced well-being of its people, via just enjoyment of all its needs, rights, aspirations and sustainable peace. Governments are necessarily political regimes pursuing a course of development action that they consider as most suited within the construct and form of their society and its constitution. Government comprises the constitution & laws, institutions & structures, management mechanisms & administrative processes. These are devolutionary instruments that make a government participatory and responsive.

Governance, on the other hand, is the sum of cumulative practice of behaviour and attitude of the government as seen in the manner they create and use the said devolutionary instruments. Form, style, systems, methods, and procedures of government generally reflect the pattern of governance in a nation or city. The quality and effectiveness of governance depend mostly on how judiciously the government uses the said instruments to help people achieve the ultimate goal of their progress - justice, equity and peace.
The term 'Governance' is derived from the Greek word 'kybernan' and 'kybernetes'. It means 'to steer and to pilot or be at the helm of things'. While the term 'government' indicates a political unit for the function of policy making as distinguished from the administration of policies, the word 'governance' denotes an overall responsibility for both - the political and administrative functions. It also implies ensuring moral behaviour and ethical conduct in the task of governing, i.e., the continuous exercise of authority on both the political and administrative units of governments.

Some noteworthy definitions of 'governance' come from the World Bank, UNDP, OECD and The Commission of Global Governance. They are:

'The World Bank has identified three distinct aspects of governance:

(i) the form of political regime; (ii) the process by which the authority is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development; and (iii) the capacity of governments to design, formulate and implement policies and discharge functions.' (World Bank, 1994)

'Governance is viewed as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes, and Institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and mediate their differences.' (UNDP, 1997)

'The concept of governance denotes the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development. This broad definition encompasses the role of public authorities in establishing the environment in which economic operators function and in determining the distribution of benefits as the nature of relationship between the ruler and the ruled'. (OECD, 1995)

'Governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest'. (Commission on Global Governance, 1995)

Good governance is both a goal and a process. It only can help us find solutions to poverty, inequality and insecurity. It creates an environment in which civil organizations, business community, private citizens and other institutions can assume ownership of the city development process and the management of their communities.

Measuring Good Governance

According to Trickle-down theory the economic growth will automatically lead to equitable human development. It is true that it will lead to development of some and not the whole society.
When good governance is absent, a greedy few will, by might and craft, can appropriate to themselves the best of the fruits and profits of economic growth leading the way to greater economic and social disparities. Responsive and accountable governance systems and processes upholding equity and rule of law will prevent such polarization of resources, both material and human.

**Three Interdependent Actors of Governance**

There are three key elements or players involved in good governance. They are the State, the Civil Society and the Private Sector. All three are critical for sustaining human development. Because each has weaknesses and strengths, a major objective of good governance is to promote highest possible constructive interaction among the three in order to minimize individual weakness and utilize the strengths optimally. The intricate intercourse between and among these three domains will indicate the direction of the society's economic and social flight path. The more integral, balanced and inter-dependant the three are the better for that society.

The State provides the foundation of Justice, Equity and Peace, creating conducive political and legal environs for human progress. The Civil Society provides the foundation of Liberty, Equality, and Responsibility & Self-expression. The Private Corporate Sector provides the foundations of economic growth and development. The three regimes carry out these responsibilities by performing multifarious tasks.

To register early and sustainable progress in development, a creative pact through cooperative alliances and partnerships among these three is necessary. The pact must describe (i) what creative responses will it contain to address the burning socio-economic issues, (ii) clearly defined roles for each of the three, collectively and severally, in monitoring the progress through yardsticks and indicators specifically identified for the purpose. These indicators must be scientifically prepared, methodically pre-tested and sensitively introduced.

Any attempt at measuring good governance must have indicators to assess the effectiveness of interplay among these regimes. Some of the results of this interplay may not be too easily discernible and measurable. Yet, the overall impact can be measured through peoples' own involvement in the assessment process.

**Results of Good Governance**

Good governance results in:

- The orderly organization of the city's predominant political thought, vision & action,
- The administration of events & processes leading to the realization of the vision, and
- The maintenance of ethical rhythm and equity in the distribution of the fruits of realizing the vision, to the satisfaction of all.

The result of good governance is development that 'gives priority to poor, advances the cause of women, sustains the environment, and creates needed opportunities for employment and other livelihoods' (Re-conceptualizing Governance, UNDP, 1997. Pp. 1)
UNDP has observed that Governance is good and effective when it subscribes to, promotes and ensures the following nine characteristics:

- Participation
- Consensus Orientation
- Effective & Efficiency
- Strategic Vision
- Responsiveness
- Equity Building
- Rule of Law
- Transparency
- Accountability

In other words, the assessment tools employed must lead us to measure the extent to which the governance of a particular urban local body is: participatory; sustainable, legitimate and acceptable to people, transparent; promotes equity and equality; able to develop the resources and methods of governance; promotes gender balance; tolerates and accepts diverse views and perspectives; able to mobilize and efficiently use resources for social purposes; operates by rule of law; commands public trust and respect; accountable; sensitive to the needs and aspirations of citizens; regulatory rather than controlling; and facilitating instead of providing.

Thus, Good Governance needs:

1. Making, administration responsive.
3. Making, administration transparent.
5. Making, politicians and Public services excellent, i.e. working on the basis of values enshrined in Ancient Sanskrit Literature.
Quality Management Systems

General Concepts

Introduction

All organization, large or small, has an established way or system of doing business. A quality management system is about how an organization manages its business activities which are associated with quality of service. Quality management system helps an organization to build systems which enable it to provide quality service consistently. It may be clarified that characteristics of the service(s) and their standards. Therefore, quality management system standards are not alternate to service standards. In fact, they are complementary to each other. The use of service standards together with quality management system standards help in not only maintaining but also continually improving quality of services, which may result in enhancing customers’ satisfaction and competitiveness.

Quality management systems standards take into consideration eight quality management principles, namely, customer focus, leadership, involvement of people, process approach, system approach to management, continual improvement, factual approach to decision making, and mutually beneficial supplier relationships, which are relevant and applicable to all organizations providing service.

Quality management standards promote the adoption of a process approach when developing, implementing and improving the effectiveness of a quality management system, to enhance customer satisfaction by meeting customer requirements.

For an organization to function effectively, it has to identify and manage numerous linked activities. Set of inter-related or interacting activities which transforms inputs into outputs is termed as process. Often the output from one process is the input to the next process.

The application of a system of processes within an organization, together with the identification and interactions of these processes, and their management, can be referred to as the ‘Process Approach’.

An advantage of the process approach is the ongoing control that it provides over the linkage between the individual process within the system of process, as well as over their combination and interaction. In addition, it highlights the value addition at every stage.

When used within a quality management system, such an approach emphasizes the importance of

- Understanding and meeting requirements,
- The need to consider processes in terms of added value,
- Obtaining results of process performance and effectiveness, and
• Continual improvement of process based on objective measurement.

(Note – Introduction is an extract from IS: 15700, Foreword)

**Eight Quality Management Principles**

1. Leadership

   Leaders establish unity of purpose and direction of the organization. They should create and maintain the internal environment in which people can become fully involved in achieving the organization’s objectives.

2. Involvement of People

   People at all levels are the essence of an organization and their full involvement enables their abilities to be used for the organization’s benefit.

3. Process Approach

   A desired result is achieved more efficiently when activities and related resources are managed as a process.

4. System Approach to Management

   Identifying, understanding and managing interrelated processes as a system contributes to the organization’s effectiveness and efficiency in achieving its objectives.

5. Continual Improvement

   Continual improvement of the organization’s overall performance should be permanent objective of the organization.

6. Factual Approach to Decision Making

   Effective decisions are based on the analysis of data and information.

7. Mutually Beneficial Supplier Relationships

   An organization and its suppliers are interdependent and a mutually beneficial relationship enhances the ability of both to create value.

8. Important Terms & Conditions
1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Sevottam model has been developed with the overarching objective of improving the quality of public service delivery in the country. The model has three components, and in addition to this overarching objective, there are intermediate outcomes expected from compliance of conditions designed for each of these three components.

The first component of the model requires effective charter implementation thereby opening up a channel for receiving citizens’ inputs into the way in which organizations determine service delivery requirements. Citizens’ Charters publicly declare the information on citizens’ entitlements; making citizens better informed and hence empowering them to demand better services.

The second component of the model, ‘Public Grievance Redress’ requires a good grievance redress system operating in a manner that leaves the citizen more satisfied with how the organization responds to complaints/grievances, irrespective of the final decision.

The third component ‘Excellence in Service Delivery’, postulates that an organization can have an excellent performance in service delivery only if it is managing the key ingredients for good service delivery well, and building its own capacity to continuously improve delivery.

The ability of such an assessment model in influencing service delivery quality will be a function of how tightly improvement actions are linked to assessment results. Further, any assessment model needs to be updated periodically to keep it abreast with emerging developments. Change Management as well as Research and Development have therefore, been identified as important focus areas for running this model, in addition to administration of the assessment process and its culmination in certification or awards.

Figure 1: Intended Outcomes of Implementing Sevottam-

![Figure 1: Intended Outcomes of Implementing Sevottam](image-url)
2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SERVICE DELIVERY ASSESSMENT

2.1 Assessment Model Content

The main part of the model consists of criteria that ascertain how well the organization is tuned into the requirements of the three components that form the Sevottam model. However, before the organization undertakes a systematic assessment it needs to have some basics in place. The basic eligibility conditions as well as the next level of criteria are explained in the following subsections.

2.1.1 Assessment Framework

The assessment framework takes into account two kinds of questions: to assess basic compliance, and to assess quality of processes through which compliance is achieved.

2.1.1.1 Compliance Assessment

This part of the assessment acts as a screening mechanism to filter out organizations that do not meet the basic requirements to even enter the assessment process. Currently it consists of 5 criteria that ascertain whether the organization has started applying some tools that can improve service delivery and is therefore likely to benefit from the assessment process. The criteria are articulated in the form of questions that offer binary choices (“Yes/No”). In case the organization does not clear these criteria, it indicates that building appreciation of the tools needs to be started in right earnest and gives pointers on what to do.

Figure 2: Basic Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Published an approved Citizens’ Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Circulated the Charter among service delivery units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appointed a senior officer as Director of Public Grievances / Nodal officer for Citizens’ Charter for the Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Set up a task force for formulation, implementation and review of Citizens’ Charter as per standards &amp; for conducting self-assessment with involvement of representative citizen groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Published grievance lodging and redress procedure, and timelines for redress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1.2 Process Quality Assessment

This part of the assessment acts as a rating mechanism to assess the quality of tool application and its utilization for improved service delivery. It consists of 11 criteria for each of the three modules, viz. Citizens’ Charter, Public Grievance Redress, and Service Delivery Capability thereby comprising 33 criteria in all. These criteria ascertain the extent to which the organization is applying service delivery improvement tools in a systematic manner and is able to learn from
experience. The criteria are articulated in the form of questions that can invite rating on a five-point scale ranging from “ad hoc” to “systematic” action. The rating given in response to each question needs to be backed up by evidence attached with the application. An organization that scores well on these criteria deserves commendation for having understood the utility of service improvement tools and for putting this understanding to good use.

2.1.2 Component Modules
If an organization meets the basic eligibility conditions and goes through the next level of assessment, then at the first level there are three modules corresponding to each of the above components. At the next level, each module comprises three criteria to ascertain effectiveness of each tool in improving service delivery. These criteria are specific to the respective module and are explained in the succeeding sub sections. Each criterion is composed of a few (3 to 5) sub criteria. The following schematic shows the modular structure of this part of the model.

As shown in Figure 3 below, the proposed model consists of three main modules, each corresponding concepts explained below. Performance for each module can be assessed separately on the basis of three criteria. Each criterion is further divided into elements, details of which are available in subsection 2.2.

![Figure 3: Structure of Component Modules](image)

2.1.2.1 Charter Effectiveness

The Charter Mark (CM) is an award given by UK Government to agencies that are implementing Citizens’ Charters and have demonstrated high standards of quality in delivering services as outlined in their respective charters. In the Indian context, an assessment will need to cover the entire range of processes right from charter design and formulation to implementation of charter
commitments and periodic review of commitments based on stakeholder needs. In the Indian context, organizational readiness for receiving a CM will be assessed on the basis of a wider connotation of “Charter Effectiveness” consisting of three elements: how the contents of the charter are decided upon and disseminated, how far the contents reflect actual achievements, and how they are updated in accordance with citizen needs.

2.1.2.2 Public Grievance Redress

The objective of any Public Grievance Redress Mechanism is to resolve public grievances in an effective and speedy manner. In addition, complaints also provide vital feedback that indicates efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. Based on such feedback, agencies can take remedial and preventive actions to reduce complaint-prone areas. In the Indian context, it is important to encourage an organizational approach that is focused on efficient handling of grievances received, as well as on taking suitable actions that eliminate chronic grievance prone areas. The assessment of Public Grievance Redress Mechanism needs to take into account the three aspects of grievance handling: how they are received, how they are resolved, and how they are prevented.

2.1.2.3 Service Delivery Capability

Organizational Performance Excellence the world over is assessed on two kinds of parameters: the results that the organization can show, and the manner in which the results are being achieved. This aspect essentially focuses on actions taken by the organization to enhance its delivery capability by strengthening the inputs that go into better delivery such as quality of strategic planning, human resources, information management, etc. In the Indian context, such assessments need to encourage better resource utilization for improved infrastructure, technology usage and human resource management, which are key ingredients for improved service delivery.

2.1.3 Participating Organizations

Organizations that come under this assessment will be assessed on both aspects: the macro part of creating an environment that enables better service delivery, and the micro part of making best use of the available environment and delivering better services. Therefore the model envisages assessment at two levels: parent and outlet.

2.1.3.1 Parent Level

Primary responsibility for the macro aspect lies with the Ministry or Department that formulates policy and issues guidelines to delivery outlets or agencies to function in accordance with the do’s and don’ts conveyed through those guidelines.

2.1.3.2 Outlet Level

Primary responsibility for the micro aspect lies with service delivery outlets or agencies under the Ministry or Department that are designated for direct interaction with citizens. In the Indian context, the reality of this distinction is very pronounced and the assessment tool gives it due recognition by carrying out the assessment at both levels as shown below.
Figure 4 shows that the assessment is to be carried out at both levels, first where policy for multiple outlets gets articulated, and second, at individual outlets where the policy is interpreted and applied. An organization can choose to define the boundaries of outlets to be covered by the assessment in terms of a geographical zone, or in terms of individual outlets. The assessment will be for the defined boundaries and the parent can replicate the good practices within the boundaries to other outlets.

### 2.2 Model Application

The model can be used in many ways depending on how far requirements go, how well prospective assessees are performing and how far they are ready to take on service delivery improvement initiatives. The extent to which an organization is meeting the criteria as above can be assessed through a set of 33 questions listed below. These questions can be used in various forms depending on the implementation approach, some alternatives for which are described in subsection 2.2.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Module/Criteria/Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Citizens’ Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Charter Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>How do you determine and/or distinguish the citizen groups as also your stakeholders and what services do you offer to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>How do you meet the service expectations of your citizen groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>How do you ensure that services and their standards as described in the charter are in accordance with expectations of citizen groups identified above?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>How do you ensure that preparation and/or review of the charter is participatory and inclusive of all your citizen groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5</td>
<td>How do you ensure that frontline staff and citizen groups are aware of the charter and can understand its contents easily for compliance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Charter Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>How do you measure and track service delivery performance of different outlets against charter contents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>How do you communicate the gaps in service delivery to officer/team responsible for charter monitoring and to the outlets concerned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>How do you fill the observed and/or reported gaps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Charter Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>How do you find out whether your charter is serving its purpose and take measures to enhance its effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>How do you incorporate legislative changes (e.g., introduction of Right to Information Act, etc.) and other relevant provisions/developments in your charter revision process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>How do you ensure that frontline staff and the citizens are aware of the basis for making changes as above?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grievance Redress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Grievance Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>How do you prepare and implement guidelines for spreading awareness on public grievance process and ensure that citizens get the information they need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>How do you prepare and implement guidelines for recording and classifying grievances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>How do you prepare and implement guidelines for multiple channels of grievance redress such as toll-free telephone lines, web site, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Grievance Redress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>How do you determine time norms for acknowledgement, and redress of grievances/complaints received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>How do you ensure that the time norms as above are adhered to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>How do you continuously improve the system and use forums like Jan Sunwai, Lok Adalats and other single window disposal systems to expedite grievance redress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grievance Prevention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>How do you use grievance analysis while preparing annual action plans and strategy of the organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>How do you find out grievance prone areas and communicate them to the officer/team responsible for service delivery improvement and to the Public Grievance Redress Officer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>How do you link grievance analysis to charter review and to other guidelines so that complaint prone areas are improved upon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>How do you measure and track the progress on improvements required to reduce complaint prone areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>How do you ensure that frontline staff and the citizens are aware of improvements made in grievance redress mechanism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service Delivery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Citizen Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>How do you determine citizen satisfaction levels and implement steps required for improving the same?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>How do you measure citizen satisfaction across the organization and for particular service delivery outlets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>How do you link citizen satisfaction results to charter review and to other processes affecting service delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>How do you prepare and implement guidelines that encourage your outlets for creating a citizen focused organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>How do you find out and distinguish among outlets on the basis of service delivery, and implement steps required to improve the same?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employee Motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>How do you encourage and ensure courteous, punctual, and prompt service delivery by your front line staff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>How do you prepare and implement guidelines to encourage the willingness of the frontline staff to accept responsibilities for service delivery as per citizen expectations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td>How do you encourage healthy competition among your outlets for improved service delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>How do you determine and implement minimum standards of service for convenience of citizens such as putting signage, placing waiting benches, drinking water and other needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>How do you determine the resources that are required taking into account service delivery needs, current budgets, current channels of service delivery to ensure resource availability/utilization as per plans/requirements and standards fixed for service delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>How do you prepare and implement guidelines that encourage outlets to continuously improve service delivery?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1 Usage Options

There are four broad ways in which this model can be used: (1) as a self-assessment tool by organizations already motivated to improve service delivery, (2) as a requirement standard, (3) as a benchmark assessment process to be established, (4) as a rating model to recognize and reward organizations that are doing commendable work in service delivery.

2.2.1.1 Standardization and Certification

Currently there is no uniformity among government departments on implementation of Citizens’ Charters, public grievance redress mechanisms, and how they link citizens’ expectations with ongoing improvements by way of process re-engineering, infrastructure enhancement, IT upgradation, employee skill building, etc. An immediate use from this model has been the evolution of the requirement standard IS15700: 2005, to be followed by all government organizations. Government organizations are required to demonstrate conformance to the IS15700 standard in order to achieve Sevottam certification.

2.2.1.2 Voluntary Benchmarking

Upon wider dissemination of the model, government organizations keen to improve their delivery performance can voluntarily use it to compare notes with what others have been able to achieve and thereby identify focus areas of improvement for themselves. This will be a useful application if environmental pressures on government organizations to improve service delivery are very strong. These pressures could come from political will, executive action, or incentive systems that encourage service delivery improvements. An assessee organization can opt to conduct only a self-assessment, or may go in for an external assessment. In the latter case, it will have to bear the costs of external assessment, in return for which it will have access to an outsider view and a professional analysis of its performance on service delivery parameters.

2.2.1.3 Mandatory Assessment

Government of India may take up a mandatory assessment of select organizations during a particular year based on its priorities and Annual Action Plan for that year. In this case also, assessee organizations will have to commit resources as mandated, in return for which they will have access to an outsider view and a professional analysis of their performance on service delivery parameters.

2.2.1.4 Assessment Based Awards

The results of external assessment can be used to give Awards to organizations that may have put in commendable performance. This will be a useful application when a large number of organizations achieve high levels of performance and creating healthy competition is expected to institute a culture of excellence among them. For such an award, all three components need to be assessed as part of an integrated model.
2.2.2 Further Directions for Development

When organizations are at the basic stage of learning, they need to be familiar with generic guidelines that underlie good performance in more developed organizations. Once these generic guidelines are applied to a significant extent and corresponding organizational development takes place, they can themselves start formulating guidelines for their specific sectors that will enhance service delivery quality. In the Indian context, as this model is rolled out on a larger scale, individual sectoral models can be developed further while maintaining their standards at levels that are consistent with best practice.

3 ASSUMPTIONS AND DEPENDENCIES

For the Sevottam model to be implemented on a large scale, appropriate institutional arrangements must be in place. It is expected that over a period of time, such assessments will actually help improve service delivery and not just remain academic scoring exercises. However, such outcomes require not just a robust assessment model, but several other enabling factors as shown below.

The various assumptions and dependencies associated with model design and other critical success factors are explained below.
3.1 Model Design
The assessment model is designed after considering international best practice and examining the ground realities of our country, including the social and economic environment. The following sub sections describe international best practice inputs taken into account while designing the model.

3.1.1 International Best Practice

There are various models across the world that incorporate best practice as relevant for assessment of service delivery in the public sector. The two most prominent ones are Charter Mark of UK and Malcolm Baldrige of USA, salient features of which are described below. Several countries have instituted assessment-based awards, most of which are given by the Head of State, and in general the assessments are based on Malcolm Baldrige type models. Discussions about efficacy of such assessments in actually improving service delivery are reasonably well documented and can provide good insights useful for directing the course of evolution of this model. Original documentation on above models, as available on respective websites is self-explanatory. For the initial stages of assessment in India, some of these documents may not seem relevant. However, they constitute important references for evolving the model further as it stabilizes and starts showing results.

3.1.1.1 Charter Mark

This is specifically used by the Government of UK to publicly acknowledge effective implementation of Citizens’ Charters by government agencies. The exercise is conducted by Cabinet Office and requires external assessment by accredited organizations. Participation is voluntary and suitable prestige is associated with the Awards to encourage prospective assessees, and make the exercise worth the effort and expense.

3.1.1.2 Malcolm Baldrige

This is a more wholesome model and defines ‘Excellence’ as a combination of process and results. It has spawned the largest number of variants and most countries, including India, have instituted awards for business organizations based on this model. The model has been extended to assess service delivery by government organizations as well, and specific models for health and education sectors are also in use. The U.S. Department of Commerce is responsible for the Baldrige National Quality Program and the Award. External examiners are drawn from a pool of qualified assessors who volunteer every year when assessments are advertised. The incentive to participate in the process as examiner or assessee is created by the prestige associated with the award.
3.2 Other Enabling Factors

While model design is important to establish credibility of the assessment exercise, there are at least three critical issues that will impact realization of benefits in the form of actual service delivery improvements. These are briefly explained below.

- Commitment from the highest political and administrative levels
- Stakeholder involvement in scheme design
- Change Management interventions

The following sub sections explain current understanding on these critical issues.

3.2.1 Securing Mandate and Political Commitment

During the Chief Ministers’ Conference in 1997, State Governments had agreed and undertaken measures to implement Citizens’ Charters, but the success of this program leaves much to be desired. We all know that this success depends on the level of commitment, ownership and leadership drive by the implementing agencies. For this model to be successful, commitment and enthusiasm on the part of organizations to use tools for service delivery improvements will be required. Part of the enthusiasm can come from better tool design. However, much more will need to come from leadership commitment.

3.2.2 Need for Stakeholder Involvement

In addition to the usual project delivery and review requirements, the success of this exercise will also depend on the involvement of stakeholders. As such, civil society representatives should be taken on board at appropriate stages like definition of service standards and assessment for Sevottam certification, etc.

3.2.3 Change Management

Change Management is at the heart of this assessment improvement initiative, particularly changing the culture and mindset of government officials from an ‘administration’ focus to ‘performance management’. The response of public officials to adopt these new initiatives, which require greater transparency, accountability and openness, will be crucial to implementation success. Prototype test of this model was carried out purely as an assessment exercise, but eventually change management needs to be integrated with the assessment exercise.

4 CONCLUSION

This document recommends a model for assessing the quality of service delivery to by Public Service Organizations in India. While model design is important to establish credibility of any assessment exercise, real benefits will also depend on commitment from the highest political and administrative levels to drive this exercise.

The following figure summarizes the model criteria linkage with three specific benefits and shows at the core how organizations can move from meeting basic standards to healthy competition for bringing excellence in service delivery.
Figure 6: Model criteria
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IS/ISO 9000 : 2005 Quality management systems – Fundamentals and vocabulary (Third
revision) provides definitions and explanations, where relevant for general terms used in the
context of quality management. Whenever in doubt, this International Guide should be referred.
The following terms are frequently used in relation to the implementation of IS 15700 and are
therefore reproduced with elaboration as necessary quality – Degree to which a set of inherent
characteristics fulfils requirements.

The earlier definitions of quality (see fig 1) described it as an attribute or a function of
some variable. It should be noted that the present definition presents quality as a relational value
(degree) based on its ability to satisfy all stated or implied requirements.

Examples of quality requirements are shown in Fig 2.
Customer - Organization or person that receives a product and / or service.
Example: Consumer, Client, Citizen, end-users, Beneficiary and Purchaser

Customer Satisfaction - Customer’s perception of the degree to which the customer’s requirements have been fulfilled.

Customer complaints are a common indicator of low customer satisfaction but their absence does not necessarily imply high customer satisfaction.

Even when customer requirements have been agreed with the customer and fulfilled, this does not necessarily ensure high customer satisfaction.

Complaint (Grievance) - Expression of dissatisfaction made to an organization related to its products, service and / or process(es), where a response or resolution is explicitly or implicitly expected.

Public Service Organization - An organization which provides service(s) to public at large and / or whose activities influence public interest.

Example: Government ministries and department, Regulatory bodies, Public utility service providers, etc.
Service - The result generated, by activities at the interface between the organization and he customer and by organization’s internal activities, to meet customer requirements.

Service Delivery - The organization’s activities, including those at the customer interface, necessary to provide the service.

Stakeholder (Interested Party) - Person or group having an interest in the performance or success of an organization.

Example: Customers, Owners, people in an organization, Suppliers, Bankers, Unions, Partners or Society.

Top Management - Person of group of people, who directs and controls an organization at the highest level

Several requirements specified for top management in IS 15700 shall apply to this person or group or persons collectively. Top management is subject to both internal as well as external audits.

Citizen’s Charter - Citizen’s charter is a document declaring the intentions and the commitment of an organization for providing effective and efficient service, taking into account customer`s expectations and minimum acceptable levels of service, thereby providing assurance that the organization complies with the service quality standards.

Service Quality Policy - The overall intentions and direction of an organization as regards service quality, as formally expressed by top management.

An organization needs to establish both the Citizen’s charter which is a public declaration of intentions and commitments towards quality, and the Quality Policy which is a driving statement for the staff and other partners in service delivery that facilitates the framing of service quality objectives, which form a part of internal management.

Service Quality Objectives - Something sought, or aimed for, related to service quality

PDCA Cycle – It is a quality loop that can be applied for any quality initiative or programme, which is:

- Plan : establish the objectives and process necessary to deliver result in accordance with customer requirements and the organization`s policies;
- Do : implement the process
- Check: monitor and measure process and product against policies, objectives and requirements for the product and report the result;
- Act : take actions to continually improve process performance

Understanding the Process Approach
For organizations to function effectively, they have to identify and manage numerous interrelated and interacting processes. An activity using resources, and managed in order to enable the transformation of inputs into outputs, can be considered as a process. Often, the output from one process will directly from the input into the next process. The systematic identification and management of the process employed within an organization and particularly the interactions between such process is referred to as the “process approach”.

Examples of inputs and outputs

- Equipment
- Materials
- Components
- Energy
- Information
- Financial resources
- Design

Process approach assumes greater significance when applied in the context of the service organization, because unlike manufacturing organizations, here due to simultaneous production and consumption of service, the related process and their interactions have to be managed with a greater degree of control and precision.

An advantage of the process approach is the ongoing control that it provides over the linkage between the individual process within the system of processes, as well as over their combination and interaction. In addition, it highlights the value addition at every stage.

When used within a quality management system, such an approach emphasizes the importance of

- Understanding and meeting requirements
- The need to consider process in terms of added value
- Obtaining results of process performance and effectiveness, and
- Continual improvement of process based on objective measurement.

In plain words process approach would mean recognizing that a series of process are needed to provide a service. The typical actions to manage the process(es) are:
• Systematically defining the activities necessary to obtain a desired result
• Establishing clear responsibility and accountability for managing key activities
• Analyzing and measuring of the capability of key activities
• Identifying the interfaces of key activities
• Focusing on resources, methods, & materials.
Quality in Service Sector

Understanding Services

Service has come to occupy a major share of the world economy. Over the past decade we have seen the spectacular increase in IT enable service transacted across continents. Even traditional services such as banking, telecom service have undergone exceptional changes, the chief driver being inflow of global service companies setting world class standards as benchmarks. A significant indicator of growing consciousness of service standards is the increasing adoption of ISO 9001 Standard by the service sector in recent times comprising a host of industries such as healthcare, hospitality, financial, education, construction, transportation and many others. Some of these developments have influenced sectors rendering public service and we have seen even government agencies subjecting themselves to the discipline of quality management.

Over the years several attempts have been made to understand service as distinct from products so that that can be standardized and controlled with the objective of, meeting customer requirements and improving quality. The combined work of several researchers determined that there are fundamental differences between products and service and therefore they have to be treated differently. However, services rarely come in isolation. The overall product is generally a combination of goods and service, where their respective content keeps varying with the nature of service. Fig 3 gives a spectrum from pure goods to pure service, and their combinations:

![Tangibility Spectrum Diagram](image-url)
Understanding difference between Goods and Services

While analyzing the overall product of an organization, it is prudent to segregate the components of goods and services. The quality of goods can be ensured in the normal way, by having a set of technical specifications, controlling their design and manufacturing process (where relevant) or verifying them through inspection and testing, rectifying or rejecting the defectives and packaging them to reach the customer safety. The quality of services however is a function of many variables, for which it is essential to understand how they differ from products:

1. Services are intangible - Unlike products, which can be standardized, services are non material in nature and lack a physical from or shape. This means that the customer does not have the convenience of appraising the service, as he would do to a product, before purchasing. He can only ‘experience’ the service and later remember the experience as good or bad (in degree of satisfaction levels). The perception that remains in memory is the quality of service as far as the consumer is concerned.

2. Services are heterogeneous in nature - A Service outcome is a function of many variables and therefore not uniform. The variables could arise due to different in person delivering the service (his temperament, knowledge, mood), difference in person in receiving the service (his background, knowledge of service, previous experience, responsiveness), the setting (the environment in which the transaction takes place), back up support, circumstance etc. thus unlike products, which are assembly line made under identical conditions, the predictability of a service outcome being uniform is much lower. Besides, the perception for an otherwise uniform delivery may also vary from one consumer to another, for example people who come from higher social or economic strata have higher expectations.

3. Services are depending on the delivery person - While products are depending on good designing and production facilities, services are very often (through not always, such as through electronic medium) delivered by people. Thus personal attributes play a major role on the manner of delivery. A service outcome may be satisfactory, yet the behavior of the delivery person may leave a poor opinion of the overall delivery. In other areas, personal skills competence and knowledge of rules and procedures, attitude, fairness etc, all make the service quality dependent on him. Modern service organization, such as Call Centers tend to overcome this by careful training on the manner in which conversations are held, responses given and monitoring these.

4. Customer is inseparable in the delivery process - One of the unique features of services is that the customer is a partner in the delivery process and must perform some role for the service to be delivered. Examples including the filling of application from, making oral requests or providing responses, obeying rules etc. A service is likely to fail or get affected if the customer does not play his own part properly. This feature also leads to most service related disputes, as often the consumer is not aware of his own role. A proactive service organization is expected to
also inform the consumer on their obligations (for example the display of a filled application form as a guide).

5. Simultaneous Production and Consumption - Another unique feature of service is that they are consumed as they are being produced. There is thus very limited opportunity to correct and deficiency, before delivery. Most of the time, the deficiency is known after the service performance. Organizations who realize the importance of this attribute, take proactive measures with their regular clients such as keeping them informed of changes in rules and procedures, the current status of service delivery etc.

6. Applying Quality Assurance to Services - As services are produced and consumed simultaneously it is difficult to assure their quality in the traditional sense as for products whose quality is assured on very high confidence levels. However, those elements of services that are tangible or where they are subject to prior evaluation can be brought under quality assurance. Examples of this include the goods associated with services (forms, documents, municipal drinking water), equipment (maintenance of public utilities) e.g. ATMS, pay phones, acknowledgement of letters, email etc.

7. Service cannot be Stocked - There is no means to produce services in advance, store them for future supply, or pre-inspect them before releasing in the market. Hence there are very limited buffers or cushion available to ensure a steady flow of quantum and quality of service as per market demand. This is the reason why on certain days, banks may have much longer queues with attendant strain resources and consequently on the patience of both consumers and the service providers. Organizations gain experience on such patterns and plan for re-allocation of resources.

8. Service is irreversible - Another unique feature of services is that they cannot be reprocessed or repaired as far as the transaction itself is concerned. Where a deficiency has occurred, it remains as an (bad) experience with the consumer. Service sectors therefore have to resort to damage control after the event, such as offering apology or compensation in some form. However, consumers are often more tolerant of service lapses and tend to accept apology or compensations.

Other difference between products and services relate to testing before delivery which is possible only for products, the transportability of products from production facility to consumer which is not possible for services. Waiting time in the case of services often becomes a crucial factor, while people are prepared to wait longer for products to be delivered.

Because of these fundamental differences between products and services:

- People perceive greater risk in purchasing services than products.
Because of their own involvement, people tend to complain less for deficient service as compared to products.

There is a greater of prior information seeking and post evaluation of services.

**Classification of Services**

In order to understand the quality requirements for Services, it is first necessary to see whether all types of services can be treated as one or whether their requirements vary with context. As a first step in this direction let us examine how the context changes based on nature of service, type of demand, extent of customer involvement, service recipient, degree of customization, professionalism etc. The following table classifies them based on 12 variables and the extreme attribute for each with illustration. It should however this classification would help us in determining and prioritizing the service quality dimensions that follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is the of the service result act</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>Repair / Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td>Education / Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Who is the direct recipient of service</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possessions</td>
<td>Car maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is the relationship of the service Provider with customers</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Clubs / Resorts / Banks / Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No formal Membership</td>
<td>Hotel / healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What is the nature of Service Delivery</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Electric / Water supply / News casting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrete</td>
<td>Postal / Courier / Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What is the degree of Service Customization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Water supply / Pollution control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Architecture / Construction / Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What is the degree of Customer involvement in service delivery</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Media based information services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Interactive phone net based services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What is the Nature of service Demand</td>
<td>Low variability</td>
<td>Postal / Telecom services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High variability</td>
<td>Electric supply / Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How good is the supplier`s capability &amp; capacity to meet peak demand</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Net based services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


9. What are the Methods of Service delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low contact</th>
<th>High contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public utility services; Electric / Water supply; Road maintenance</td>
<td>Medical / Hospitality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Extent of Availability of service Outlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single / restricted</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govt Officers e.g.RTO, Rigister, Education Board, Town Development authority</td>
<td>Post Officers, Bank (ATMs), Petrol Stations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What is the Extent of equipment / facility attributes forming part of the service product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net based services, Consultancy, Accounting, Legal</td>
<td>Gas cylinder refill services, Equipment maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is the Extent of contribution of people attributes delivering the services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance, Cleaning services, Automated services, e.g. ATMs</td>
<td>All across the counter service, Call centers, Audio / Visual presentation services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service quality**

The ISO 9000 definition of Quality is Degree to which a set of inherent characteristic fulfils requirements.

This definition applies both to provide as well as service. However due to typical attributes of services such as intangibility, customer involvement, simultaneous production & consumption, difficulty of testing before delivery and irreversibility, the quality of services have to be understood as distinct from products. Service quality differs from product quality in 3 aspects:

- Service quality is more difficult for the consumer to evaluate than goods quality. It is hard to find precise and measurable variables of service attributes.

- Quality evaluations are not only based on result of services but also on the manner of delivery.

- Service quality perceptions result from a direct comparison of consumer’s expectations with actual service performance.

Service quality is therefore a function of the gap between the customer expectations and the customer perceptions. If expectations are greater than performance, then perceived quality is less than satisfactory and hence customer dissatisfaction occurs.
While customer perceptions are based on direct experience (sometimes based on experience of others), Customers expectations are built from various sources. These include:

- Word of mouth communications from other customers
- The personal needs of each individual customer
- The customer’s past experience of the service
- External communications by the service provider – the expressed and implied messages in advertisements, brochures etc.
- Services offered by the competition

It is logical that any measurement of service quality therefore must examine the difference between expectations and perceptions. The overall difference of Gap in Service Quality is built up from several aspects within the organization that contribute to it. Figure 4 gives a representation of these Gaps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer’s expectations</th>
<th>Gap 1</th>
<th>Supplier’s perception of customer expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplier’s perception of customer expectations</td>
<td>Gap 2</td>
<td>Service Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality Standard</td>
<td>Gap 3</td>
<td>Level of service actually delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of service actually delivered</td>
<td>Gap 4</td>
<td>Service quality promised e.g. through claims, charters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality promised / Customer’s expectations</td>
<td>Gap 5</td>
<td>Perception of service after consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four gaps (Gap 1, Gap 2, Gap 3, Gap 4), are identified as functions of the way in which service is delivered, whereas Gap 5 pertains to the customer and as such is considered to be the true measure of service quality. The measurement of service quality (Gap between expectations and perceptions) has to be carried out for those dimensions of quality that are significant and relevant to the organizations. The measurement methodology has been described in the Chapter on, Measurement Tools.

**Service Quality Dimensions**

When considering dimensions of service quality, it should be realized that customer’s perception is the only valid perspective. While management and employees should strive to understand the
quality requirements, their own beliefs of judgment of quality dimensions cannot over-ride the customer’s expectations, neither should they attempt at measuring quality achievements only through internal means, as these would invariably leave major gaps. Consumer expectations of quality are varied and encompass a whole lot of considerations or dimensions. Several attempts have been made to standardize the dimensions. A general consensus has emerged in standardizing 5 basic dimensions of service quality which incorporate 5 additional dimensions within them. The following are the five dimensions of service quality:

- **Tangibles** associated with the service that bears on the quality of service being delivered. These relate to appearance of physical facilities, equipments, personal and communications aids.
- **Reliability** that is ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately (including security, that is freedom from danger, risk or doubt),
- **Assurance** which includes credibility of service provider (trustworthiness, believability, honesty), knowledge and competence of personal.
- **Responsiveness** that is willingness to help customer and provide prompt service, accessibility of relevant personnel and methods of communicating with the customers.
- **Empathy** which is the human element associated with the service delivery and includes the need of being heard and attended with dignity and understanding. It is the caring, individualized attention which the service firm provides to its customers and conscious efforts at understanding the special needs of customers.

It can be seen that the above 5 (including additional 5) dimensions of service largely cover all services including public services. Some of the important features of public services such as fairness and equity are covered by the dimensions of ‘Assurance’, timelines is covered under ‘responsiveness’, service outcome under ‘reliability’, etc. the measurement of service quality is in fact done on these five basic dimensions spread over the relevant activities and outreach of the organizations.

**Building Service Quality**

ISO 9000 defines Service delivery as ‘The organization’s activities, including those at the customer interface, necessary to provide the service’. As the definition indicates, the service is dependent on a number of activities, some of them taking place at the service provider / customer interface.

Since service evaluation is based on the experience of the transaction which lasts only for a finite duration, it is essential that all components, all building blocks should be synchronized perfectly to contribute to the attainment of the service objectives. Numerous examples exist where the absence of a form, a person, or a piece of information leads to delays or complete service failure.

Within an organization, services are classified as Primary services and support services. Primary services are mostly rendered at the Supplier / Customer interface e.g. at the counter or in the front office or when a public inspector visits a site for checking compliance. In situations where
the organization has registered members such as Bank account holders or income tax assesses, or telephone subscribers, the interface with the customer is of a continuous nature, as at every point of time, the customer is being serviced in some manner, e.g. processing or holding information relating to customer, maintaining his account. The service experience in such case is passive and becomes active only a period of time based on the overall impact of their encounters and the outcome of the services being rendered.

Primary services are also rendered during interface with customer’s possessions that takes place at the back office (not visible to the customer) e.g. offsite repair service, handling of baggage by airlines, testing of samples. As a general rule, primary services are those that directly address the consumers.

Support services are those that are performed to make the primary service possible. These are located behind the interfaces. While some support services are directly connected to the primary services, others impact them indirectly.

Information in a computer network that is used for client servicing is a direct support service. On the other hand, maintenance of the computer hardware lends indirect support.

**Support Services including**

- Human resource management.
- Maintenance.
- Purchasing, inventory management.
- Inspections.
- Information processing.
- Technology management.
- Customer research and
- Planning for these

In order to ensure the quality of service, it is important that both primary as well as supporting delivery processes need to be effective and efficient and therefore all actions needed to identify them, determining their interactions and to monitor them need to be taken. The responsibilities of service provider will include.

- **Planning and Providing the input resources which are**
  - Human resources
  - Equipment
  - Information / Training to persons
  - Facilities / Environment
  - Finance
  - Other resources such as Technology / Software

- **Controlling the processes. The service provider is required to**
- Ensure timely availability of input resources
- Ensure proper sequence of activities
- Ensure accessibility of service outlet to intended customer
- Ensure courtesy, friendliness and willingness of server to respond to queries
- Maintain the equipment / environment / inventory / information

Monitoring the Output Service Quality
- Ensure conformance to service standards
- Record the compliance levels
- Measure and analyses the quantifiable variable e.g time, errors, internal process failure
- Obtain customer feedback / record complaints and analyse

Improving based on feedbacks
- Market research on customer perceptions
- Close the Service Quality Gaps
- Talking corrective actions on deficiencies and non-conformances
- Setting objectives and meeting them
- Updating of citizen`s Charter
CITIZEN CHARTER

Basic Concept, Origin and Principles

It has been recognised the world over that good governance is essential for sustainable development, both economic and social. The three essential aspects emphasised in good governance are transparency, accountability and responsiveness of the administration. The “Citizen’s Charters initiative” is a response to the quest for solving the problems which a citizen encounters, day in and day out, while dealing with organisations providing public services.

The concept of Citizen’s Charter enshrines the trust between the service provider and its users. It aims at continuously improve the quality of public services for the people of the country so that these services respond to the needs and wishes of the users. “Services First” motto should be adopted by all the service sector organisations.

The basic objective of the Citizen’s Charter is to empower the citizen in relation to public service delivery. The six principles of the Citizen’s Charter movement as originally framed were:

(i) Quality: Improving the quality of services;
(ii) Choice: Wherever possible;
(iii) Standards: Specifying what to expect and how to act if standards are not met;
(iv) Value: For the taxpayers’ money;
(v) Accountability: Individuals and Organisations; and

The aim and objective of the “Citizen Charter” is to make a citizen aware about the functioning of welfare Government in respect of various departments run and managed by them. Though our country has achieved a lot towards information and technology, still a common citizen is unaware about the working system of Government, thereby often cheated by the miscreants and harassed. In order to streamline the system of governance transparent and get the feedback of the doorsteps is the intension of the Administration to introduce the citizen charter.

What is a Citizen’s Charter?

Citizen’s Charter is a document which represents a systematic effort to focus on the commitment of the Organisation towards its Citizens in respects of Standard of Services, Information, Choice and Consultation, Non-discrimination and Accessibility, Grievance Redress, Courtesy and Value for Money. This also includes expectations of the Organisation from the Citizen for fulfilling the commitment of the Organisation.

Who is a ‘Citizen’ with reference to Citizen’s Charter?
The term ‘Citizen’ in the Citizen’s Charter implies the clients or customers whose interests and values are addressed by the Citizen’s Charter and, therefore, includes not only the citizens but also all the stakeholders, i.e., citizens, customers, clients, users, beneficiaries, other Ministries/Departments/Organisations, State Governments, UT Administrations etc.

 **Whether Ministries/ Departments/ Agencies of State Governments and UT Administrations are also required to formulate Citizen’s Charters?**

Citizen’s Charter initiative not only covers the Central Government Ministries/Departments/Organisations but also the Departments/Agencies of State Governments and UT Administrations. Various Departments/Agencies of many State Governments and UT Administrations have brought out their Charters. More than 600 Citizen’s Charters have so far been issued by Agencies/Organisations of 24 States/Union Territories.

 **Whether Citizen’s Charter is legally enforceable?**

No. The Citizen’s Charter is not legally enforceable and, therefore, is non-justiciable. However, it is a tool for facilitating the delivery of services to citizens with specified standards, quality and time frame etc. with commitments from the Organisation and its clients.

 **What are the components of a Citizen’s Charter?**

A good Citizen’s Charter should have the following components:-

(i) Vision and Mission Statement of the Organisation

(ii) Details of Business transacted by the Organisation

(iii) Details of ‘Citizens’ or ‘Clients’

(iv) Statement of services including standards, quality, time frame etc. provided to each Citizen/Client group separately and how/where to get the services

(v) Details of Grievance Redress Mechanism and how to access it

(vi) Expectations from the ‘Citizens’ or ‘Clients’

(vii) Additional commitments such as compensation in the event of failure of service delivery.

**Road map to formulate the citizen’s Charter :-**

(i) Setting up of a Task Force in the Organisation to formulate the Citizen’s Charter

(ii) Identification of all stakeholders in the Organisation and major
services provided by Organisation;

(iii) Setting up of a Core Group in the Organisation consisting of representatives from all stakeholders which inter-alia may include Top Management, Middle Management, cutting-edge level, staff representatives, strategic partners, Customers/ Clients etc.;

The Core Group shall oversee the formulation of the Citizen’s Charter and approve it. It shall monitor its implementation thereafter.

(iv) Consultation with Clients/ Stakeholders/ Staff (Primarily at cutting-edge level) and their representative associations;

(v) Preparation of Draft Citizen’s Charter;
   
   (a) Circulation for comments/ suggestions
   
   (b) Modification of Charter to include suggestions.

(vi) Submission of draft Charter to Department

(vii) Consideration of the Charter by Core Group

(viii) Modification of Charter by the Ministry/ Department on the basis of suggestions/ observations by the Core Group

(ix) Approval by Minister-in-charge

(x) Formal issue/ release of Charter and putting up on website

(xi) Sending copies to People’s Representatives and all stakeholders

(xii) Appointment of a Nodal Officer to ensure effective implementation.

The six important areas to be covered in every Citizen’s Charter

The Six Principles of Citizen’s Charters:

i. Published Standards;
ii. Openness and Information;
iii. Choice and Consultation;
iv. Courtesy and Helpfulness;
v. Redress when things go wrong;
vi. Value for money;
Need to Evaluate, Monitor and Review

It is critically important that the evaluation system for performance in line with the Citizen’s Charter standards is congruent with the department’s broader performance information system. Thus, the standards in the charter should not be different from those of individual officials as per their job description or as set out in their departmental indicators.

Evaluation should take place regularly, ideally quarterly. This should be IT-enabled so that data can be analysed in real-time and reports on service failure against the charter standards can be generated automatically.

A practice of self-assessment should be put in place enabling the staff to assess how well they think they are delivering services. This can be compared with feedback from customers. The charter mark system is another way to evaluate the citizen’s charters. Other forms of evaluation, such as exit polls for user groups and surveys and feedback forms give a good indication of the quality of services.

A Citizens’ Charter represents the commitment of the Organisation towards standard, quality and time frame of service delivery, grievance redress mechanism, transparency and accountability.

COMPLAINTS HANDLING

The organization shall establish a documented procedure for complaint handling process. Various steps in the complaints handling process shall include the following;

a) Identification of complaint prone areas in a systematic manner and determine the time norms for their redress;

b) Providing information concerning complaints handling process in clear language and formats accessible to all. Such information shall include:

1. Where and how the complaints can be made,
2. Minimum information to be provided by complainant, and
3. Time limits within which the complaint will be closed.

c) Widely publicizing the information about complaints handling process through print, web and other media. The name, address, telephone number and other contact details of the public grievance officer of the organization shall also be displayed prominently at the reception and other convenient places in the organization;
d) Unique identification of the complaint and recording necessary information including relevant details of complaint, remedy requested, due date of redress, relevant data related to the complaint and immediate action to be taken (if any);

e) Scrutiny of the complaint and its categorization as critical, major or minor depending upon its seriousness and severity;

f) Acknowledgement of each complaint promptly giving the complaint number along with an indication of the redress time and the name, designation and telephone number of the employee to be contacted for all future correspondence;

g) Investigation of relevant circumstances and information relating to the complaint. The level of investigation shall be commensurate with the seriousness and severity of the complaint. If the complaint cannot be immediately resolved, it shall be dealt in a manner which would lead to its effective redress as soon as possible and the complainant shall be intimated;

h) Communication of the decision to the complainant regarding his complaint immediately after the decision is taken and getting his feedback. In case the decision is not in line with the remedy requested by the complainant, the justification for the decision taken along with alternative internal and external recourse available for appeal shall also be intimated and the complaint shall then be closed; and

i) Nominating 'Ombudsman' who could be approached if normal service delivery mechanism does not respond

The terms “complaint” and grievance” have been used synonymously in IS 15700 (as well as in guideline document) and the implementing organization may use the term applicable to them.

Complaints are an expression of dissatisfaction, oral or in writing, about the service or actions of an agency or its staff as well as the complaint handling process itself affecting an individual or group. It can also concern a failure by an organization to comply with its service standards in its citizen charter or other pledges made by the organization regarding services it provides to the public.

Various efforts are undertaken on a continual basis to ensure quality services; but in reality there is always the possibility of service failures arising out of service standards not met or when pledges made in the citizen charters are not fulfilled. When there is a service failure or deficiency
in any aspect of service delivery, a good complaint redressed system will readily provide
essential feedback on the quality of services provided to rectify any gaps in service delivery. In
doing so, there is also the need to assure the citizens that their complaints are taken seriously and
that the complaints are resolved in a responsive and timely manner to the satisfaction of the
users.

Hence to ensure customer satisfaction, the organization should institutionalize a good service
recovery system through effectively handling of complaints. For example, online web-enabled
system for lodging of complaints/grievances, like the Public Grievances Redress and Monitoring
System (PGRMS) developed by National Informatics Centre (NIC) in association with
Department of Administrative Reform and Public Grievances (DARPG), would ensure online
availability of complaint redressed system to the citizen and also help in creating database for
analysis of complaints.

The purpose of the Complaints Handling Mechanism can be broadly defined as follows:

a) Citizens have a right to complain and seek redress for a decision that is unfair or wrong.

b) Organizations can identify areas that need improvement.

c) It is a valuable tool for collecting information about specific complaints and their trends
   and for providing feedback to the organization.

d) Effective complaints management can promote customer satisfaction.

e) They save money and time by resolving problems internally, close to the source.

f) They can prevent complaints from escalating and multiplying, a situation that can be
   resource-intensive and lead to adverse publicity.

g) They are fundamental to good administrative practice for the public service.

h) It is part of good governance.

Public complaints may include complaints made by members of the public on their
dissatisfaction with any service delivery process including administrative action such as:

a) Unjust/ not in accordance with the existing laws and regulations,

b) Causing excessive delays in service delivery,

c) Abuse of power,
d) Mal administration

e) Ineffective service delivery,

f) Lack of transparency and discrimination in the delivery of the services.

g) Service devoid of any courtesy and human touch

At times, someone may make a comment that highlights a part of the service that could be improved, and may not be termed as a complaint. Thus, a feedback can be a complaint but could also take the form of a compliment or suggestion.

Complaints serve as valuable sources of information that organizations use to assess their performance and improve programmes service delivery. It is a well-known established factor that relatively only a few dissatisfied clients bother to complain. Thus, for every disgruntled client, there are many more who do not complain although they may be in a similar predicament. It is also generally acknowledged that many of these complaints could have been resolved quickly and efficiently at the ‘point of service’ where front line staff is interacting with the users. To ensure that this takes place, staff should be delegated the required authority and motivated to settle complaints at their level. The Head of Department should take the decision regarding the category of complaints that can be handled at the ‘point of service’. Quite often, the complaints are received orally or face to face at customer interface. For 10 simple steps to deal with such complaints, refer to Annex P.

It may be desirable to have routine or less complex complaints heard and dealt with where they originate, while complaints on more complex decisions may require review by a senior manager or committee from that of the original decision maker. The trust and confidence of the public on the public complaints system depends on the management of complaints in a systematic way and that they are resolved fairly, efficiently and within a reasonable time frame. For establishing and documenting a procedure on complaints handling, guidance may be drawn from IS/ISO 10002:2004 Quality management-Customer satisfaction-Guidelines for complaints handling in organizations. While scrutinizing the complaint, it should be categorized as critical, major or minor as defined below:

a) Critical: On the basis of objective scrutiny, if it is observed that the complaint leads to doubts about the credibility, image of the organization and the declarations made by the organization in the Citizen Charter or otherwise, are of no value then the complaint should be categorized as Critical.

b) Major: The absence of, or failure to implement or maintain one or more requirements of a key service or service delivery process, or a situation that leads to doubts about the quality of the service being provided by the organization.

c) Minor: Not having adequately maintained one or more requirements of service or service delivery process or a situation that leads to doubts regarding the assurance of quality of services being provided by the organization.
One major confidence measure to customers is the publicity on how well the organization has managed the complaints. In service delivery, it is hard to undo the damage done. It can best be compensated by a damage control exercise which in most of the cases of service delivery is not possible. This publicity for the management of complaints can be a powerful tool of public accountability. By publicizing the complaints and the results thereon through a public report, the organization can inform the public about the effectiveness of its complaint management system.

The organization needs to publish information on complaints received periodically and it should include:

a) Numbers and types/categories of complaints;
b) Average redressed time for complaints;
c) Action taken as a result of complaints to improve services.
d) Complaints resolved and pending
PUBLIC GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL (PGR) SYSTEM

Introduction

The Municipalities are responsible for providing basic civic services to the Citizens viz., drinking water, sewage, maintenance of street lights, roads, drains, parks, markets, building Byelaw enforcement and several other functions. There is a notion among the general public that the municipalities do not perform their duties efficiently. On the other hand the municipalities express that the citizens unnecessarily violate law and do not understand the immense pressure and constraints within which the municipality functions. In absence of proper interface between Municipality and its Citizens, the level of satisfaction of Citizens is low. There is urgent need to set right this anomaly.

Background & Need for streamlining the system

Earlier manual system of grievance registration and redressal was a single track system wherein the citizen would approach the municipality with a complaint; register it through a paper form or over the phone and keep wondering about the status of the complaint and its redressal. There was absolutely no mechanism to track the status of complaint for citizens or even in some cases ULB officials, which resulted in the deterioration of credibility of the Municipality.

Details of good Governance steps initiated

In order to streamline the Municipal systems, a new mechanism was devised called the “Public Grievance and Redressal system” which was made functional on 1st July 2005, for the 57 larger cities of Karnataka. This is a Web enabled system built in the respective city website which can be accessed by the citizens anywhere anytime.

1. The PGR module is a citizen friendly complaint registration and tracking system that functions over internet, Phone and Paper form. Through the Public Grievance and Redressal System citizens can register their grievances and be able to track progress of its redressal in a structured and efficient manner. Upon registration, the computer system generates a “Complaint tracking Number” using which the status and progress of the complaint can be checked by the citizen over internet “24X7”.

2. Complaints are categorized into three types

**Immediate** – to be replied, problem solved and attended within 24 hrs.
**Priority** – to be replied, problem solved and attended within 7 days.
**Normal** – either to be replied or problem solved or attended within 30 days based on the complaint type.

After prioritizing, complaints are assigned to the appropriate official / department based on the complaint type and categorization. Complaints are auto-routed to the appropriate redressal
officer. If complaints are not redressed within the allotted time they automatically get escalated to the higher level officer.

The PGR helpline functions 24/7 and envisages private participation i.e., through local NGOs. The complaints are received by a NGO who manages the PGR cell on an honorarium. Grievance applications are received through E-mail/Telephone/Fax/Post or Paper form and are directly registered online. The registered complaints are printed and segregated department wise based on the nature/type of the Complaint. The PGR system assigns a unique computer-generated Complaint-ID, which Citizens can use to track and monitor the progress on their complaints redressal. Complaints are also auto-routed to the appropriate person and depending on the urgency of complaints, SMS alerts are directly sent to city officials, for its speedy redressal.

The Directorate of Municipal Administration office constantly monitors the status, generates weekly report of PGR system across the 57 cities. The efficiency of the redressal of grievances is also measured and accordingly cities are ranked. In 57 towns so far we have registered 91,600 complaints and out of which 85,600 complaints have been redressed.

The PGR module developed with assistance of e-Governments foundation is also being periodically evaluated to understand the functioning of the system as against the design concept.

**BENEFITS**

These are live reports which can be generated at any point of time. Rich reporting capability has been provided so that Municipal Commissioners/Chief Officers as well as citizens can see the department wise complaint breakdown, ward wise breakdown as well as GIS reports that show the distribution of complaints over the city. These reports aid the Municipal Commissioners and other officials to streamline the Municipal functions through process re-engineering, proper planning and in turn bring about transparency of information and smoother delivery of Municipal services to Citizens of Karnataka.

**The changed scenario**

- Citizen friendly, responsive and responsible Public grievance registering system.
- NGO participation.
- Efficient tracking of Complaints.
- Accountability of Municipal Staff.
- Improvement of response time.
- Enable Performance measurement of Municipal Staff.
- Helps Municipal authorities in decision making.
In a civil society every day life of people is dependent upon the service network provided by the system. Services include trade, business, and industrial activity and public utility services either from Public sector or Private sector. People, who are the users/customers, are the focus of all these agencies. If the services provided by these agencies are good then the people are happy, otherwise not. But the customers’ interest was taken for granted and were neglected by almost all service providers resulting in a gloomy picture of the economy.

This was the situation in UK around 1980’s. To address this situation the economists, industrialists, planners and administrators together worked out a draft charter to improve the level of people/customers satisfaction. This initiative was called as Citizen’s Charter and was made very popular by John Major the then Prime Minister of United Kingdom. This experiment was a great success and yielded the desired results. Encouraged by this success the next government led by Mr. Tony Blair fine tuned the Charter concept and called “Service first”. More than four hundred Citizen’s Charters were developed with in a short period both in the Public and Private sectors. This was followed by good number of South East Asian as well as European countries.

India was no exception to this situation. The Conference of Chief Secretaries in 1996 prepared an agenda for providing a responsive administration. Followed by this, the Chief Ministers Conference in 1997 prepared an Action-Plan and called upon to adopt the following in governance:

- Make administration accountable and citizen friendly;
- Ensure Transparency and Right to Information;
- Take measures to cleans and motivate civil services.

To make the government accountable and citizen friendly the Conference came out very clearly to:

- Enforce Citizen’s Charter,
- Redress Public Grievances,
- De-centralization and Devolution of Powers,
- Review of laws, Regulations and Procedures

With the unanimous approval of the Action-Plan in the Chief Ministers’ Conference the government of India decided to adopt Citizen’s Charter in all the government and Public Sector Undertakings. The Department of Administrative Reforms & Public Grievances (DARPG) was given the responsibility to popularize the charters in governance. More than 400 Citizen’s Charters have been formulated so far both by the government and public sector undertakings. Many State governments have also taken up initiatives in this regard. Nodal departments and
Nodal Officers have been identified to take necessary steps to popularize Citizen’s Charters in their respective states.

What is a Citizen’s Charter?

“Citizen’s Charter is a written, voluntary declaration by service providers that highlights the standards of service delivery that they must subscribe to, availability of choice for consumers, avenues for grievance redressal and other related information”. In simple words, a Citizen’s Charter is an expression of understanding between the citizen and the service provider about the nature of services that the latter is obliged to provide. The Citizen’s Charter is a tool to improve the quality of services, address the needs of citizens’ rights and set clear standards of performance.

Customer’s satisfaction is the hallmark of the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery of the services. They are interrelated and interdependent. In fact the Citizen’s Charters aim at improvement in the level of satisfaction of the customer continuously. This is the key to success of the Charters and important reason for its spread throughout the world.

About 107 Citizen Charters learnt to have been formulated by the Center and State departments and about 629 Charters from other organizations. The Consumer Coordination Council (CCC) of New Delhi has conducted a campaign for creating awareness on Citizen’s Charters. It has conducted Surveys, published leaflets, campaign kits etc... An external evaluation conducted to study the effectiveness of these charters reveals that:

- Creation of Charters were not voluntary initiations
- The staff involvement at the time of formulation of Charter was very poor
- The responsible officers transferred and alternative arrangements were not made
- The public was either not informed or ignorant about the Charters
- Unrealistic assurances on the quality and conditions kept the Charters away from the people
- The formulators of the Charters had not understood the concept of Citizen Charters properly.

The position of Citizen’s Charters in Karnataka:

The Department of Public Administration and Reforms (DPAR) is the Nodal department to initiate Charters formulation in Karnataka. Few government departments, some Public Sector Undertakings like KSRTC, BWSSB, KPTCL and good number of Banks have formulated the Citizen’s Charters. There appears to be no study/ reports made on Charters so far except the Citizen Report Card (CRC), which is the only study that throw some light on the effectiveness of the Charters. There are three CRC studies undertaken by the Bangalore based NGO Public Affairs Committee conducted a study on the effective delivery of services by the Public Undertakings like BMC, KSRTC, BWSSB, BDA etc.. But, there appears to be no studies conducted directly on the functioning and effectiveness of the Citizen Charters in general, and in the government departments of Karnataka in particular. Even the Citizen Report Cards also focus on the effective delivery of Service and not on the effectiveness of the Charters. It is thus interesting to study formulations and their implementation.
Citizen’s Charters have been claimed to be an effective tool for good governance wherever it has been taken up seriously but there hardly exists detailed studies to support this. In the absence of any such study, it is difficult, either to claim that the Citizen Charters are effective or not made any impact at all. Administrative Training Institute Mysore has been engaged in organizing training programs on Citizen’s Charters since 2002-03. One Regional Workshop sponsored by DARPG was also conducted in ATI during January 2004, to train the Officers and Resource Persons in the concept of Citizen’s Charter. Similarly, training workshops and seminars were also conducted by the DPAR in Bangalore. Apart from this exercise not much has been done in this regard. It is with this background, it was felt that a small study in the form of an Action Research would enhance the quality and input on the Charters. It is therefore, decided to conduct the empirical study on the Citizen’s Charters in Karnataka.

Aim of the study: - The aim of the study is to enable the government departments to adopt the concept and formulate the Citizen’s Charters effectively there by make the services citizen friendly.

Objective of the Study: -
1. Study how the Charters have been formulated
2. Analyze whether the Charters have all the essentials components of a good/ model Charter
3. Examine the steps taken by the departments to formulate the Charters.
4. Develop guidelines to formulate good Citizen Charters to make the concept effective.

Method of Study:

This is the first study on Citizen’s Charters in Karnataka. As such it would give an opportunity to study the existing Charters in Government departments and study how these departments have formulated the Charters. Twenty departments have responded to the request and sent in their Charters copy. (Annexure-1) All the 20 Charters have been considered for the study.

Tools of Data collection:

The required data for the study were obtained through letters followed by Questionnaire-1. Based on the information obtained through Questionnaire. The study was undertaken from 31.11.2005 to 31.05.2006.

The Charters have been examined as to the various aspects of formulation and its components (Annexure-2). The Charters have been examined with respect to the essential components and the observation is made based on the information furnished by the departments as per the Annexure
**Scope of the study:**

Being an Empirical Study it was decided to focus only on the Charters pertaining to the State Government departments in the first phase and the Public Sector Undertakings in the second phase.

**Jurisdiction of the Study:**

The jurisdiction of the study is extended to the Citizen’s Charters of government departments of Karnataka only.

**Duration of the Study:**

Over 50 Head of the Departments were requested to support the action research by sending the information in the prescribed Questionnaires. Twenty departments responded favorably and sent in their department Citizen’s Charter copy along with additional information sought for. These twenty Citizen’s Charters have been included for the current study. While seeking the information from the departments the questionnaire was so designed as to get the required data on the essential steps for formulation of a Charter. The Questionnaire-A is as per the annexure-1, which is also called Citizen’s Charter Profile (CCP). The information so obtained is tabulated and is enclosed as per the CCP-1 of the Table-1 gives the names and address of the department. CCP-2 is the date of commencement of the CC. Charters formulated in Karnataka (Year-wise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department of Sericulture is the first to formulate the Charters on 06.01.1999, followed by the Food and Civil Supplies and KGID in 2001. Seven departments did not give the date of commencement of the Charters, and even it was not available in their copy of Charters.

**Jurisdiction:**

The Charters jurisdiction depends upon the activities of the departments. It can be local if the nature of activities is so defined or it may spread to different levels depending up on the jurisdiction of the department. While the jurisdiction of the Charter of a hospital is restricted to that particular place and hospital it may extend to the entire state i.e. Karnataka Lokayukta. It
may be concurrent i.e. Taluk, District and State in case of Kannada and Culture department. On analysis it can be seen that this aspect has not been given serious thought while formulating the Charters. In most of the cases the head offices have formulated the Charters on behalf of the district and taluk level offices and claim to have the state jurisdiction there by these offices are free from the obligations. The lower offices will be simply asked to follow the suite. The charters may not be that effective if the offices that implement them are not involved in the formulation process. The Charters could be made more effective if the Head Offices give a model Charter for their department and ask the lower offices to develop their own depending up on the local needs.

**Programs:**

The Charters may be formulated for any single program or for multiple programs depending upon the purpose. This is a thoughtful exercise. But on going through the Charters it is very clear that the departments have an impression that one Charter can be developed for all department programs. The CC of Education department and Food & Civil Supplies runs to 39 and 19 pages. They have included all the programs of their departments. The very fact that charters include all the programs shows that there is little relation to the standardization or the quality aspects. The Charters of the Transport department makes a sincere effort to list only the important programs, which have larger public interface and also spell out the quality and the cost of services. This is a positive sign. In brief, the charters in general have not given importance to the service standards and standardization. It is important that the Charter formulators give due considerations to this aspect.

**Initiatives:**

The CC initiative was adopted by the states following the guidelines issued by the GOI. On going through the records it is seen that the GOI has initiated series of actions spreading and marketing the concept of Charter across the country. Number of states have accepted and adopted the Charters. The study reveals that only two departments have formulated the Charters based on the guidelines of GOI. Eight departments say that they have formulated their Charters as per the guidelines of GOK. Only one department has taken initiative. Perhaps this department also might have been guided by the GOK. Ten departments have not answered at all. In the absence of this information it may be construed that these departments also must have been guided by the DPAR. No department has come out with information that they have followed other departments in formulating their Charter’s. It is clear that the departments in Karnataka have followed the guidelines issued by the DPAR.

**Available model:**

It was intended to know whether there was any model Citizen Charter available for immediate reference. Four departments have replied and have informed that a Citizen Charter formulated by
other departments have been used as guidelines. One department has come out with a specific answer saying that it had the guidelines from IIPM (K). Another department has answered that it had the reference of GOI. In general, it can be said that, the DPAR and its model Charter have guided the majority of the departments.

Formulation of Citizen’s Charter: -

The formulation of Citizen’s Charter and steps to be adopted is a very important stage. A Citizen’s Charter is the expression of an understanding between the citizen and the public service about the quantity and quality of services citizens receive in exchange for their taxes. It is essentially about the rights of the public and the obligation of the public servants. As citizens fund public services, either directly or indirectly they have the right to expect a particular quality that is responsive to their needs and which is provided efficiently at a reasonable cost. This essentially involves very clear-cut, well-defined steps to be followed.

- Agreed and published standards for service delivery
- Choice and consultation with users
- Identifying and engaging with stakeholders

These are very important steps that are required to be observed at the time of formulation of Charters, without which the Charters become defective in formulation. We cannot imagine a Citizen’s Charter without the above three important aspects.

The process of formulation of Citizen’s Charter involves identifying the services, felt need, clearly spelt objectives and scope, involvement of the staff, consultation of the stakeholders, expectations of the users, and the resources available. Without these considerations the formulation of Charters are impossible.

It is surprising note that none of the departments has adopted method required to formulate the Charters. Seven departments have answered that the Charters have been formulated through an official communication. Perhaps the senior level officers through the official file movement system have developed the Charters. For example, head of the department asking the senior officers in the head office to formulate the Charters as per the guidelines of DPAR and these officers responding accordingly.
One department has answered that the subordinate officers have developed the Charter. Perhaps the head office instructing the district office and get the Charter formulated as per the guidelines of DPAR.

Two departments have come out openly saying that individual officers have developed the Charters for their department. No department has got the Charters prepared by an outside agency/NGO. This is also a good sign. At least this task has not been outsourced!

Ten departments have not furnished any information as to how the Charters have been formulated. May be, those departments do not have any information. This is a clear indication as to how the essential aspects of the formulation of Charters have been totally made insignificant. This non-observance of the condition precedent to formulate the Charters resulted in the defective formulation of Charter. Naturally, the Charters can never deliver the desired results with these serious defects. None of the essential steps that are to be followed as listed above are observed. Hence it can be construed that the Charters have become a mere formal documents than being an effective tool of making the services citizen centric.

The above points are further strengthened in the last question of the Questionnaire wherein it is intended further to know the steps taken before the formulation of the Charters. It was desired to know whether any meeting of the staff, users, stakeholders and others was conducted before. Only three departments have answered that they have conducted meetings. There is no information about any brain storming sessions or workshop conducted as a preparatory step to formulate the Charters. Seven departments have answered that the Charters were formulated in the course of routine official file movement i.e. the Charters have been developed by the middle level staff following the guidelines and put up for approval. These Charters might have been approved just like any other routine file, which clearly indicates that no special effort was made. Charters cannot be developed the way in which they have been developed. It is too much to expect from such weak tools.

After having discussed the formulation of the Charters, the component needs to be examined.

Components of Citizen’s Charters:

Citizen’s Charter represents a systematic effort to focus on the commitment of an organization in the delivery of its services to its users. It is an assurance that services rendered will comply with the standards declared as quality standards.

Though there is no set of rules for the formulation of Citizen’s Charters the experience shows that a good Citizen Charter should essentially include the following important components for its effectiveness and usefulness.

- **Vision and Mission statement of the Organization**
- **Details of business transaction by the organization**
The Charter is a written document. It begins with a nobler statement, usually giving the objectives and followed by the Vision statement. What is this vision statement? The best Citizen’s Charters adopted a practice of making a nobler statement expressing their desire to achieve in an ideal state of condition, which is not usually seen. This has been followed in our Indian Charters also. The Vision statement gives an opportunity to what the organization is going to achieve in an ideal situation. This is a wish statement showing the positive attitude of the department.

The Mission statement is all about the committed staff and the whole of the department willing to be with the Charters implementation. It declares the organizations total commitment to the general public. It is like setting the house in order before going to the public. Both the vision and Mission statement provide necessary motivation to the organization as well as to the general public as to the honest intentions of the department.

The charters that have been received for the study have variety in themselves. Only seven Charters have Vision and Mission statements. Whereas the remaining 13 Charters do not have the statements. They simply open their front page with “Aims and Objectives” of the department. The Charters could be still more effective if the Aims and Objectives statements follow the “vision and Mission” statements. The statements can really attract the customer. The Sericulture and the Commercial Tax departments have made out a very good and also appealing Vision and Mission statement, which can serve as good examples. Remaining Charters have made a bald statement in their routine official language. The ATI has also come out with a very catchy and committed statement, which explains the training philosophy of the government. Therefore, it can be agreed that a Vision and Mission statement always makes a good beginning to any Charter.

The second important component of a Charter is that the department can state the services provided. The purpose of making this public is not to list out various services that are available but to inform what services are useful to the public at large. The departments have grossly misunderstood this. Eleven departments have included their services in the Charter in a way the public can get the required messages. In the remaining Charters there is some confusion as to...
whether to call services or “our Commitments”. The fact that the departments have not been able to follow is that, do the public want every thing about the services like origin and development of the scheme, scope, eligibility, procedure to get the benefits and so on? If all these details are to be given in the Charter then departments may better printout the booklets of services. Charter is not the document to give all these details. The Charter of the Education department is one such example where it runs to 39 pages. Can the department think of supplying these copies to all the public free of cost? It is difficult. A charter should include only that information as required by the users. It should be as brief as much as possible. Details can be made available in the office. There is no uniform understanding among the Charter departments.

Third and very important component of a Charter is to identify who is the Client? The Charter is an understanding between the citizen and the service provider. The Charter becomes incomplete without the role of citizens. The aim of all Charters is to fulfill the aspirations of the users. They strive hard to meet the expectations of the clients. If the citizens have no role in the formulation of the Charters then how can any organization think of meeting the needs of the users?

The users/clients/beneficiaries are to be involved at every stage of the formulation of the Charters. First they should be identified and then consulted. A Charter with out mention of the client is one sided document and defective in nature. It is surprising to note that only four Charters have mentioned about their clients. They have identified the users. The other Charters have either not mentioned about the clients or not consulted them at all. In either case, the process is incomplete and they are one sided. The Charters are meant for those who are the users. If the users are not consulted, then what purpose the Charters serve? It is a futile exercise. Nothing significant can be expected from the Charter exercises. For example, the Charter of Commercial Tax Department does not explicitly say for whom the Charter assurance is made. Of Course, the Tax Payers, can be the implied answers. If this is missing then one may feel that it is just a statement made to the general public. Majority of the Charters have committed the same mistake. They are one-sided declarations.

The fourth component is the essence of the whole Charter exercise i.e effective delivery of services to the satisfaction of the clients. The Charter initiatives aims at standardization of services, quick delivery, cost effectiveness and user friendly approach. All these aspects contribute to satisfaction of the customer. If these aspects are not included in the Charter then again the exercise of the Charter become a mere formality and serve no purpose.

On examination of the Charters, it is seen that only seven have thought fit to include the services provided by them. Some of them are in detail and some are in brief. The Charter should essentially cover a statement of services, standards, quality and time frame. There may be some difficulty in giving this information in brief and defining the standard, set time frame. But this is a real challenge. People expect all these information from the service providers. They should be
able to do it. The Transport and Social Welfare departments have attempted to give this information and partly they are successful. But too much of information also keeps the reader away, for example Education department. A Charter is incomplete without this information and serves no purpose. They cannot meet the expectations of the people. The charters become futile and dry documents. The success of Charters in UK is because of the fact that they were very clear about all these aspects. Improving the efficiency and making cost effective delivery needs continuous efforts. People can judge the quality of service before and after the Charters. False assurances can be easily made out. The Charters should avoid these practices.

Fifth component of the Charter is the provision for grievance redressal system. If the clients are not happy with the services provided by the organization they should have an inbuilt system of redress of their grievances. Otherwise, the dissatisfaction will leads to the customer turning away from the organization. It is this neglect of users that lead to increased dissatisfaction and related poor performances. Only seven departments have thought of redressing the grievances and their Charters do contain these provisions. Thirteen departments have not included provisions to redress the grievances in their Charters. If the users are not happy with the service providers what is the remedy, and where should they go? If the Charter is silent about the problems of the users then those Charters or the departments cannot claim to be user friendly, which is against the spirit of Citizen’s Charters.

Expectations from the Citizens/ Clients: - The Citizen’s Charters have been known to be the bridge between the user and the service providers. The organizations consult the users before they decide the service delivery system. While the organizations work on the system of providing services they also expect the users to follow certain conditions, i.e. expectations from the clients. The understanding should be mutual. The users will also realize that they have an obligation too. This is a good sign of a Charter.

The charters that have identified the clients are the one that have made provisions for the expectations also. Only four Charters have given the obligation clause in their Charters. The rest have no expectations. This is an indication to show that the charter formulation process lacks directions.

Remedies: - the charters should also contain clear and effective remedies for when things go wrong. If the standards committed in the charter are not met whom, where and how the user should contact to get the remedy the compensation need to be specified in each case. This is the practice in the case of advance Charters. None of the Charters in the study have made any provisions for remedies.

To make the charters more users friendly and appealing there is a practice of giving additional information, which will help the user to access, the services easily. Few Charters have thought of giving additional information in the form of “Help Lines”. The Sericulture, Animal Husbandry
and KGID are some examples for giving additional information. Charters like Education and FCS departments have gone in details about Right to Information and its relevance to their services.

Language: - The language of the Charters should necessarily be the language of the users. It is advisable to have the Charter in English also. Nine Charters are in Kannada and the remaining in English.

Conclusions:

On examination of all the charts, it is found that Charters formulation was deficient on the following grounds:

1. Date of formulation is not available in most of the Charters and it is not considered significant.
2. The Head of the departments has developed the Charters. It is presumed to have statewide jurisdiction. In fact, no thought has been given as to spell out the jurisdiction or the area of application.
3. Good Charters usually cover those services which can be standardized and having larger public interface. Charter can be for all or for selected few services. But whatever services selected under Charters necessarily is defined as to the quality, standard, cost effectiveness so that the consumer is aware of the improvement after the Charter initiative. But this aspect has not been given its due importance. The Charters covers all departmental services with out any exception. Many Charters simply list out all the programs in detail.
4. Since the concept of Charters is new to our country, the guidelines developed by the GOI based on UK's experience serves as the basis for formulation of Charter. It was expected that the Charters relay upon these guidelines and follow some good models. But the study reveals that all the Charters covered have followed the guidelines perhaps issued by the DPAR, which in turn has received these guidelines from DARPG. How the DPAR could not ensure adoption of the good guidelines developed by DARPG is again a point for further study. In fact, the guidelines developed by GOI are based on the success stories of UK's experience. The fact that good number of central departments and the Public Sector undertakings have successfully implemented the Charters should serve as an eye opener to many. This has not happened in Karnataka.
5. The Charter formulation exercises in Karnataka should have the advantage of following any good model of Charter. No doubt, Charters can never be identical for the simple reason that services and users are different. Nevertheless there can be so much variation at least in their basic structures. There appears to be many models.
6. The Charter formulation is a very systematic process involving the clients, users, stakeholders and in addition to the staff of the service providers. But in the present study, these aspects have not been given importance. It is difficult to imagine a Charter without the involvement of the users and the stakeholders. This is clear violation of the guidelines and against to the spirit of the Charters. The method followed to formulate the Charters is defective. Hence the Charters can also be defective. These Charters can neither produce any significant results nor satisfy the users.

7. Usually the Charter formulation exercises precede number of preparatory stages like number of meetings with the users/clients/stakeholders, identifying the services, standardization process, draft formulation, workshops, seminars etc,. But the way the Charters appears to have been formulated gives an impression that the Charters were formulated through official file movements. Hence the process of the formulation of the Charters is also defective. There may be 2-3 exceptions.

8. Components of Charters are equally important to make them effective. Here the standard practice of making a good Charter on the lines of UK's experience has been considered as model. All Charters make a good beginning with a Vision and Mission statement which is a well thought practice. Only seven Charters have this statement. Others begin with either with introduction or with a preamble. Some call it objectives.

9. Provision to include the services provided in brief have neither been understood properly nor reflected in the Charters. Eight Charters have attempted to give their services in brief. Whereas the others listed all the programs in detail in which the users are not interested. The information given in the Charter should be wanted by the users. Service Providers interest is not very important.

10. Charters cannot be formulated without identifying the users/clients. But only four have identified their clients and the rest have addressed without considered the users. Similarly, the expectations from the clients. This clearly indicates the position of the users in the Charters. In fact the users occupy the focal points in any good charter, which really intends customer satisfaction. The Charters in the study have not considered this important aspect and making the whole exercise looking one sided.

11. The grievance redress system is an integral part of any Charter. Only seven Charters have made provision for this. The others have either given their address or local office address for further contacts. There should be genuine concern for the hardships faced by the clients and sincere efforts should be made to address their problems if any. Otherwise, the Charters become insensitive to the needs of the users and serve no purpose.

12. To gain the confidence of the users Charters provide useful additional information to help them. Few Charters have made provisions for “Help Line”. This is a good move showing concern to guide the users.

Considering all these aspects as discussed above it may be construed that the Citizen’s Charters formulation process is defective in nature. The Charter formulation exercises lack
guidance and does not include the most essential and vital components which make a Charter really effective. Most of the provisions included in the Charters are not focusing the user needs and give an impression that they are a routine department exercises. Naturally, it is too much to expect that the Citizen’s Charters would any way help either to improve the standard of delivery of services or the satisfaction of the customers. Unless the departments develop customer satisfaction as their foremost objective, the Citizen’s Charters remain a formal document without any significance.
Citizen's Charter initiatives in Public Sector Undertakings
(An Empirical Study-2)

By HP Shiva Shankar, Faculty, Public Administration, ATI Mysore.

**Objectives of the Study:** The present study of Citizen's Charter in Public Sector Undertakings is an attempt to know

1. *whether the Charter mechanism has been adopted,*
2. *If Yes, then the process of formulation of Charters,*
3. *Whether the Citizen's Charter contain essential components,*
4. *Examine whether the Charters fulfill the requirements of the GOI guidelines.*

**Method of Study:**
The method adopted in the 1st study is continued in the current study also. About 30 PSU s were requested to send the required information along with a copy of the Charter. Twenty Organizations responded to the letter. Eleven organizations have replied that they have not adopted Charters. Many have candidly accepted that they are not aware of the charter concept. The Charter profile is as per the Annexure-I. Among the PSU s the KPTCL, KSRTC (HO) 3 Divisional Road Transport Corporations Depots, Electricity Companies are the major organizations who have responded to the letter. The other important organizations are KSPCB, KPSC, BDA, BMTC & WDC. Few have referred to their web-cites for details.

**Tools of Data Collection:**
Information on the process of formulation of the Charters was obtained through correspondence in Form-1 (CCP-1). The organizations that have furnished information are as per the Profile-1. The Executive heads of the major service organizations like KSRTC, KSPCB, Electrical Companies having their Offices in Mysore were interviewed to study the implementation of the Charter. Publicity given and such other important issues were also observed.

**Scope of the study & Jurisdiction of the Study:**
The Study is limited to the Citizen's Charter Initiatives among the Public Sector Undertakings in Karnataka. The study does not cover Urban Local Bodies.

**Duration of the Study:**
The Study is conducted during December 2006 to April 20
Analysis of the Charters:

Over thirty PSU who are providing vide range of services to the public were selected for the study and letters were addressed to their Chief Administrative Officers. List enclosed as per Annexure-I. As many as nineteen organizations responded to the request and sent in their replies in the format (Annexure-II). Out of the nineteen responses received seven organizations replied that they have not adopted a Charter so far. It is interesting to note that many were candid to accept that they are not aware of the concept of the Charter and what it means for the organization. Further, it is more interesting and a very healthy thinking on the part of the organizations that they are eager to know about the Charter mechanism and are looking forward to the study outcome.

The following major organizations have Citizen's Charter:

1. Karnataka Road Transport Corporation Bangalore, Hassan, Mangalore, Mysore.
2. BMTC Bangalore
3. Electrical Companies of Bangalore, Mangalore, Mysore
4. Karnataka State Pollution Control Board Bangalore, Mysore
5. Karnataka Public Service Commission, Bangalore
6. Dr Ambedkar Development Corporation Ltd Bangalore
7. D Deveraja Urs Backward Classes Development Corporation Ltd Bangalore.
9. Karnataka Women Development Corporation, Bangalore
10. Bangalore Development Authority, Bangalore.

KPTCL is the Pioneer to go for Charter initiative in as early a July 2000 it self. It is one of the largest PSU serving by providing electricity to more than 100 lakhs Customers spread over 1,90,000 KM s in the State. It is really a very big challenge& enormous task for any organization to provide such a very important utility service for such big population to cover. The initiative of the organization to go for Charter initiative in itself is a very positive step in making the services citizen friendly. The KPTCL has titled Citizen’s Charter as “Customer Charter” giving importance to the customers needs. The Chairman & the Managing Director of the Company, while releasing the charter expresses his confidence that the “Customer Charter will bring in greater transparency and accountability in the organization and benefit the customer in enabling them to have more efficient service delivery. In fact, this opening sentence of the Managing Director is an indicator to show the purpose of Charter initiatives. The analysis of the content of the Charter can be taken up little later.

KSRTC is the second PSU to go for Charters initiatives in February 2002. The Charter exercise was undertaken by the Central Organization of the KSRTC i.e., Head Office & was simply adopted by the respective Divisional Offices. There are no Divisional specific issues or services in the Charters of the Divisions. However, the BMTC the icon of KSRTC is working
continuously to improve the quality of services and also meet the commitment it has made to the commuters in the Citizen Charter.

The Citizen’s Charter of BMTC is published in two languages with a dual purpose of educating both its personnel and the general public regarding the corporation's obligations to its people and the special commitments towards them.

The revised multi colour Charter of KSRTC has been released very recently in January 2007. In the foreword to the Charter the earlier efforts & some of the achievements have been remembered. It takes pride in the role of the stakeholders in improving the quality of services and dedicates the present version to the Citizens. However, it is seen that there is deviation in presentation of the contents. The most important Vision Statement is missing. A Charter becomes a mere official document if it contains/lists only the services without expressing vision. A Vision statement is like a preamble to the Constitution. It is a guiding spirit for the business of the organization.

Similarly, the Mission Statement is also missing. Vision can not be realized unless the Mission is not made clear. Perhaps the introductory para giving the details about the organization might have been treated as Vision & Mission Statement. But this para can not substitute for the Vision & Mission Statement. Even the narration is in an official way giving all the service details. The Charter need not include all the service details & eligibility conditions. No doubt, these details are required to the customer, but he is not wholly depending on the Charter for details, for e.g., advantages of the passes, details of contract carriages etc can find place in separate annexure. Except the process & the structure, the Charter of KSRTC has retained its commitment to improve the quality of services to the citizens. But the post Charter follow up work like wide publicity, writing on the walls of the Bus Stand, hanging small Boards behind the Driver seat of all Busses, making available the Charter copies either on 'No-Cost or Low-Cost' to the citizen is also missing. It is learnt that the Charter Copies are not intended to the Public information! Then who want these copies, is the question to be answered. It is for the internal use of the employees!

Both the KSRTC and the KPTCL have been bifurcated in to many Divisions for better administration & they have established themselves in to very effective organizations. Naturally, there should have been either a review of services or re defining the priority of the services/ areas of services. But there appears to be no effort in this direction to re-design or restructure the Charters as per the needs of the Divisions. The Charters of the Division says they have "Statewide" jurisdiction which is not factually correct. Division wise Charters cannot have jurisdiction beyond their limits.

KPSC has a Charter for the entire State though the main Office is located in Udyog Bhavan Bangalore and its Division Offices in the Divisional Head Quarters. These
establishments could have made out these differences and made the Charters district or Divisions specific to be more realistic and citizen friendly.

The Charter of KSPCB has statewide jurisdiction indicating that the District Units have no charter of their own. But the Electrical Companies are very clear in their jurisdiction because they operate well within the districts or the area allotted to them.

Another important observation that needs our attention is that the Electrical Companies are governed by the “Karnataka Electricity Regulatory Commission (KERC) under Electricity Act. The Regulation has made it mandatory on all Electrical Companies to adopt very strict consumer interest protection measures in their day-to-day administration and its enforcement is regularly monitored by the Commission. These Regulations spell-out very clearly the type of services, standard of services, responsible officers to meet these requirements and the appellate authorities for redress of the grievances. Following are the important mandatory regulatory measures to be adopted by the Electrical Companies.

1. KERC(ES&D) Code 2004 Regarding Child Labour
2. KERC(Consumer Complaints Handling (Procedure) Regulations 2004
3. KERC( Licensees” Standard of Performance) Regulations 2004
4. KERC(Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations 2004
5. KERC (State Advisory Committee) Regulations 2004

The Commission has come out with clear Standard of services that the citizen can expect & the person who is responsible to provide these services is also identified. The Commission has also made it very clear the grievance redress measures in case of non performance or complaints. These obligatory measures have really made the staff very much alert in their duties. Naturally, the users are relieved of their burden to run from pillar to post in search of services. In fact, these regulatory measures have taken the burden of the Charters to the large extent. Though the Regulatory measures are responsible in making the services effective, they cannot be a substitute for the Charters. At times these regulations appear to be very technical and only the elite customer can avail these facilities. (Copy of the Regulation is enclosed as per Annexure-III).

Dr BR Ambedkar Development Corporation which is erstwhile Karnataka SC/ST Development Corporation has a different report to make. It has made an attempt to formulate a draft Citizen’s Charter but later on entrusted this task to an outside agency which is against to the spirit of Charter formulation because of the simple reason that only the service provider-clients and the stake holders can consult each other to draft a Charter for the service provider. A consultant can only fine tune the draft and give a professional touch. An out side agency can never draft a charter for an organization for the simple reason that he has no interest and cannot be linked to the citizens continuously.
The other major organizations to go for Charter initiatives are the BMC, BWS&SB & BDA Bangalore. The BMP in its health page says it proposes Charter for all health activities and painted on the wall of the Hospitals.

The BDA has a Charter since 2001. The Charter of BDA appears to be well thought out exercise and very much appealing in its presentation, wordings, & structure. The Citizen is the focus of BDA's Charter that could be seen from the very first opening word which reads- "Whatever we do, no matter how hard the endeavour proves, we revolve around one end- You."

The Charter of BDA has all the essential components of a good Citizen's Charter. We will examine the features of this Charter little later.

**Programs:**
The Charter may include all services provided by the organizations or may be restricted to selected service. The Charter of KSRTC includes all services connected to the needs of the commuters. KPTCL has also covered all services in the Charters. Similarly the other Charters also have included all services provided the organizations. There are no exceptions to this practice

**CC Initiatives & available model:**
Unlike the Government departments, the PSU s have formulated Citizen's Charter on their own initiatives in as early as 2000 itself. The Customer Charter of KPTCL & Citizen's Charter of KSRTC are the best examples. The initiatives taken by the GOI Ministry of Administrative Reforms & Public Grievances was responsible for popularizing the concept of Citizen’s Charter among the Government departments & PSU s coming under the various ministries. The States were encouraged to take up Charter initiatives. The KSRTC & KPTCL, leading PSU s picked up the opportunity as they were looking for a break through to meet the ever increasing demands of the customers. Citizen’s Charters came in handy to improve the service delivery mechanisms. Some of the Charters formulated by different ministries would have served as the Models for the PSU s. The BDA, BMC & BWS & SB followed the suite. These were the first generation PSU s adopting the Charter concepts. The latest in the list is the Women Development Corporation that has gone for Charter in April 2006. Dr Ambedkar Development Corporation which has ventured to formulate the Charter has ultimately asked a private organization to develop a Charter for the organization. Ten PSU s have replied that they are looking forward for clear guidelines on developing Charter.

**Formulation of Citizen’s Charter:**
The Process of formulation of the Citizen’s Charter is very interesting one. It is not a document to be prepared sitting in the Office or the one developed by an expert draftsman. A Citizen’s
Charter is the expression of an understanding between the citizen and the public service about the quantity and quality of services citizens receive in exchange for their taxes. It is essentially about the rights of the public and the obligation of the public servants. Essentially the process should include:

- Agreed and published standards for service delivery
- Choice and consultation with users
- Identifying and engaging with stakeholders

Any attempt by an organization to develop a Charter without observing the above requisite conditions leads to a defective formulation of the Charter. On going through the copies of the Charters and the information given by the service providers, the customers have a minimum role in the whole process. Setting the standard of services and the quality of services expected by the customers have not been identified. KSRTC has made it very clear that the traveling is made more comfortable with in the affordable cost. The plus point of the Charter is that it has been able to provide the customer choices of services. It is not sure that the Commuters have been involved during the process of Charter formulation. In KSPCB few dedicated members have contributed through their rich personal experiences giving a beautiful & inspiring Vision. It is quite comprehensive and on the professional lines. The Charter includes almost all services provided by the Board and runs in to 15 pages.

The Charter of KPTCL (Electrical Companies) is heavily guided by the KERC Act. CHESCOM reports that DPAR has also guided the Charter formulation. The Charters of Electrical Companies are titled as “Customer Charters”. In strict terminologies, the Charters of the Electrical Companies cannot be treated as Citizen’s Charter for a simple reason that they do not include the feature of the Charters.

The Charter of KPSC is guided by the DPAR and reported that no model was available. The Charter of Karnataka Women Development Corporation appears more like an information broacher than a Charter.

The D Devaraj Urs BC Development Corporation Charter has been guided by the department. In fact the information supplied by the Corporation contains details of Charter formulation. The Circular is dated 06.10.2000 refers to the guidelines to formulate Citizen’s Charters issued by DPAR. The essence of Charter formulation is very well explained in the guideline.

Karnataka State Finance Corporation is another important Institution serving the entrepreneurs financing their activities on agreed terms & conditions. It is an ISO-9000 Organization known for efficiency, standardized services & also one among very few profit making PSU. But still it is surprising to know record that there is no Citizen's Charter. Standardization alone may not fulfill the needs of the Customers. Even the courtesy, grievance redress system, cost of services and
many more issues that are part of the Charters are very important for any organization to provide customer centered services.

Women Development Corporation has made a sincere effort to formulate the Charter. Its GM was candid enough to acknowledge that the organization was not very clear about the whole process of formulation of the Charter. Naturally, the Charter is missing so many vital aspects like Vision, Mission, Standardization of services and so many other aspects required to make Charter.

**Components of Citizen’s Charters:**

A good Citizen Charter should essentially include the following important components for its effectiveness and usefulness.

- Vision and Mission statement of the Organization
- Details of business transaction by the organization
- Details of the “CITIZEN” or “CLIENTS”
- Statement of services including Standard, Quality, Time frame etc provided to each Citizen/Client group separately and how/where to get services.
- Details of Grievance Redress Mechanism and how to access it
- Expectations from the Citizens or Clients
- Remedies available at the disposal of the Customers/Citizens in case of deviation from the standards.
- Additional comments such as compensation in the event of failure of service delivery
- Language of the clients/customers

The Citizen’s Charter is a written document expressing the genuine interest of the service providing organization; the interest is expressed in terms of the quality/standard of services, cost, time required, the people who deliver services in a very effective manner to the satisfaction of the user. This has to be expressed in a very simple but appealing manner. The Vision & Mission statement provides opportunity to the organization to its intention clear through Vision statement. Vision statement is an expression of the noble intention of the service provider in an ideal situation. This could be the height of service level that one can expect from the organization.

The Charters of KPTCL, KSRTC, BDA & KSPCB have a Vision & Mission statement. BDA has designed its statement in a very simple but appealing language. The statements make the reader convinced about the honest intention of the service provider. We can make out the difference between the Vision & Mission statement clearly in this Charter. Some how, this clarity is missing in other Charters. The KPTCL has only a mission statement & the Vision statement is missing. Perhaps the mission statement does extend its scope to the Vision statement also.
The Charter of KSPCB has come out with a very appealing Vision statement which reads as "Towards a Cleaner & Greener Karnataka". This Vision statement is enough to inspire the employees as well as the people why they all need pollution free life. The Mission Statement also clearly defines the commitment of the organization to realize the Vision. The Mission Statement is worth quoting here:

**Our Mission:**
We are committed to pollution free Environment for a better quality of life through:
- Effective Implementation of laws;
- Creating awareness among the public; and
- Co-operation with our stakeholders.

Further, it expands the Basic Goal: We want to achieve is improved quality of life for every one and a better Karnataka to live in.

Some charters have come out with a simple & bald statement “Aims & Objectives” which is an official version of the Vision & Mission statement. This is an indication of the missing elements of the Charter formulation process.

Second component of the Charter is the Services provided by the organization. The Service provider can spell out the services rendered by them in the charter. But the Charter is not required to cover all the services. It may include only few services which are very important from the view point of the user or may be extended to many services. The charters under study, some how covered all services. As a result, the Service Provider is required to focus on all services provided by them. The point is not either to inclusion or exclusion of any service, but it becomes relevant when the process of standardization of service is under consideration. The organizations may go slow to cover the services and extend the process of inclusion in phases.

However, the KPTCL has been able to include all services under the Customer Charter successfully. The service standard have been identified & clearly classified. This is a major achievement of KPTCL. Similarly, the KSRTC has included almost all services with in the purview of Charter and has been able to standardize very effectively using the ICT. It is really a classic example worth studying how a PSU which was under loss continuously, could emerge & transform as one of the leading & continuously profit making organization. Now it is also one of the prestigious companies to own & operate fleets of high-tech & international standards winning "Golden Peacock Award" for three consecutive years. The credit need not be simply given to the Charter process, but the dynamic changes that were incorporated along with Charter initiatives. There are many such good examples to prove one point that the Citizen’s Charter if taken in the right earnest & efforts made sincerely will achieve the set task of making the services people friendly.
**The Clients/Users:**
Clients or the Users form part of the Charter. The voluntary offer of improved service by the service providers is meant for the users. The PSU's being the utility service providers have clearly identified their Clients or Users in their Charters. The people who are the users of electricity are the consumers and the KPTCL Charter is meant for them. The Commuters are the customers in case of the Charters of KSRTC. In case of the KSPCB, the Industrialists & entrepreneurs are the customers. The general public who approach the Board with some grievances also become the users to the extent that the remedies are the services provided by the Board.
Similarly, the BDA, D Devaraj Urs BC Corporation, WDC have also clearly identified their users. But do these Organizations have consulted the users at the time of formulation of the Charter? The answer is "NO"

**Standardization of Services/ Delivery of Services:**
The KPTCL has been very successful in standardizing the services and also fix up responsibilities. The Charter has listed out all services that are provided by the KPTCL & the quality of services, time frame, and procedure to avail the services in a simple language.

Similarly, the KSRTC has given wide variety of services available to the general public. The multiple choices available, accessibility, the ICT initiatives for better services and innovations are some of the special feature of this charter. The services provided include quality transportation of different level, class technology & comforts. Commuters have the choices. Grievance redress has been standardized. Reservation of Tickets which is a very important service requirement has been computerized in almost all Bus Stands. A new software called AWATAR (Any Where Any Time Advance Reservation) has been introduced to meet the reservation requirements of the travelers from where ever they are. These & other innovations are being introduced to meet the increasing demands of the commuters.

The KSPCB has standardized the services as for as the enforcement of regulatory & professional services are concerned. Different services under Regulatory Enactments have been identified and the standard has been fixed in the Charter clearly. The KSPCB has gone a step ahead showing their efficient way of delivery of services reducing the permissible days allowed for services. The Charter has really served the purpose by telling the people the standard of service, time limit & cost of service. Another important clause that is incorporated in the Charter is what services are not included & KSPCB is not responsible because these services look like the one belonged to the Board but they are covered by the ULBs.

Dr Ambedkar DC, DDBC, WDC have given only the list of services and the eligibility conditions in a table form. It is interesting to note that these corporations have made an attempt to streamline the delivery of services by simplifying the procedures. SC/ST Development
Corporation has listed all the services & given the eligible conditions, procedure to apply, Documents to be enclosed and the implementing authority in one statement. No doubt these details are required to the users but the Charter is not the right document to give all these details. The organization has every opportunity to make these announcements as & when it is required. The other problem with this practice of giving the details is that the programs keep changing as regard the eligibility, procedure etc., and it becomes difficult to incorporate all changes in the Charter. The Charter should only focus on the general application instead of specific or minute details. The details may be supplemented in the form of broachers or hand books. Even the Charter of BDA also includes these details in the table format in a very comprehensive manner.

**Grievance Redress System:**
The quality of services can be improved continuously only when difficulty faced by the user is understood by the service provider. This is possible only when there is enough scope for the user to express their grievances. Removing the barriers in the service delivery process is the only way to achieve customer satisfaction. Hence grievance redress has been given priority in the Charters. It is an inbuilt mechanism of the Charter process to include grievance redress system.

The KPTCL & the Charters of the Electrical Companies have given importance to this grievance redress titled "**Customers' Complaints- Redressal Standard**". Serving 100 lakh Customer is by any estimates is an enormous task to any organization. Unless the organization standardize the service delivery and also the grievance redress mechanism, it is difficult to meet the expectations of the customer. In fact, the KERC has Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ambudsman Regulations 2004. The Charter guides the customer as to when, how & where should they register their grievances, the person/office responsible, & Time Standard for redressal. Help Line facilities are also available in case the grievances are not redressed with in the stipulated time limits. They are aware of the ground situations & difficulties. This shows their humble approach towards making service delivery system effective.

The KSRTC & BMTC have also given priority to grievance redress for making the transport system effective. The Grievance Redress machinery has been identified. Call Centers, Enquiry Counters & Public Address System have been opened to attend to the queries of the commuters on the spot. **Interactive Voice Response System (IVRS)** is installed to attend to the calls of the public continuously. Any serious grievance pertaining to the claims & compensations are taken up for redressal trough Transport Adalats.

The Charter of BDA appeals through "**We Value Your Feedback**" & highlights the importance of the feedback that can be given 24x7 days. The PRO is designated to look into the grievances from the Customer. This is the commitment of the organization towards making services citizen friendly.
The Charters of KSPCB, KWDC & DBCDC recognizes the right of the customers and gives the addresses of the officers who are responsible to redress the grievances. KSPCB has dealt with the grievance redressal very systematically. It has identified the nature of grievance and also set its standard.

For example any complainant will get an immediate reply/ response with in ten working days. Even the e-mails are also treated as complaints and they get on line reply. Help Desks have been provided for the use of the customer & the Appellate Authority have been listed for the benefit of users

In brief, it is heartening to note that the Charters do consider redress of the Grievances of the people is very important step in making the services people friendly and also to improve the quality of services continuously.

Expectations from the Citizens: Users:
The Charters of KPTCL has a set of expectations from the Customer in the form of DO's & Dont's. Emphasizing the safety, the Charter appeals "Parents & wards have the onus of protecting the children against any hazard posed by electricity". Also another important message of saving power saying "Power is precious, the customer to follow the philosophy of 'Waste not, want not' so that the power is available to more important areas like Hospitals, Railways, Transport & the like". The Charter is also educative by giving the tips to save power. The KSPCB calls upon the Users to perform certain duties to realize the aim of the organization.

Remedies:
It is one of the important provisions in the Charter that if the organization fails to provide services as per the set standards and if the customer is put to inconveniences then he should be compensated. This is nothing but setting one self a high set of professional standard of services. Very few organizations look forward in this direction. KPTCL & KSPCB have this provision in their Charter. The organization has offered to compensate & fixed certain amount payable to the affected customer. This provision of paying the Customer for not providing the service as per the set standard is documentary proof to the customer that they value time and money. The rate of compensation is also indicated in the Schedule itself. This provision of compensating the customer also keeps the employee always alert and also enables him to provide quick relief well with in the accepted standard. It enhances the credibility of the statements made in the Charter and also the confidence the service provider. But the other Charters do not have similar provision.

Language: - It is very well settled practice among the organizations that go for Citizen's Charter that the Charters will be in the language of the Users. Naturally, the Charters in Karnataka shall be in Kannada. The Charter of KSRTC is both in Kannada & English. Where as the Charter of KSPCB/WDC/DBC are only in English. It may be observed here that the
Organizations are not aware of the language requirement of the people. In Karnataka, the Charters shall be in Kannada.

**Conclusion:** - The Citizen Charter Initiatives in Public Sector Undertakings originates during 2000-01 with two prominent PSU s like KSRTC & KPTCL. This was followed by good number of other Organizations like BWSSB, BMC& BDA. There is a trend in the circumstances precedent to the formulation of the Citizen’s Charter in all these PSUs. All of these Organizations were known for basic civic amenity services. Increasing demand for quality services from the public & correspondingly deteriorating delivery mechanisms was a big challenge to the administrators & leaders. Growing demand for improved civic amenities necessitating these PSU s to go for Citizen friendly services. The impact of LPG, participation of International Financial Agencies, the e-Government initiatives all contributed for an urgent need to improve delivery mechanisms & make public services more competent & citizen friendly. The efforts of Public Affairs Committee, Bangalore in this connection is worth mentioning.

Responding to the needs of the people and also their commitment to improve the quality of services, the officers who were heading these organizations drew up an action-plan to bring overall improvements. The KPTCL & KSRTC were bifurcated in to smaller & manageable units for efficient management & improve the quality of services. The Citizen’s Charter movement came in very much handy at a time when there was a cry for better services. The Noise of the Citizens was to be converted in to Voice in the form of Charters. It is at this crucial juncture that the Charter initiatives were taken up.

The Charters of KSRTC, KPTCL, BDA, BMC & BWSSB belonged to this first generation during 2000-02. There is a method in the formulation of the Charter. Commitment is abundant & sincerity is explicitly seen in these Charters. The Charters make the Vision of the Organizations very clear & inspiring. The Mission Statements matches to the Vision of these Charters. Followed by the Mission, the services of the Organizations are listed out in tabular form. Some of the Charters have given the accepted standard of Services that are guaranteed by the Service Providers. This exercise of identifying the services & fixing the standard is a very good move and an outcome of the Charter process. Many Organizations who were pondering over quantity of services were made to sit & think the quality & standards of services. The Charters of KSRTC, KPTCL, BMTC, KSPCB & BDA are best examples.

However, the same spirit is missing in many other Charters. It has become a mere exercise of creating a document called Citizen’s Charter. The Charters developed after 2003-04 lack the concern of the Charter requirement in as far as the Content, Process, involvement of the Stakeholder, setting the Standards, redressal of the Grievances and concern for the needs of the customers. The following are some of the important observations & findings of the study.

1. Citizen’s Charters aims at improving the quality of services as such it becomes an effective tool for good governance. To make the Charter effective:
   - *bring in efficiency in the delivery process,*
• make services open & transparent,
• involve people(Users) at every stage of decision making
• set standards, make the services cost effective, give the people the choices
• listen to the grievances of the users, provide relief
• always continue efforts to make the services citizen friendly.

These are the essence principles of making a good Charter. These features are seen more frequently in the Charters of GOI & the PSU s of GOI. However, the same spirit is missing when the message is disseminated to the States. We have seen how the Charters initiative has been taken up among the Government departments as reported in the study “Citizen’s Charters- An Empirical Study” by the same investigator.

However, there is some improvement in the process of formulation of the Charters of PSU s. The Charters developed by the major PSU s & Civic Bodies during 2000-02 had the concern for making the services citizen friendly & efficient. As a result, the Charters have adopted the most commonly accepted method. They have:

• Vision & Mission Statement,
• List of important Services, Standard, quality, time limit, cost of service,
• Grievance redress mechanism, responsible staff, availability, offices
• Remedies, Help Lines

The Best examples are the Charters of KSRTC, KPTCL, BDA, BMTC & KSPCB. Incidentally these are the organizations which have proved that they can transform show results to the expectation of the users. Citizen Charters have come in handy for these organizations to achieve excellence in public service. However, the same may not hold good in case of Charters developed afterwards. The later entrants have missed the above essential components of Charters. The deficiencies that could be seen among these Charters are:

1. Instead of Vision & Mission Statements many Charters have only statement of Objectives which do not give any direction to the Policy/Philosophy of the organization.
2. Only the services have been listed instead of listing the Standard, Quality, Time Frame, Cost & Method of Delivery. This will not give the required confidence to the user as regards the quality and other aspects of services.
3. Concern for the difficulties of the User to avail the services is not seen & efforts to redress the grievance are missing. What are the remedies if the Service Provider do not provide the assured service is very relevant to make provider accountable. If this is missing, Charters are definitely deficient.
4. The Charter document appears to be unilateral declarations and role of the stakeholders is missing.
5. Charters are in English indicating that it is not meant for the users! The Charters
6. The Charters have not been made public. Publicity given is inadequate. The Charters of KSRTC is displayed on main entry point of the Mysore Bus Stand. Only the gist of the Charter is given with out the Vision-Mission Statement. The Users will have to be given opportunity to know the contents of the Charters.

7. Many Charters have been priced. How & Why should the User buy the Charter paying money? The logic behind making available the Charter copy free will encourage the accessibility. Other wise Users may shun away from the Charter business.

8. The Revised Charter of KSRTC has drifted from the earlier accepted format and now shifted to a more simpler version of objectives, list of services which is common in any broachers & for internal circulation only. This is against to the accepted norms of the Charters concept. Good number of the Charters fall in to this category. This is the out come of monitoring failures.

9. Initiatives for ISO-9000 Chartering do not prevent the organizations to go for Charters & Citizen’s Charters definitely are supplementary to each other the.

10. The practice of developing Charters form an unconnected Out–Sourcing Agency is against to the concept & the principles of Charters. The Service Providers knows his clients/users & his needs better. It is only the Service Provider who can come out with the quality/Standard of service that he can afford to & not the out sider.

11. If the process of formulation of Charter is defective then the Charters will suffer from many deficiencies and may not give the desired results as is the case with many Charters under study.