Indicator 16.6.2 - Key Issues for Consideration by the Working Group

---

Target: 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Indicator: 16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services

---

This paper provides initial thinking around the development of the indicator metadata sheet for indicator 16.6.2 *Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services*. The paper is envisioned to be a living document, which will be further elaborated and detailed in close cooperation with the Praia Working Group accompanying the development of this indicator. The paper is organized around a few headings:

1. **Three main challenges**

Functional

a) Which services should be counted under 'public services'? Which role does public service provided by a private partner possess?

b) Which services should be prioritized for focus in terms of gender?

c) Public services at national level only or also local level (and in that case which levels)? What data can (realistically) be collected?

d) How do we span different types of services - for example those that are accessed continuously and those that are infrequently used (which impacts on our understanding of the phrase "last")?

e) Differentiate between services from very different sectors such as "soft" social services and "hard" rule of law services

f) Differentiate between services that have easily quantifiable deliverables and those that don't. This could be mitigated by accompanying the survey with a series of characteristics that the services should have in an ideal situation to guide the informants on what they should consider when determining their level of satisfaction and to assign a rating to the public services

g) In developed countries and in many developing countries, service satisfaction surveys are numerous and frequent across a range of sectors. The indicator may therefore be seen as too simple, unrealistic, redundant and adding little value

Data collection design

a) A perception survey is a complicated foundation for data collection. The inclusion of "last experience" in the indicator is problematic in that some services are regular, some are not and may have been many years ago (with answers affected by memory bias), and some citizens have never had experience with the service (e.g. judiciary service). It is therefore important to establish a reference period and control telescope effect. The use of lists or cards, along with specific characteristics of the public services, can also help respondents concentrate on their experiences

b) The survey design should make the respondents focus on their personal experience, rather than conveying a general perception that may reflect the experience of others, or media reporting on various types of mismanagement in public administration. Therefore, surveys should include questions that ensure personal use of public services from random selected respondents, and avoid proxy responses from other members of the household.

Table 1.2. **The service quality framework**

Access	Responsiveness	Reliability	Satisfaction
Affordability	Timeliness	Accuracy/competence/customer rights (possibilities to file complaints, suggestions, receive support and/or compensation	Reported satisfaction (perception)
Geographic proximity	"Match" of service to needs	Tangible function (facilities, machines, etc.)	Reported confidence/trust (perception)
Adaptations for those with disabilities	Customer service (courtesy and treatment)	Consistency/fairness	
Adaptations to different cultures (e.g. languages, etc.)	Integrated services (across delivery channels)	Security (confidentiality, safety)	
Access to electronic services (digital divide)			

Demographic

a) It is assumed that this indicator should strive for the same level of disaggregation as 7.1 and 7,2 (and other SDG indicators).

b) Disaggregation: A range of technical challenges relating to, for example, disability but more political/contentious issues relating to 'population groups'. South Africa is currently exploring new approaches and existing work addresses disaggregation issues relating to identity groups[1]

c) National vs. local level also has an impact on what disaggregation should look like

2. Relevant data collection experiences

This section lists a few existing data sets of relevance to 16.6.2, while a more comprehensive mapping is undertaken.

Further, a broad range of national-level datasets are of relevance to 16.6.2. When initially asked about the feasibility of this indicator, a range of countries has responded (see comments listed below) that they only have data for specific services (for example the police). This presumably reflects that data collection on public service satisfaction within many sectors is decentralized and thus not "owned" by NSOs. In many countries this is likely to pose a specific challenge for 16.6.2.

UNDP (OGC) is currently exploring the possibility of conducting a light survey focused on 16.6.2, 16.7.1 and 16.7.2 engaging the broadest possible group of NSOs to inform the indicator development

---

[1] OHCHR comment: *"Target groups should be identified at national level in an inclusive, participatory process, with the direct involvement of marginalised and minority groups themselves."* (The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) has made clear that identification as a member of a particular ethnic group "shall, if no justification exists to the contrary, be based upon self-identification by the individual concerned." This principle also applies to other population groups. Target groups may include persons with disabilities, ethnic groups, LGBTI persons, indigenous peoples, religious minorities, linguistic minorities, youth, older persons, or other groups under-represented in the national context.)

processes. This survey would be a good opportunity to solicit good practices relating to measuring satisfaction with public services.

OECD

The OECD has data across different sectors:

a)   Education: data on student satisfaction with their schools in the 2012 wave of the OECD program for international students assessment (PISA). Participating students were asked to report on a 4 point Likert scale about how satisfied they are with school. 60 countries were included in 2013 but not for PISA 2015 and 2018. If needed monitoring SDG16, the OECD would give consideration to the possibility of including this question in the PISA 2021 questionnaire.

b)   Healthcare: an increasing number of countries have been collecting data on both Patient-Reported-Experience-Measures (PREMs) which pertain to patients' perceptions of their health care experience such as having an opportunity to ask questions or raise concerns. PEMs measures are included in OECD (2015) based on data for 18 OECD countries collected by the Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey.
Data on satisfaction with online government services are available from Eurostat and are updated regularly. This data is collected from both general population and from users of specific e-government services such as filing online tax forms.

c)   Justice: data on users' satisfaction of judicial services and courts for European Countries are available from a Flash Barometer conducted in 2013. This survey provided comparative data from citizens with personal experiences with the justice system in their country regarding timeliness of procedures and how well informed they felt.

d)   Trustlab: Is an international programme that collects information on trust and other social norms through techniques drawn from behavioural science and experimental economics. Trustlab will be rolled out in a range of countries worldwide, covering both OECD member and non-member countries. The survey has been conducted in France in October 2016, in Korea in November 2016 and in 6 other countries over the next couple of months.
The programme is based on three modules of behavioral games, implicit association tests and traditional surveys.

The information collected is country-comparable and focuses primarily on cooperation and trust in others (generalized trust) as well as on trust in institutions. The project will feed into the ongoing OECD "Guidelines for Measuring Trust" which aim at assessing the quality of trust measures and at creating future measurement standards.

OECD Government at a Glance

OECD produces annual surveys of OECD countries on trust in government through the Gallup World Poll.

Questions in world poll:
- Percentage of people who answered "satisfied" to the question: "In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the availability of quality health care?"

- Percentage of people who answered "satisfied" to the question: "In the city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the educational system or the schools?"
- Percentage of people who answered "Yes" to the question: "In this country, do you have confidence in each of the following, or not? How about the judicial system and courts?"

The same questions are asked for "roads and highways", "availability of quality health-care", and "availability of quality education" (as well as housing). However, these questions are not asked in all countries and years, and do not distinguish between public and private providers.

The World Values Survey asks respondents in 60 countries (for the 6th Wave, 2010-2014) about confidence in institutions including the armed forces, the police, the courts, government and parliament. There are also questions on the extent to which government should take responsibility to ensure that everybody is provided for. Private sector data collectors already conduct surveys in a range of countries – Gallup's World Poll conducts representative surveys face to face in over 140 countries covering the emerging and developed world, including questions on confidence in the judicial system, in the local police, in the military and in government. Edelman's Trust Barometer breaks down questions of trust amongst a range of institutions.

SHASA- GPS
Nine countries have started to collect data using the Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance, with as many as 20 expressing interest. Questions on the Harmonised Module ask specifically about rates of access to, and trust in, the following services/institutions: public service (in general), courts of justice, police, public hospitals and clinics, public schools, tax/customs authorities, social security system, state media, Parliament, army, President, Prime Minister (where applicable), Mayor (where applicable).

The substantial SHaSA GPS experience since 2013 confirms the technical and methodological feasibility and substantive validity of the proposed survey-based indicators for indicator 16.6.2, in comparative and differentiated respects. Among twenty African countries that have committed to the GPS programme, 9 countries have already undertaken the surveys at least once, after institutionalizing the NSO role in the production of GPS statistics at country level. This has enabled the leveraging of their official mandate and legitimacy, as well as their expertise, scale of operation, training, documentation, and sustainability. Moreover, the SHAsA program has recently workshopped and then documented the country experiences in running the survey, including the challenges that have been encountered with the survey design and in the execution of the survey itself.

Since detailed questions on the GPS module ask specifically about rates of access to, and trust in, services/institutions, the GPS-SHaSA experience can thoroughly inform the development of the methodology for 16.6.2.: Questions cover respondents perceptions and experiences of public service (in general), courts of justice, police, public hospitals and clinics, public schools, tax/customs authorities, social security system, state media, Parliament, army, President, Prime Minister (where applicable), Mayor (where applicable). The analyses permit disaggregation by gender, region, income and other relevant demographic variables.

Regional Barometers
Regional Barometers (e.g. 19 countries in Africa in 2014 amongst 36 in total since the Afrobarometer process started, 10 Arab states in the Arab barometer, 18 Latin American states in the Latinobarometer, 13 Asian states with three surveys and a further five with at least one survey each) ask about experience

of accessing essential government services, including public schools, public clinics and hospitals, registration offices (birth certificate, driver's license, passport, voter's card, permits etc.), water, sanitation and electricity. Questions also ask about ease of access, including the need for bribes, gifts or favors.

South Africa
Data disaggregation:
Sub-groups are often defined by such characteristics as age, gender, ethnicity, employment status or migrant status.The target age group for measures of trust will vary with respect to the goals of the research programme. For example, in the context of research on retirement income policies, it may be appropriate to limit the target population to persons aged 65 or older. In general, however, measures of trust would usually be collected for all the adult population (aged 15 years and older). There is little literature on child trust, and currently relatively little policy demand. For this reason, issues relating to child trust (i.e. children's levels of trust) are not covered here.

One population group that may be of high policy interest, but which is not typically covered in household surveys, is people not living in private households. This group includes people living in institutions, including prisons, hospitals or residential care facilities, as well as people with no fixed residence, such as the homeless. These groups raise two issues with respect to the measurement of trust. The first problem is common to all attempts to collect statistical information on such groups – that such population groups tend to be excluded from standard household survey sample frames. This means that, at a minimum, specific data collection efforts will be required based on a sample frame designed to cover the relevant institutions. In some cases, such as for the homeless, it may be difficult to develop any statistically representative sampling approach at all.

A more significant challenge faced in the measurement of trust is that many of the people in the relevant groups may not be able to respond on their own behalf. This is particularly the case for people institutionalized for health-related reasons that affect mental functioning (including people with some mental illnesses, or with physical illnesses limiting the ability to communicate, and the very old). In these cases, it is not possible to collect information on trust from the respondent. Proxy responses, which might be appropriate for some types of data (income, marital status, age), are not valid with respect to trust.

Mexico

INEGI-Mexico applies biennially, since 2011, the National Survey on Governmental Quality and Impact (ENCIG) that provides estimates on population's satisfaction with public services at the national level, state level, and for 32 cities. Public services are divided by public goods (e.g. water provision, waste collection) public services that were used in the last 12 months (e.g. education, health services) and public proceedings made personally in the last 12 months (e.g. passport and driver's license). This survey includes specific characteristics of public services such as availability of medicines in the case of health services or timetables for public transportation, which help the respondent to remember her/his experience and provide a more accurate view of the quality and the service delivery. The survey also focus on corruption experiences arising from contact with public servants. In 2016 INEGI-Mexico also collected information from economic units on their satisfaction with public services and regulations.

Other

Freedom in the World Surveys has been conducted by the Freedom House on similar topics with comprehensive background on methodology and design.

Further, a very broad range of country-level and even subnational level service satisfaction surveys exist.

3. NSO country comments on first round of indicator survey

In February 2015, countries were asked by the UN Statistics Division to assess the feasibility, relevance and suitability of the proposed indicators. Among the comments for 16.6.2 were:

- Canada: Other governmental departments might have relevant data available.
- Denmark: Does only have data in regards to population satisfied with the police.
- Italy: Does only have data in regards to population satisfied with the police and public transportation.
- Brazil: Perception and satisfaction indicators are highly dependent on knowledge of civil rights
- Mexico: The source for this indicator is a Household Survey, however this type of survey is available in very few countries. It should also be taken into account that there are methodological differences between surveys. INEGI-Mexico produces a survey that measures this phenomenon every two years.

4. Intersection of 16.6.2 with other SDG indicators

This indicator can also be used to monitor targets and vice versa:

- 1.4 (access to basic services)
- 3.8 (access to quality, essential health-care services)
- 4.1, 4.2 and 4a (quality education, including facilities)
- 7.1 (access to affordable, reliable energy services)
- 10.2 (social inclusion)
- 11.1 (adequate housing)
- 16.3 (rule of law)

5. Praia Working Group) for 16.6.2

1.	François Roubaud	French Institute of Research for Development
2.	Ambroise ABANDA	NSO Cameroon (Institut National de la Statistique du Cameroun)
3.	Ibrahima BA	NSO Côte d'Ivore
4.	Rita Judit KELEMEN	NSO Hungary (Hungarian Central Statistical Office)
5.	Franco Barrios Adrian	NSO Mexico (INEGI)
6.	GARCIA VELAZQUEZ MARIA DEL PILAR	NSO Mexico (INEGI)
7.	Jaimes Bello Oscar	NSO Mexico (INEGI)
8.	Amadou Garba Halimatou	NSO Niger (Institut National de la Statistique du Niger)
9.	Khalid Abu Khalid	NSO Palestine (Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics)
10.	Wilma A. Guillen	NSO Philippines
11.	Isabel Schmidt	NSO South Africa
12.	Lotfi Hrizi	NSO Tunisia (Statistiques Tunisie)
13.	Nadia Touihri	NSO Tunisia (Statistiques Tunisie)
14.	Guillaume Lafortune	OECD
15.	Marco Mira D'Ercole	OECD
16.	Alexander Hamilton	UK Department for International Development (DFID)
17.	Sara Duerto Valero	UN Women
18.	Jairo Acuna-Alfaro	UNDP
19.	Allen Beck	US Department of Justice - Bureau of Justice Statistics