A Review of National Statistics Offices' Practices and Methodological Considerations in Measuring Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services

Inputs for SDG Indicator 16.6.2 Measurement Methodology

UNDP Oslo Governance Centre
November 2017

Table of Contents

Annexes are in a separate document

Acknowledgements

This report has been commissioned by the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre, with research undertaken by Do Thanh Huyen[1], Policy Analyst from UNDP VietNam, under the supervision and guidance of Alexandra Wilde, Senior Research and Policy Advisor, UNDP Oslo Governance Centre.

We are grateful to interlocutors from national statistics offices and relevant government agencies in participating countries, including Cameroon, Germany, Georgia, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, South Africa, Tunisia and Viet Nam, for their insightful comments and suggestions during the research. Information about Pakistan's current practices in household surveys that capture citizens' satisfaction with their experiences in using public service facilities came from Aroub Farooq, Development Policy Unit, UNDP Pakistan.

We are grateful also to OECD colleagues, El-Iza Mohamedou, Guilaume Lafortune and Santiago Gonzalez for their expert inputs into this study and to Edmund J. Malesky from Duke University, Ellen Lust from the University of Gothenburg, Nick Thijs from European Institute of Public Administration, Paul J. Schuler from the University of Arizona, and Pierre Landry from Chinese Hong Kong University for their advice and guidance on methodological considerations. We appreciate also the relevant literature shared by World Bank Group colleagues, in particular Hana Brixi and Sanjay Agarwal.

Finally, we acknowledge the useful feedback on the initial draft of the report from Max Everest-Phillips, Director of UNDP's Global Centre for Public Service Excellence; Marie Laberge, expert UNDP consultant on SDG 16 measurement and from UNDP colleagues, Jairo Acuna-Alfaro, Serge Kapto and Bouazza Bouchkhar from UNDP's Strategic Policy Unit in the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support.

---

[1] Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this report are entirely those of the researcher and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre.

Executive Summary

This study has been conducted by UNDP to inform recommendations for how all statistical offices globally should produce statistics for the SDG 16.6.2 indicator "Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services". While there is significant experience with measuring citizen satisfaction with public services, indicator SDG 16.6.2 has been categorised by the IAEG-SDGs as a tier 3 indicator (lacking an internationally agreed methodology). This is because the indicator lacks specificity, including on what is a "public service", what is meant by "satisfaction", how "the last experience of public services" is defined, and how to capture these aspects so that the indicator reflects citizen voices and experience.

This study examines the potential for a common approach to measuring SDG 16.6.2 by documenting current practices of country-led citizen satisfaction surveys and/or national household/living standard surveys that are being conducted, how these examples have addressed the issues of defining public services that are included in the surveys and reviewing advantages and disadvantages of different survey methods. The study also examines how existing practices have integrated the "leaving no-one behind" principle, an important ambition of Agenda 2030.

The study was undertaken with two key outputs in focus:

1. **Mapping of current surveying practices by national statistics offices and relevant government agencies.** This was done through a survey and follow up interviews of statistical offices in selected countries, including Cameroon, Germany, Georgia, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Tunisia and Viet Nam.

    In particular, the study focuses on existing practices across the following areas:

    (i) scoping of sectors/categories of public services included in national household surveys and/or citizen satisfaction surveys;

    (ii) question formulation, i.e. how questions have been formulated to ask citizens about their satisfaction with public services;

    (iii) response modalities i.e. how scales of satisfaction have been designed; and

    (iv) survey implementation issues, i.e. how the population for satisfaction surveys has been drawn, sampling methods, frequency of surveys, etc.). It also collects suggestions from the interlocutors on those matters to inform a more consistent, systematic approach to SDG 16.6.2 indicator measurement for countries to adopt and gauge this indicator.

2. **Review of methodological considerations stemming from the existing practices,** drawing on experts in the research community, focusing on the advantages and disadvantages of different survey methods and approaches being adopted in different citizen satisfaction surveys. The review focuses in particular on the pros and cons of measuring satisfaction through asking specific attribute questions before or after an overall satisfaction question; on using experience-based or perception-based questions in surveys; and on response formats in citizen satisfaction survey questionnaires.

Findings from the mapping exercise show **large variability** in the ways national statistics offices and government agencies in selected countries **collect data** on citizen satisfaction with public services. This variety potentially poses a great challenge for global efforts to create a useful and consistent metadata for cross-country comparison.

The **scope** of public services being covered in country-led citizen national household surveys run by national statistics offices also **varies greatly** from one country to another. Cameroon, Germany, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan and Tunisia cover a wide range of sectors in their national household surveys, while the Viet Nam

statistics office (despite the richness in government and non-government data available in the country) has not yet included a question about citizen satisfaction in its living standard surveys[2]. Some countries (the Philippines and South Africa) narrow down to a small number of services. Some others (Latvia and Norway) have chosen to focus on the performance of government/public institutions rather than sectors.

The review of the scope of selected countries' public service surveys shows that the **most common sectors** covered by both national household surveys and citizen satisfaction surveys include:
- *health, education, water, social welfare, electricity and transport*. Among these, *health and education* are the most recurrent sectors. *Water* is the second most frequently surveyed sector, and then *electricity*;
- *civil registration* (public proceedings, administrative procedures, citizen service centres); and,
- *justice services* (including law and order, courts, police, personal registry services)

There is wide variation across the 13 selected countries in terms of approaches to **question formulation** and **response modalities.** Differences are found in the approaches to understanding users' experiences vs. users' perceptions, including the use of questions on users' satisfaction (with some countries providing attributes of satisfaction first and overall satisfaction as a follow-up, and others flipping the order, or just asking about overall satisfaction). Furthermore, some countries specify satisfaction attributes relevant for each sector while others (e.g. Cameroon, Pakistan and Latvia) apply exactly the same questions for all public services.

Response modalities in terms of formats and scales also vary across different citizen satisfaction surveys. Some (e.g. Norway and Germany) apply numeric rating scales while others use narrative scales. Tunisia provides four levels of satisfaction, while Cameroon, Germany, Mexico and South Africa apply five or more than five levels of satisfaction. The labelling of levels of satisfaction also differs greatly, with some (like Cameroon) using unipolar scaling while others (like Mexico, the Philippines and Pakistan) using bipolar scaling, but with different scale points.

The **frequency** of satisfaction surveys differs greatly from one country to the other: annual (Latvia and South Africa), biennial (Germany, Mexico, Norway and Pakistan), every three years (Tunisia), every five years (Philippines), every seven years (Cameroon), and ad-hoc (Kenya).

Survey samples also are diverse, with most countries surveying people from the age of 18 years, while Germany surveys people from the age of 15 years. Funding for surveys and national policy priorities are the top factors influencing **survey implementation** in the selected countries.

Based on a review of concerns and suggestions from interlocutors from selected countries, this study also presents a detailed assessment of **advantages and disadvantages of different survey methods** under consideration and suggests options for a harmonized and systematic methodology to ensure consistent and internationally comparable reporting on SDG 16.6.2.

---

[2] The experience of Viet Nam is included in this study not because of the surveying practices of the National Statistics Office, but rather because of the internationally renowned Viet Nam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI), published annually since 2009, which provides extensive coverage of citizen experiences and satisfaction with public services. The philosophy behind PAPI's monitoring approach is that citizens are seen as "end-users of public administrative services" capable of assessing governance and public administration in their localities. The PAPI is primarily led by a research outfit (the Centre for Community Support Development Studies – CECODES) in close collaboration with the Viet Nam Fatherland Front (an umbrella group of mass movements in Vietnam aligned with the Communist Party of Vietnam) and UNDP. See Annex 1.13 for more information on the PAPI.

A review of the 232 global SDG indicators was undertaken to understand which indicators already cover aspects of satisfaction and the prioritised sectors of the selected country interlocutors were considered. As a result, this study recommends that SDG indicator 16.6.2 focus on the following four public service areas:

1. **Healthcare: Quality of primary healthcare services (health clinics and healthcare centres)**
2. **Education: Quality of primary and lower secondary education services**
3. **Civil Registration: Birth registration, identity documents**
4. **Justice Services: Quality of services to resolve civil, administrative and commercial disputes**

The table below elaborates specific dimensions and attributes for understanding and measuring the quality of public services which this study recommends to apply across the above public services.

Dimensions	Criteria	Possible Specific Attributes
Access	- Affordability - Geographical proximity - Access to information	- fees/charges are reasonable - distance from home reasonable - information about fees, procedures, processes made available for users to obtain before coming to or at the service premises
Responsiveness and fairness	- Courtesy and treatment - Timeliness	- staff was courteous and professional - staff's attitude was nice - staff's behaviour was fair/impartial - timeliness of service
Tangibles	- Appearance of physical facilities, equipment - Appearance of personnel - Available communication materials	- availability of equipment - availability of staff - publicised standard operation procedures, processes
Inclusivity	- Match of services to special needs	- accessibility for the disabled, the elderly, the illiterate, ethnic minorities using different languages (from users' observation when using public services), gender sensitivity, etc.
Satisfaction	Overall satisfaction	- satisfaction upon rating above specific attributes

This paper provides sample questions for each service area and across each of the quality dimensions and attributes.

Background

UNDP, through its Oslo Governance Centre (OGC), is coordinating the methodological development of three global "tier 3"[3] SDG 16 indicators. The three indicators are:

- 16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services
- 16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions
- 16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group

While the indicators share some commonalities in their focus on state-society relations, they vary significantly with regards to definitional clarity, the availability of data, the type of data needed for monitoring (administrative, survey etc.), the complexity of what needs to be measured and the potential political sensitivities around the indicator. An Expert Group Meeting of statisticians and governance experts was convened on 9-10 May 2017 by the OGC to further advance development of the three indicators with a view to submitting a final definition and metadata sheet to the Statistical Commission through the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics[4] and the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) by the end of 2017. At the May Meeting, several issues and areas for additional research were identified across the 3 indicators, including for SDG 16.6.2.[5]

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

Measuring satisfaction with public goods and services is at the heart of a people-centric approach to service delivery and an important outcome indicator of overall government performance. Perception data are commonly used to evaluate citizens' experiences with government organizations and obtain their views on the outputs received. Such information can help public managers identify which elements of service delivery drive satisfaction, as well as monitor the impact of reforms on end-users. Measuring citizen satisfaction is also a means of allowing policy makers and managers to better understand their customer base, helping to identify sub-groups of users and needs or gaps in accessibility.

While there is significant experience with measuring citizen satisfaction with public services, this is not being done in the same way across countries. The global indicator SDG 16.6.2 lacks specificity on what a "public service" is and on what is meant by "satisfaction". The May 2017 Expert Group Meeting

---

[3] To facilitate the implementation of the global indicator framework, all indicators are classified by the IAEG-SDGs into three tiers on the basis of their level of methodological development and the availability of data at the global level, as follows: **Tier 1:** Indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards are available, and data are regularly produced by countries for at least 50 per cent of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant; **Tier 2:** Indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards are available, but data are not regularly produced by countries; **Tier 3:** No internationally established methodology or standards are yet available for the indicator, but methodology/standards are being (or will be) developed or tested.

[4] https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/citygroups/praia.cshtml

[5] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/norway/undp-ogc/documents/Final%20expert%20group%20meeting%20report.pdf

recommended that **a core set of services be identified for all countries**, that there should be **a focus on "services of consequence"** (e.g. health, education, housing, social services, police, courts) and **that a gender perspective be applied** in the determination of core services "of consequence", for men's needs may be different than those of women. The Expert Group Meeting noted the need to narrow down a limited set of public services that are **universally salient,** i.e. as much as possible **for all countries and within countries (rural and urban populations)**. The expert group meeting identified **several areas of research** to inform recommendations for how national statistical offices should produce statistics for the indicator including the need to **undertake a mapping of national surveying practices to document sectors of focus, categories of services examined, use of quality attributes in survey questions, types of response scales, etc. This study was undertaken to respond to these research gaps.**

Methodology for study

The study focused on two outputs:

1) **Mapping of current NSO surveying practices:** The mapping was based on a review of survey practices of 13 selected National Statistics Offices including Cameroon, Germany, Georgia, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Tunisia and Viet Nam in measuring satisfaction with public services.

The NSOs included in the study were selected on the basis of the following criteria:
- Useful experience to share and existing collaboration, based on a UNDP survey of NSO experience in producing statistics for SDG 16.6.2; 16.7.1 and 16.7.2 carried out in March – April 2017 to inform the first Expert Group Meeting. The NSOs surveyed were predominantly members of the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics.
- Global representation i.e. at least one NSO from each one of the five UN member states regions (Arab States; Asia Pacific; Africa; Latin America and the Caribbeans and Europe)

The mapping exercise focused on:
- *Scope:* sectors/categories of services included (some of particular relevance to urban vs. rural areas, sectors/services of particular relevance from a gender perspective, etc.)
- *Question formulation:* questions tailored to each service vs. same questions asked for all services; use of service-specific 'attributes' to guide respondents in their assessment of the quality of service provision (e.g. affordability, geographical proximity, professionalism of employees, etc.); hierarchy/ordering of questions; focus on 'last experience' or 'service provision in general', etc.
- *Response modalities:* numerical vs. narrative response scales, larger vs. smaller response scales (0-10, 0-7 or 1-4), etc.
- *Survey implementation issues:* who is the respondent (an individual or an individual representing the household), frequency of survey (higher/lower frequency depending on sectors/services), etc.

2) **Reviewing evidence and compiling key findings and lessons learned from existing research on the measurement of public satisfaction with public service provision, as well as from the broader literature on attitudinal questions**. The research examined the following aspects:

- *Advantages and disadvantages of providing respondents with a list of service-specific 'attributes' to guide their assessment of the quality of service provision*. The research also looked at how to minimize cultural influences/influences of varying expectations and explored the usefulness of

applying a 'staged approach', i.e. first asking respondents about their general satisfaction with service provision, then asking follow-up questions with explicit references to specific quality attributes of a given service.

- *Advantages and disadvantages of measuring users' perceptions of public service provision vs. asking about users' personal experience of services*. The research also sought to understand if those who do not personally use public services due to different barriers (disability, ethnic languages, old age, etc.) will be excluded from being heard.

- *Advantages and disadvantages of various response formats*, including (a) scale length, (b) scale labelling, and (c) response order.

The study is based on substantive inputs from interlocutors from selected NSOs and experts in the field of governance measurement and public surveys. It also draws on recent literature produced by the OECD and others which are documented in the bibliography of this report.

The review was done through a survey and follow up interviews of SDG 16.6.2-informed statisticians from participating NSOs and relevant government agencies between the period of 11 September to 13 October 2017. The interlocutors are practitioners in the field in their respective countries, with a solid understanding of what is technically feasible and reliable in the measurement of SDG indicator 16.6.2. See Annex 1 for detailed country inputs captured in the Interview Questionnaire.

This study looks at **the scope of public services** covered in:
   (i)   National household surveys run by national statistics offices (NSOs), and
   (ii)   Sectoral citizen satisfaction surveys run by government agencies in the selected countries.

Scope of the indicator

SDG indicator 16.6.2 does not specify what a "public service" is. Experiences and feedback from selected countries suggest that "public services" are understood in broad terms, as some services may be delivered by a private provider but funded by the state and will still be considered public services.

The emphasis placed on "the last experience" of users of public services in indicator 16.6.2 may be problematic in that some services are regularly provided while others are not. For less frequently used services, the "last" use of a public service may be many years ago, and responses risk being affected by recall bias and memory factors. This may be the case for justice services, for instance, which may never have been used by some (if not many) citizens in their lifetime.

The Praia Group recommended that the same "core services" (limited to a maximum of six) be measured by all countries, and that there be a focus on "services of consequence" (e.g. health, education, housing, social services, police, courts). Moreover, a gender perspective should be applied in the determination of core services, because services needed by men may be different from those needed by women.

This section explores definitions of "public services" and takes stock of how public service provision is already being measured across the SDG indicator framework.

Definition of 'Public Services'

States have a human rights obligation to deliver a variety of services to their populations: "The provision of these services is essential to the protection of human rights such as the right to housing, health, education and food."[6] The role of the public sector as service provider or regulator of the private provision of services is crucial for the realization of all human rights, particularly social and economic rights[7]. As stated by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, "Regardless of whether services are privatized or not, there must be careful monitoring in place for quality control of each service. […] The public service ethos should attach to the public service, not the status of the service provider."[8]

The human rights framework provides an important set of standards for measuring how well public service is designed and delivered and whether the benefits reach all rights-holders, including persons who are vulnerable and marginalized or whose access is hampered by poverty, disability or other forms of exclusion.

Social rights include the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to health, the right to water and sanitation, the right to food, the right to housing, and the right to education. For instance:

- The human right to water entitles everyone to sufficient, safe, acceptable, physically accessible and affordable water for personal and domestic uses.[9]
- The right to health extends to food and nutrition, housing, access to safe and potable water and adequate sanitation, safe and healthy working conditions as well as a healthy environment.[10] The availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of health-related services should be facilitated and controlled by States. This duty extends to a variety of health-related services ranging from controlling the spread of infectious diseases to ensuring maternal health and adequate facilities for children.
- The right to education is both a human right in itself and an indispensable means of realizing other human rights.[11] Whether education is provided publically or privately, States should adopt a human rights approach to ensure that it is of an adequate standard and does not exclude any child on the basis of race, religion, geographical location or any other defining characteristic.

For illustrative purposes, Table 1 below consolidates a selection of definitions of 'public services', 'basic services' or related terms used by international, regional and national institutions and/or jurisdictions.

---

[6] Good Governance Practices for the Protection of Human Rights (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.07.XIV.10), p. 38.

[7] Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the role of the public service as an essential component of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights, Human Rights Council, 25th Session, 23 December 2013, A/HRC/25/27

[8] Ibid.

[9] Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 15 (2012) on the right to water, para. 2.

[10] Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 14 (2000) on the right to the highest attainable standard of health, para. 4.

[11] Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 13 (1999) on the right to education, para. 1.

Table 1: Definitions of public services

Terms	Definitions	Sources
Basic Social Services for All (BSSA)	Six key BSSA areas include: population, primary healthcare, nutrition, basic education, drinking water and sanitation, shelter.	UN's Wall Chart on Basic Social Services for All (BSSA), 1997
Public Service	"The concept of public service is a twofold one: it embraces both the bodies providing services and the services of general-interest they provide. Public service obligations may be imposed by the public authorities on the body providing a service (airlines, road or rail carriers, energy producers and so on), either nationally or regionally. Incidentally, the concept of the public service and the concept of the public sector (including the civil service) are often wrongfully confused; they differ in terms of function, status, ownership and 'clientele'."	European Union Law's Glossary
Service of General Interest	Services that public authorities of the Member States clarify as being of general interest and, therefore, subject to specific public service obligations.	European Commission's 2011 communication regarding 'A Quality Framework for Services of General Interest in Europe', p. 3
Collective Service	Services provided by general government that benefit the community.	OECD's glossary of statistical terms
Public services	Public services means all services provided by government and includes central and local government services, tertiary institutions, schools and hospitals.	Kiwis Count Survey, New Zealand, 2017
Public service	Any service or public-interest activity that is under the authority of the government administration	African Charter on Values and Principles of Public Service and Administration, African Union, 2011
Basic public services	Services that the State provides without a need for the citizen to make a petition or to carry out a process to obtain them whenever it requires them.	National Survey of Quality and Governmental Impact (ENCIG) 2013, Mexico

'Public Services' Across the SDGs

Public service provision is addressed across several SDGs. It is thus important to review all SDGs and to take stock of what is already being measured and what is not yet measured in other SDGs. Amongst SDG indicators assessing various aspects of public service provision, indicator 1.4.1 has particular relevance to indicator 16.6.2, which measures the "proportion of population living in households with access to basic services."

SDG indicator 1.4.1 is classified as a 'tier III' indicator and a workplan has been submitted by the custodial agency responsible for this indicator – UN-Habitat. Recent expert discussions on the development of this indicator have agreed on the following[12]:

- **Basic services:** Refer to public service provision systems that meet human basic needs and contribute directly to povery eradication (since this indicator falls under Goal 1), rather than looking at public services in general (e.g. access to telecommunications rather than 24/7 broadband internet) including:
  - Drinking water
  - Sanitation and hygiene
  - Energy
  - Mobility and transportation
  - Waste collection
  - Healthcare
  - Education
  - Information technologies
- **Data sources:** Expert discussions on 1.4.1 have agreed that this indicator will draw from readily available indicators – from SDG global indicators but other from other widely available indicators (e.g. UNESCO indicators on education). The intention is to spare NSOs from additional data collection work for this indicator, and to make 1.4.1 a sort of a 'dashboard' bringing together other relevant existing indicators – so that 1.4.1 becomes a 'one-stop-shop' platform on basic service provision indicators. The below table compiles relevant SDG indicators that have already been identified as possible sources for 1.4.1:

Access to	Related SDG indicators
Safely managed drinking water services	6.1.1 Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services
Safely managed sanitation services	6.2.1 Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water
Waste collection *(Looking for other survey-based indicator)*	11.6.1 Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated, by cities
Mobility and transport	9.1.1 Proportion of the rural population who live within 2 km of an all-season road 11.2.1 Proportion of population that has convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and persons with disabilities
Modern energy	7.1.1 Percentage of population with access to electricity 7.1.2 Percentage of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology
Information and Communication Technology	5.b.1 Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex 9.c.1 Proportion of population covered by a mobile network, by technology

---

[12] Information obtained from discussions held with UN-Habitat focal points on indicator 1.4.1, as well as documentations shared on latest EGM on 1.4.1 (November 2017).

Access to	Related SDG indicators
Education *(Looking for other survey-based indicator)*	4.1.1 Percentage of children/young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics.
Healthcare *(Looking for other survey-based indicator)*	4.a.1 Proportion of schools with access to basic educational facilities like electricity; the Internet for pedagogical purposes; computers for pedagogical purposes; adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities, etc. 4.c.1. Proportion of teachers at different level of education having received at least the minimum organized teacher training (e.g. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service

- **Access to basic services:** Expert discussions on 1.4.1 have concluded that the initially broad definition of 'access' used for this indicator ("'access' implies that sufficient and affordable service is reliably available with adequate quality") will have to be simplified to match the more limited dimensions measured by existing indicators (i.e. mainly physical access). On the basis of existing definitions of 'access' underpinning existing global indicators, 'access' will be defined differently for each service: for some sectors (e.g. water and sanitation), definitions already take into account 'quality' dimensions, but this is not the case across all services listed above. This approach confirms the value-added of 16.6.2 in measuring additional dimensions of quality, fairness, etc.

Table 3a lists other SDG indicators related to public service provision. These indicators need to be distinguished from very many other SDG indicators measuring development outcomes *enabled by* public service provision, but which do not say anything about people's actual access to or experience of public services (e.g. 3.1.2 "Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel" as an outcome indicator vs. 3.8.1 "Coverage of essential health services" as a service-provision-related indicator).

Table 3a pays particular attention to two aspects of service-provision-related SDG indicators that are of particular relevance to indicator 16.6.2, namely their data source (i.e. whether they are measured using citizen surveys or other sources) and the aspects of service provision they focus on (e.g. access, equity, etc.)

Three key observations can be derived from a review of table 3a:

1) When indicators are measured from household surveys, they almost always measure only 'access' to public services (e.g. 7.1.1. "Proportion of population with access to electricity")
2) When indicators draw from administrative sources, they measure mainly national coverage of service provision or the functionality of 'tangibles' – i.e. the appearance/functionality of physical facilities and equipment (e.g. 4.a.1 proportion of schools with access to electricity, internet, computers, etc.)
3) Other dimensions of public service provision, such as responsivenss, fairness and inclusivity, are not addressed by existing public-service-related indicators across the SDG framework.

Table 3a: Measurement of public service provision across the SDG framework

Categories of public services	Relevant SDG indicators	Data sources (from SDG metadata or Tier III indicator workplan)	Aspects of service provision covered in these indicators
1. **Basic services (in general)**	*1.4.1 "Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services"*	*Tier III indicator workplan:* • Routine national surveys and surveys of service providers • Additional data obtained directly from country/ local government databases/websites. • Satellite images and remote sensing	Access
2. **Social protection services**	*1.3.1 "Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by…"*	ILO Social Security Inquiry database (in-country administrative data sources)	Access
3. **Land registration services**	*1.4.2 "Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure"*	*Tier III indicator workplan:* from household surveys and administrative data from registries and cadasters	Access to land registration services People's perception of how secure their tenure rights are
	5.a.1 (a) "Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex"; and (b) "share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure"	*Tier III indicator workplan:* from household surveys	Equal access by men and women to various types of tenure rights / various types of ownership of agricultural land
4. **Health services**	*3.8.1 "Coverage of essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases*	*Tier III indicator workplan:* In general, values for tracer indicators are computed from national population-based survey data (e.g., coverage of family planning and improved water and sanitation), as well as administrative data that countries report to WHO (e.g., immunization coverage, HIV	Access by all

14

Categories of public services	Relevant SDG indicators	Data sources (from SDG metadata or Tier III indicator workplan)	Aspects of service provision covered in these indicators
	and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population)"	and TB treatment coverage, and health workforce density).	
	3.5.1 "Coverage of treatment interventions (pharmacological, psychosocial and rehabilitation and aftercare services) for substance use disorders"	*Tier III indicator workplan:* Global and regional surveys (from WHO, UNODC) addressed to governmental entities or focal points designated by the governments.	Coverage of treatment interventions across national territory
	3.b.1 "Proportion of the population with access to affordable medicines and vaccines on a sustainable basis"	Administrative records	Access to medicines and vaccines Affordability
5. **Education services**	*4.a.1 "Proportion of schools with access to: (a) electricity; (b) the Internet for pedagogical purposes; (c) computers for pedagogical purposes; (d) adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities; (e) basic drinking water; (f) single-sex basic sanitation facilities; and (g) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)"*	Administrative data from schools and other providers of education or training.	Availability of quality education facilities across national territory
	4.c.1 "Proportion of teachers in: (a) pre-primary; (b) primary; (c) lower secondary; and (d) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher training (e.g. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the	Administrative data from schools and other organized learning centres.	Availability of qualified teachers

Categories of public services	Relevant SDG indicators	Data sources (from SDG metadata or Tier III indicator workplan)	Aspects of service provision covered in these indicators
	relevant level in a given country"		
6. Water and sanitation	*6.1.1 "Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services"*	Mainly from household surveys and censuses compiled in database of the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)	Availability and quality of water at the household level[13]
	6.2.1 "Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water"	Mainly from household surveys and censuses compiled in database of the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP)	Availability and quality of 'safely managed' sanitation services[14]
7. Energy services	*7.1.1 "Proportion of population with access to electricity"*	From household surveys compiled by the World Bank in a metadatabase of statistics on electricity access harvested from the full global body of household surveys (World Bank Electrification Database)	Access[15]

[13] Drinking water services will be disaggregated by service level (including surface water (i.e. no services), unimproved, limited, basic, and safely managed services) following the JMP drinking water ladder. The JMP definition of Access to Basic Drinking Water Services is the following: "drinking water from an improved source is available with collection time not more than 30 minutes for a round trip, including queuing. Improved sources include: piped water, boreholes or tubewells, protected dug wells, protected springs, and packaged or delivered water."

[14] Sanitation services will be disaggregated by service level (including open defecation (i.e. no services), unimproved, limited, basic, and safely managed services) following the JMP sanitation ladder. 'Safely managed sanitation services' are defined by the JMP as "services obtained from improved sanitation facilities that are not shared with other households. Improved facilities include flush/pour flush to piped sewer systems, septic tanks or pit latrines; ventilated improved pit latrines, composting toilets or pit latrines with slabs." 'Access to Basic Hygiene Facilities' is defined by the JMP as "availability of a handwashing facility on premises with soap and water. Handwashing facilities may be fixed or mobile and include a sink with tap water, buckets with taps, tippy-taps, and jugs or basins designated for handwashing. Soap includes bar soap, liquid soap, powder detergent, and soapy water but does not include ash, soil, sand or other handwashing agents."

[15] Aims to get more disaggregated information over time regarding the type of electricity supply (grid or off-grid), the capacity of electricity supply provided (in Watts), the duration of service (daily hours and evening hours), the reliability of service (in terms of number and length of unplanned service interruptions), the quality of service (in terms of voltage fluctuations), as well as affordability and legality of service.

Categories of public services	Relevant SDG indicators	Data sources (from SDG metadata or Tier III indicator workplan)	Aspects of service provision covered in these indicators
	7.1.2 *"Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology"*	From household surveys compiled by the WHO in a database of statistics on access to clean and polluting fuels and technologies	Access to types of primary fuels and technologies used for cooking, heating, and lighting
8. **Infrastructure & public transport**	9.1.1 *"Proportion of the rural population who live within 2 km of an all-season road"*	*Tier III indicator workplan:* Satellite images, remote sensing, Line ministries and Road Agencies are consulted to obtain (georeferenced) information on road conditions	Access by rural populations
	9.c.1 *"Proportion of population covered by a mobile network, by technology"*	Administrative data collected by ITU through an annual questionnaire from national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers.	Access to a mobile-cellular signal, irrespective of whether or not people are mobile phone subscribers or users.
	11.2.1 *"Proportion of population that has convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and persons with disabilities"*	*Tier III indicator workplan N/A*	Access
	11.1.1 "Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing"	Household surveys[16]	Access for all to adequate housing

---

[16] Data for the slum and informal settlement components of the indicator can be computed from Census and national household surveys, including DHS and MICS. Data for the inadequate housing component can be computed by using income and expenditure household surveys that capture household expenditures.

Finally, two service-provision-related indicators can be found under Goal 16, as shown in Table 3b:

Table 3b: Measurement of public service provision across the SDG framework

Categories of public services covered in SDG 16	Relevant SDG indicators	Data sources (from SDG metadata repository or Tier III indicator workplan)	Aspects of service provision covered in the indicators
1. **Justice services**	16.3.1 *"Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms"*	Tier III indicator; workplan not available	Partly/indirectly measuring access (but reporting rate influenced by several other factors beyond accessibility to justice service providers, including for instance trust in justice providers)
	Possible additional indicators identified by IAEG for future consideration[17]: *Access to civil justice*	No workplan yet	Access
2. **Registration services**	16.9.1 *"Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age"*	National vital registration systems where they are operational, and censuses, household surveys such as MICS and DHS in the absence of reliable administrative data	Access (albeit indirectly – not asking people directly)

Scope of public services covered in national household surveys reviewed by this study

The **scope,** in terms of which *public services* are covered in country-led citizen *national household surveys,* **varies greatly** from one country to another.

Cameroon, Germany, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan and Tunisia cover a wide range of sectors in their national household surveys run by *national statistics offices*, while the Viet Nam statistics office (despite the richness in government and non-government data available in the country) has not yet included a question about citizen satisfaction in its living standard surveys.

Some countries narrow down to a small number of services:
- The Philippines covers citizen satisfaction with healthcare services;
- South Africa covers health services, water supply and electricity supply in regular national household surveys, with other sectors added to topical modules periodically attached to national household surveys, based on national policy priorities.

---

[17] UN Statistical Commission, 48th Session, Report of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators

- Tunisia primarily focuses on police services, education and healthcare because these sectors were identified as national priorities by the government, which was consulted during survey design
- In Germany, the focus is on administrative services for public proceedings, including vehicle registration, birth of a child, death of a family member, and social welfare (poverty in old age, support for disability)

Meanwhile, other countries adopt a more comprehensive approach, such as Pakistan's Social and Living Standards Measurement Survey which covers about 12 different public service providers and facilities, among which are basic healthcare units, schools, agricultural expansion facilities, police, roads, drinking water and police.

Other countries still have chosen to focus on the ***performance of government/public institutions*** rather than on specific sectors:
- Latvia and Norway have focused on measuring citizen satisfaction with their last interaction with public institutions and service providers, and both countries take users' and non-users' perspectives into account.
- In Latvia, for instance, the Citizen Satisfaction with Public Administration Institutions Surveys asks about citizens' satisfactions with experiences of public administration institutions (not with public services) over a period of three years to examine how public administration institutions comply with good governance principles. Latvia's NSO works closely with relevant government agencies in their development of citizen satisfaction surveys.
- In Norway, the Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services Survey being carried out by the Agency for Public Management and eGovernment (DIFI) on a biennial basis surveys both public institutions and public services.

Upon reviewing inputs from national interlocutors, and OECD's *Government at a Glance* reports in 2015 and 2017, we find that the ***most common sectors*** being covered in both national household surveys and citizen satisfaction surveys include:
- *health, education, water, social welfare, electricity and transport*. Among these, *health and education* are the most recurrent sectors. *Water* is the second most frequently surveyed sector, and then *electricity*;
- *civil registration* (public proceedings, administrative procedures, citizen service centres); and,
- *justice services* (including law and order, courts, police, personal registry). For OECD, *justice services*, which include civil, administrative and commercial justice, have been defined as a focused area for measurement of government performance in member countries, although data gaps remain a challenge (see Annex 1.14).

Suggested priority public services by interlocutors from selected countries

Interlocutors engaged in this study were asked to list what they consider to be 'priority public services' for inclusion in the core set of services for SDG 16.6.2. Table 4 lists their responses.

Table 4. Suggestions by study interlocutors of 'priority public services' to be measured by SDG 16.6.2

Country	Public Services	Criteria for Assessment	Data Sources	Frequency
Cameroon	• Education • Health • Security (Police) • Justice • Land services • Customs • City Council Civil Status • Public transport • Water supply	• Proximity, • Utilization, • Accessibility • Satisfaction	Cameroon Household Survey (ECAM)	Every 5 years
Germany	• Mass procedures involved in situations such as vehicle registration, moving houses and tax declarations • Services concerning social difficulties such as applications for social benefits • Services relevant for corruption prevention in businesses, e.g. construction or tendering processes	• Access • Tangibles • Responsiveness • Empathy • Assurance Followed by a **question on the overall satisfaction with the public authority**.	Federal Statistical Office of Germany (Destatis)'s **surveys on interactions between public administration and citizens and companies** (on behalf of the Federal Government)	Biennial
Kenya	• Personal registration (e.g. identification cards) • Health Sector • Police • Judiciary • Land sector • Public Prosecution • Anti-Corruption • Water sector • Electricity agency • Transport sector	• General satisfaction • Sector-based attributes	[No programmed surveys yet; mostly donor-led surveys]	Ad-hoc
Latvia	• Tax revenues • Social security • Employment • Citizen migration	• Performance of service centres	Citizen Satisfaction with Public Institutions Surveys	Annual

Country	Public Services	Criteria for Assessment	Data Sources	Frequency
	• Rural support • Emergency health service • Police • E-services (on administrative services)	• Confidence of users in service providers	Citizen Satisfaction with E-Services	
Mexico	• Potable water • Drainage and Sewage Systems • Waste disposal • Public Education Services • Public Healthcare Services • Electricity • Public Transportation	• Access • Responsiveness • Reliability • Tangibles • Assurance • Empathy	National Surveys on Governmental Quality and Impact	Biennial
New Zealand	• As wide a range as possible	• Service quality	National Surveys	Continuously
Norway	• Education • Healthcare • Police • Judiciary services (courts) • Law and order • Welfare	• Quality, • Accessibility • Benefit • Transparency • Corruption	National Surveys on Citizen Satisfaction with Services	Biennial
Philippines	• Healthcare (satisfaction on confinement to hospitals/clinics) • Payment of taxes and other duties; • Justice (filing a complaint…, going to the fiscal's office…, going to court in connection with cases); • Social services; • Securing registry, permits and other licenses	• Overall satisfaction • If 'dissatisfied', reasons for dissatisfaction are listed for further elaboration (criteria including responsiveness, empathy, tangibles, assurance, reliability)	Healthcare data in National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) Potentially from Citizen Satisfaction Index Survey if CSIS can be sustained by DILG. If not, Annual Poverty Indicators Survey can take on.	Every 5 years for NDHS
South Africa	• Water • Education • Health • Documentation (civil registration like birth certificates and identity documents)	• Access • Assurance/Functionality • Responsiveness • Effectiveness • Reliability	General Household Surveys (that collect data annually for now)	Biennial (suggested)
Tunisia	• Health • Education	• Satisfaction • Sector-based attributes (based	National Survey on Perception of Citizens of	Every 3 years (between two

Country	Public Services	Criteria for Assessment	Data Sources	Frequency
		on personal experience with services during the last 12 months)	Democracy and Local Governance	presidential elections)
Viet Nam	• Public Healthcare • Public Education • Basic Infrastructure (e.g. electricity, road, water) • Public Order and Safety • Social Security Services (e.g. social insurance, welfare assistance); • Environmental Services (e.g. trash collection);	*[Not yet defined]*	May be included in the biennial Vietnam Household Living Standard Surveys (VHLSS)[18]	Biennial

In addition, OECD's experience in collecting data about 'serving citizens' was examined to see what public services are included, while noting that some OECD countries are included in this review (Table 5).

Table 5: Public services included in the OECD's Serving Citizens Framework

Public Services	Criteria for Assessment	Data Sources	Frequency
• **Health** *(health insurance, health services)* • **Education** *(from pre-school to university levels)* • **Justice** *(civil, administrative and commercial justices)* • **Tax administration** *(potential area to add in)*	• **Access**: Affordability, Geographic Proximity, and Access to Information • **Responsiveness**: 'Courtesy and Treatment', 'Match of Services to Special Needs' and 'Timeliness' • **Quality**: 'Effective Delivery of Services and Outcomes', 'Consistency in Service Delivery and Outcomes' and 'Security/Safety'	• Countries' administrative data for specific indicators (including PISA[19] survey) • Gallup World Poll's public survey data on '**overall satisfaction' with education, health and justice** • World Justice Project's Opinion Polls on **justice**	Annual (reporting)

Table 6 below summarises the priority public services, criteria for assessment, data sources and frequency of national surveys that are the most frequently suggested by interlocutors.

---

[18] Viet Nam NSO's data sheet for the time being mentions temporary data from UNDP's PAPI surveys for healthcare, primary education, admin procedures, water, road, electricity, trash collection, air quality, safety and order.

[19] PISA stands for OECD's survey to assess the performance of the Programme on International Student Assessment. See https://ec.europa.eu/education/news/20161206-pisa-2015-eu-policy-note_en for further information.

Table 6: Commonly Suggested Public Services for SDG 16.6.2

Public Services	Criteria for Assessment	Data Sources	Iteration of Surveys
• **Healthcare** • **Education** • **Water** • **Social welfare** • **Personal Documentation (birth registration, identification documents)** • **Justice (including Police, law and order)**	• Access • Responsiveness • Reliability • Tangibles • Assurance • Empathy	• National household surveys, censuses (primary) • Complementary surveys (secondary)	• Biennial (most common) • Every 5 years (second most common)

Question Formulation and Response Modality

This study finds a large degree of variation in the questions being asked to citizens on their satisfaction with public services, which poses a challenge for global efforts to produce consistent metadata for cross-national comparison.

Perception- vs. Experience-based Questions: There is a large variety in approaches to measuring citizen satisfaction in the selected countries. In Norway, citizens are asked about their general satisfaction, regardless of whether respondents are users or non-users of public services. In some other countries (e.g. Cameroon, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Tunisia), a mixed approach to both experience-based and perception-based data collection has been used. In the Philippines' national household survey, the focus is on experience of users of healthcare services only.[20]

Question Order: For countries that apply both perception- and experience-based questions, diverse views have been shared regarding the order of such questions. Some (e.g. Cameroon, Mexico, New Zealand and Pakistan) apply experience-based questions first, asking respondents whether they have used the services over a period of time (depending on when they conduct national surveys) before asking about specific attributes and lastly, overall satisfaction. In South Africa's national household survey questionnaire, the approach is interchangeable depending on the sectors being surveyed. In Tunisia, however, the overall satisfaction question comes before specific attribute questions.

Sector-specific vs. same questions: In most countries, questions are tailored to each specific service. Interlocutors explained that this is because each sector has its own features that affect users differently. Yet other countries, such as Cameroon and New Zealand, apply the same generic satisfaction questions across sectors for comparative perspectives. Latvia, meanwhile, asks the same questions for all public service providers.

Same or different attributes across different sectors: Each country reviewed under this study applies a different approach, and there are variations even across various sectors surveyed within the same

---

[20] Meanwhile, Georgia measures users' experience with administrative services at Public Service Halls (or one-stop shops). This approach is being applied in a number of countries (including Viet Nam), and is closer to the 'report card model', which is not the focus of this study.

country. For instance, South Africa and Mexico measure different sectoral attributes in their national household surveys. In Germany, because the focus of the survey is on public administration services, they apply 16 different attributes of satisfaction (for instance, information on the stages of the process, comprehensibility of the forms, access to necessary forms, option of e-government, access to the right office, spatial accessibility, opening hours, and waiting times) across the board for different services. In Latvia and Pakistan, the same sets of questions are asked for all services in their citizen satisfaction or household surveys.

Same or different response modalities: There is a large variety of response modalities in terms of formats and scales in national household surveys and citizen satisfaction surveys. Norway applies the '-3 to + 3' scale for respondents to rate their level of satisfaction. Tunisia puts forward four levels of satisfaction, while Cameroon, Germany, Mexico and South Africa apply five or more than five levels of satisfaction. The labelling of levels of satisfaction also differs greatly. In Cameroon, they use a unipolar approach by putting forward options from *"1. very satisfactory"* to "*5. not at all satisfactory*" using a Likert scaling from 1-5 before the narratives. Mexico, instead, uses the bipolar approach by asking respondents to rate their satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 6, ranging from *"1. very satisfied"* to "*6. very dissatisfied*". The Philippines and Pakistan apply the "*yes*" or "*no*" bipolar option. New Zealand uses a bipolar Likert scaling from 1-5 from "1. strongly disagree" to "5. strongly agree".

Survey Implementation

Individual or household representatives as respondents: The target population for satisfaction surveys is either individuals (in 10 selected countries) or individuals representing households (in South Africa). Respondents in Germany are from the age of 15 years old, while in the other countries, the respondents' age starts at 18 years.

Moreover, the SDG imperative of 'leaving no one behind' requires not only that public services be universal and accessible to all citizens regardless of their income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location, but also that citizens have an equal opportunity to have their voice heard, including through country-led national surveys. This exposes another challenge for SDG 16.6.2 measurement: national statistics offices and/or government agencies also need to address the question of how to reach 'those left behind' if 16.6.2 captures only citizens who have used public services (by asking about respondents' "last use" of public services).

Frequency of satisfaction surveys: The frequency of satisfaction surveys differs greatly from one country to the other: annual (Latvia and South Africa), biennial (Germany, Mexico and Norway), every three years (Tunisia), every five years (Philippines), every seven years (Cameroon), and ad-hoc (Kenya).

Factors influencing survey frequency: According to most interlocutors, the lack of financial resources is one of the key factors influencing survey periodicity. In Kenya, national household surveys have been done on an ad-hoc basis rather than regularly as it depends on funding availability from donors and user demand. Next comes national priorities and reporting mandates. In South Africa, for instance, given that the national household surveys are conducted annually, sectoral focused modules may come in on a different periodic basis.

Diverse practices

The above review shows wide diversity in the survey practices of participating countries (Cameroon, Germany, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan and South Africa). Below are some snapshots of this diversity in practices across selected countries.

Cameroon: The Cameroon Household Survey (ECAM), conducted by the national statistics agency, aims to collect data and information on accessibility to basic infrastructure, proximity of households to basic infrastructure and satisfaction levels. Cameroon has data on satisfaction with services including in education, health, civil registration, water, electricity, food markets, parking, police and postal services. ECAM's approach is to ask respondents about services using particular attributes before asking a question on general satisfaction across all selected services

Germany: Administrative services for public proceedings including vehicle registration, birth of a child, death of a family member, and social welfare (poverty in old age, support for disability) are the starting points for aggregation of citizen satisfaction with using those services (see Annex 1.3).

Mexico: The National Survey on Governmental Quality and Impact (ENCIG) focuses on citizens' satisfaction with their last use of different public services (during the reference year), classified into three main groups, namely basic public services, on-demand public services and public proceedings (see Annex 1.6). These services are selected for measurement because they are in *high demand by the population*. However, Mexico's survey focuses on the *urban* population only, an approach which is found to ensure better representativeness of results and to be more cost-effective. This, however, presents a challenge when it comes to reporting on the inclusivity of public service provision (i.e. the 'leaving-no-one-behind' imperative of the SDGs).

New Zealand: The Kiwi Account Survey being conducted annually by the New Zealand Government puts upfront in the questionnaire that the survey is about the experience of users and/or users' personal contacts with public services they have used/encountered over the past 12 months. As Annex 1.7 shows, the scope of the survey is comprehensive in its public sector coverage including healthcare, education, transport, personal identification papers, local governments, etc. Users are asked about their recent interaction with local government and/or use of specific public services. The answers are aggregated to specific services and then aggregated further into a Service Quality Score (SQS) for the Government to review the performance of the public sector.

Norway: Norway's Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services Surveys, which are conducted every two years by the Agency for Public Management and eGovernment (DIFI), provide the Government of Norway with extensive data and information on the overall performance of government institutions and services including trust in public institutions (see Annex 1.8). Every two years, DIFI sends out questionnaires through standard post and emails to 40,000 citizens, and the average response rate has been around 40%.

South Africa: The annual General Household Surveys (GHS) coupled with periodic sector-focused citizen satisfaction surveys make South Africa's statistics system well-known for its focus on citizen-centric approaches to development (see Annex 1.10). Statistics South Africa engages different sectors including education, health, water and sanitation, energy, environmental affairs in their review of the GHS questionnaires. Sectoral survey modules include both experience- and perception-based questions, and the order of questions varies from one sector to the other.

Methodological Considerations for Measuring Citizen Satisfaction with Public Service Provision

This section outlines key methodological considerations for measuring citizen satisfaction with public service provision, highlighting advantages (pros) and disadvantages (cons) of different approaches.

It is important to note that indicator 16.6.2 focuses on 'the last experience of public services', meaning that feedback from citizens, and only those who have used the services, are expected to inform the indicator. Having noted that, it is always challenging to collect data about citizens' experiences per se, due to various reasons relating to country-specific socio-political contexts, citizens' willingness and openness to share their experience and appreciation, and other discourse-related effects. As countries are 'localising' SDGs and SDG indicators, this exposes another tremendous challenge for a standardised, globally relevant and consistent SDG 16.6.2 indicator allowing cross-national comparison. Also, experts in governance measurement hold that citizen satisfaction is influenced by two key factors:

- Citizens' actual encounters/interactions with public services; and
- Citizens' expectations, which are influenced by phsycological, attitudinal and discourse elements.[21]

The latter factor provides an important rationale for ensuring an explicit focus on users' 'last experience' in the formulation of the indicator, rather than asking about general satisfaction with public services.

Users' Perception vs. Users' Experiences

Countries included in this study use both perception-based and experience-based questions. A review of the extant research and studies on the advantages and disadvantages of focusing on perceptions vs. experience is captured in Table 7.

Table 7: Pros and cons of measuring perceptions vs. experience

Pros	Cons
Users' Perception (what users think)	
- Easier to capture satisfaction attributes that are sensitive to a specific culture or a political/social discourse (e.g. access to public services but with bribery involved)	Prone to biases due to: - cultural/discourse effects (religious beliefs, rural/urban, openness vs. reservation) - psychological effects (primacy effect vs. recency effect towards a long list of attributes) - attitudinal effects (in good/positive or bad/negative moods; trust towards enumerators as state vs. independent persons; manner; feelings; emotional) - contextual effects (concerns about political repression, being criticized; driven by distrusts in governments/authorities)
- Less costly for data collection for NSOs (especially when one single-item question is used	- May fail to capture what specific public service/attributes to satisfaction matter more and

---

[21] See Ellen Lust et al., 2015; Nick Thijs, 2011, Van Ryzin, 2004, for instance.

Pros	Cons
to capture satisfaction with last use of a public service)	follow-up recommendations for concrete actions for improvement
- May help capture non-users' expectations when asked about their expectations of quality of public services	- May pose 'generalisation' problems when asking 'in general, what do you expect from your service provider?'

User's Experience (basing on one's life event or direct encounter with public service providers)

- Measures individuals' experiences rather than a general 'public' appraisal of the service	- A multi-item question with specific service quality attributes is needed which means more space on questionnaires and related costs for survey administration
- Provides better reliability and credibility of data as respondents can easily relate to what factors make them satisfied/dissatisfied.	- Requires consistent methodology in weighing and constructing an index about 'satisfaction with the last experience' with a public service
- Suitable for monitoring sector specific indicators	- Time-consuming for aggregation due to weighing and indexing
- Larger variation in responses can be assured by framing separate questions on satisfaction with different aspects or features of selected public services or different modalities of responses	- Time and cost-consuming for data collection despite sacrifice of nuances in and influential attributes to satisfaction levels
- A focus on users that have actually experienced the services provides concrete feedback on the quality of those services to service providers.	- Leaves out non-users from voicing their expectations, perceptions of public services

Note: Pros and cons synthesised from literature reviews, experts' comments and researchers' experience

Service-specific Attributes to Users' Satisfaction Levels

The ServQual model[22] is the most commonly used framework in customer and citizen satisfaction surveys. Table 8 below presents the service delivery 'dimensions' used by the ServQual model, together with some elaboration of possible specific attributes for citizen satisfaction surveys.

Table 8: ServQual Model and Possible Specific Attributes

Dimension	Definition	Possible Specific Attributes
Reliability	The ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately	- publicised procedures/processes followed by employees - confidence in employees
Assurance	The knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to convey trust and confidence	- knowledge of employees - courtesy of employees - deadlines met
Tangibles	The appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel and communication materials	- availability of physical equipment - availability of staff - availability of information about fees, charges, procedures

---

[22] Source: Parasuraman, A, Ziethaml, V. and Berry, L.L (1988) and other additional suggested readings about ServQual Model at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SERVQUAL

Dimension	Definition	Possible Specific Attributes
Empathy	The provision of caring, individualized attention to customer	- attitude of employees - attention from employees
Responsiveness	The willingness to help customers and to provide prompt service	- timeliness of service - willingness to help users

Another useful reference for defining service-specific dimensions and attributes is the OECD Serving Citizens Framework, which looks at three dimensions:

Table 9: OECD Serving Citizens Framework[23]

Dimensions	Definitions	Possible attributes
Access	"Access to health, education or justice services may depend on people's ability to pay (when these services are not covered by public sources), geographic proximity and the extent to which they have the sufficient and right information to obtain these services."	• Affordability • Geographic Proximity • Access to Information
Responsiveness	"The key metrics to assess responsiveness vary across services. In health care and justice, the timeliness of interventions and procedures are of particular importance. By contrast, in education, responsiveness is typically assessed by looking to what extent students benefit from having adequate material and pedagogical methods."	• Courtesy and Treatment • Match of Services to Special Needs • Timeliness
Quality	Mainly outcome metrics (e.g. "In health care, the quality of services can be assessed at least partly by looking at the mortality rates for the three main causes of deaths in OECD countries: heart attacks, strokes and cancer.")	• Effective Delivery of Services and Outcomes • Consistency in Service Delivery and Outcomes • Security/Safety

Another useful, legitimate (and for many countries, binding) way to assess economic, social and cultural services is the **AAAQ** (Availability, Accessibility, Acceptability and Quality) framework. In the case of economic, social and cultural rights, such as the right to education and the right to health, the committee which monitors the implementation of these rights, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCRC), has elaborated criteria to determine when specific rights are fulfilled.

In the case of the right to water, for example, in its General Comment no. 15, the ESCRC identifies four criteria[24][9]:

---

[23] http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/4215081ec055.pdf?expires=1510229313&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=44935F1F066B2028329D57111EB855A1

[24][9] CESCR General Comment Nr.15, para 12:
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G03/402/29/PDF/G0340229.pdf?OpenElement

- The guaranteed **availability** of water has to be sufficient on a continuous basis to meet drinking purposes and other basic human needs, i.e. personal and domestic uses such as cooking, personal hygiene and sanitation purposes.
- Water and sanitation facilities have to be **accessible** within a certain time-frame or distance from the dwelling, and usable by all, including women, disabled, children etc. without threats to physical safety.
- Water and sanitation services must be **affordable** and not negatively impact on the ability to pay for other essential needs, such as food, housing and medical care.
- In terms of water **quality**, it is required that water is free from hazardous substances that could endanger human health, and that its colour, odour and taste are acceptable to users.

Table 10 below presents a review of pros and cons of providing respondents with a list of service-specific attributes when seeking to understand their satisfaction with their last experiences of public services. As summarised in the section about practices in selected countries, there is inconsistency in the way countries use such attributes (or not) to measure citizen satisfaction levels.

Table 10: Pros and cons of service-specific attributes

Pros	Cons
- Nailing down to users' personal experience with the service by detailed quality criteria rather than basing on what respondents hear from others from a single question about general satisfaction.	- Potentially excluding disadvantaged groups (persons with disabilities, ethnic groups with limited interaction with local governments due to language barriers, illiterate persons) who cannot go in person to public offices or communicate effectively when direct interaction with public employees is required. ✓ This however can be addressed by making sure that all have equal access to public services. ✓ Otherwise, this can be addressed by adding a question about the barriers and difficulties met by those persons who cannot go in person to public offices (to know why they do not all have equal access to public services).
- Illustrating upfront what characteristics/attributes are of concern for government policy and actions across each service asked about in the survey	- Potentially excluding attributes that might tell more about the quality of public services from users' perspectives. ✓ This however can be addressed by adding the 'Other' item in the list of attributes. The attributes mentioned in "Other" can be standardised for the next time during the implementation of the nrew round of this survey.
- Standardising attributes across the board for comparison between different units of measurement (countries, sub-national units)	- Potentially sacrificing context-based attributes that matter more for one unit of measurement (one country) than another (the other country) ✓ This however can be addressed by additional analysis of country contexts when examining the 'Other' itemised attributes.

Pros	Cons
- Facilitating data analysis by pre-determined attributes by groups and sub-groups	- Potentially sacrificing attributes that users may find more relevant ✓ This however can be addressed by additional analysis of the 'Other' itemised attributes.
- Potentially reducing sociably desired biases (due to contextual and cultural differences)	- Potentially leaving out contextual and cultural aspects in narratives about why one country differs from the other. ✓ Since it is a set of indicators for international comparison, most common attributes should be selected. Specific contextual settings may be analysed in reporting narratives.
- Methodologically better for calculating consistency and assuring reliability of collected data, since in most cases, such surveys are one-off in a year, or every two years or a longer period of reiterations	- Potentially costing more for survey administration, as a multi-item question consumes more space on the questionnaire and requires more time from respondents ✓ Considerations of survey costs should be taken before surveys.

Note: Pros and cons synthesised from literature reviews, experts' comments and researchers' experience

Response Formats in Satisfaction-focused Survey Questions

Table 11 lists pros and cons of scale points, scale labelling and question orders.

Table 11: Pros and cons of response formats in satisfaction-focused survey questions

Pros	Cons
Scale Points and Scale Labelling (point scaling labelled with verbal scales from negativity to positivity)	
0-100 point scale (in e.g. a feeling thermometer): - ease in measuring feelings - ease in obtaining variations in responses	**0-100 point scale** (in e.g. a feeling thermometer): - difficult to label each scale to ensure clarity of survey questions, making it difficult for respondents to remember the logic of the interview questions, especially in surveys administered by enumerators - more suitable for self-administered surveys; but can be used in face-to-face interviews if well-administered.
0-10 point scale: - may collect a larger variety of responses	**0-10 point scale:** - may create fatigue in respondents, especially in enumerator-led interviews (face-to-face/telephone) due to the lack of concrete labels for each point - more suitable for self-administered surveys, with labelling of midpoints for respondents to be reminded of what is expected from them. - may create difficulty during data processing (because of variety of responses)

Pros	Cons
1-7 point scale (bi-polar constructs – measuring satisfaction levels): - easier to label scales for better clarity - to include a middle or neutral point when moving (from 'extremely dissatisfied', to 'neutral' and then to 'extremely satisfied') - to avoid noisiness in collected data as respondents can differentiate themselves when considering their choices - to avoid forcing respondents to take a position, thus to mitigate unwanted variance or biases to collected data	**1-7 point scale:** - may be affected by primacy and recency effects, especially in surveys administered by enumerators or through telephone - allows respondents to avoid taking a position in their responses
1-5 point scale (in unipolar constructs – from 'extremely <u>satisfied</u>' to 'not at all <u>satisfied</u>'): - to make the rating consistently constructed - to avoid primary and recency effects	**1-5 point scale** (in unipolar constructs): - may lose some neutrality in citizen assessment when not giving 'neutral' as an option
1-3 point scale (e.g. worse/same/better; good/fair/poor) - gives respondents the opportunity to be neutral in their responses.	**1-3 point scale** (e.g. worse**/**same**/**better**;** good/fair/poor) - may be affected by cultural, contextual effects, and respondents choose a neutral one 'to be on the safe side'.
0-1 point scale (yes/no; agree/disagree) - quick and easy for respondents to respond - force respondents to take side.	**0-1 point scale** (yes/no; agree/disagree) - losing variation and nuances in responses - does not give respondents the opportunity to be neutral on their responses.
Question Ordering: Attribute Specific Questions First and then Overall Satisfaction Question	
- Reducing priming effects by asking about specific experiences before asking about feelings. - Used more often in surveys administered in person or over telephone when there are lead-up questions before one about specific attributes.	- In need of introductory questions (e.g. if the respondent or his/her household member has used a specific service over the past 12 months) before coming to attribute-specific questions, requiring more interview time and questionnaire space.

Note: Pros and cons synthesised from literature reviews, experts' comments and researchers' experience

Recommendations

Public Services to Be Covered in SDG 16.6.2

From reviewing other service-provision-related SDG indicators and priority public services suggested by the selected country interlocutors, **the four public services "of consequence"** that this study recommends for SDG indicator 16.6.2 **are (i) education (ii) health (iii) civil registration and iv) justice services.**

Table 12 proposes sub-sets of these four public services that could be incorporated into national household surveys to measure SDG 16.6.2.

Table 12: Recommended Public Services and Sub-sets for SDG 16.6.2

Public Services	Suggested Sub-sets of Public Services	Justifications
Healthcare	Quality of primary healthcare services (health clinics and healthcare centres, with a focus on outpatient care provision)	Relevant to everyone and most commonly found in both urban and rural areas
Education	Primary and lower secondary education services	Primary education is universal; Lower secondary education is almost universal
Civil Registration	Birth registration, identity documents	Required for every citizen
Justice	Justice services to resolve civil, administrative and commercial disputes, such as disputes with a government institution to obtain official documents or financial entitlements, family disputes, disputes over land/livestock, employment-related disputes, enforcement of business agreements, tenancy or landlord disputes, etc.	Critical governance-related service; 'crime reporting rate' indicator for 16.3 does not measure public satisfaction with the provision of justice services.

This proposal is made on the basis of the following considerations:

- **Drinking water and sanitation services**, while being frequently included in NSO surveys on satisfaction with public services, are already well covered by SDG indicator 6.1.1 "Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services"[25] and SDG indicator 6.2.1 "*Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water*"[26] which also draws from surveys (Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply,

---

[25] Drinking water services will be disaggregated by service level (including surface water (i.e. no services), unimproved, limited, basic, and safely managed services) following the JMP drinking water ladder. The JMP definition of Access to Basic Drinking Water Services is the following: "drinking water from an improved source is available with collection time not more than 30 minutes for a round trip, including queuing. Improved sources include: piped water, boreholes or tubewells, protected dug wells, protected springs, and packaged or delivered water."

[26] Sanitation services will be disaggregated by service level (including open defecation (i.e. no services),

Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP) supported by UNICEF and WHO) and look at access, availability and quality.

- **The scope of healthcare and education services** must be carefully defined to ensure that the focus of indicator 16.6.2 is on services that are truly *of general interest* (as underlined in the section "Definition of Public Services")*,* compared to other services more geared towards private interests (even when provided by the state). In the case of health services, for instance, preventive and primary healthcare services can be said to be truly 'of general interest', given these services are relevant to everyone and they are most commonly found in both urban and rural areas (which might not be the case for hospitals that provide tertiary care from specialists). Likewise, in the case of education services, primary and lower secondary education services can be said to be truly 'of general interest', given their universality (which might not be the case for university education, for instance). As emphasized earlier, these services are considered 'public services of general interest' *regardless of who delivers them (private or public providers)*.

- With respect to **'social welfare'**[27] services, i.e. social welfare policies and programmes that are targeted to specific groups of the population (children, the unemployed, older persons, persons with disabilities, the poor, for instance), these are not universal and therefore cross-national comparability is hard to achieve. One sub-set of these services that has potential for inclusion in SDG 16.6.2 is the existence of a 'subsidy for children under six years old', which flows from the rights of the child. Users of this service are children's parents or custodians. However, this can arguably be measured through public services like education (e.g. free nursery schooling) and healthcare (e.g. free healthcare for children under six years old)[28].

- **Governance-related services** are excluded from the bundle of 'basic services' to be covered under SDG indicator 1.4.1 on acess to basic services (these will include drinking water, sanitation and hygiene, energy, mobility and transportation, waste collection, healthcare, education and information technologies). This is a gap that indicator 16.6.2 can usefully fill, especially that this indicator is positioned under Goal 16 which is dedicated to enhancing governance. While target 16.9 (*By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration*) measures the "*proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age*"

---

unimproved, limited, basic, and safely managed services) following the JMP sanitation ladder. 'Safely managed sanitation services' are defined by the JMP as "services obtained from improved sanitation facilities that are not shared with other households. Improved facilities include flush/pour flush to piped sewer systems, septic tanks or pit latrines; ventilated improved pit latrines, composting toilets or pit latrines with slabs." 'Access to Basic Hygiene Facilities' is defined by the JMP as "availability of a handwashing facility on premises with soap and water. Handwashing facilities may be fixed or mobile and include a sink with tap water, buckets with taps, tippy-taps, and jugs or basins designated for handwashing. Soap includes bar soap, liquid soap, powder detergent, and soapy water but does not include ash, soil, sand or other handwashing agents."

[27] Which is defined by the United Nations in 1967 as "an organized function is regarded as a body of activities designed to enable individuals, families, groups and communities to cope with the social problems of changing conditions [underline added]. But in addition to and extending beyond the range of its responsibilities for specific services, social welfare has a further function within the broad area of a country's social development. In this larger sense, social welfare should play a major role in contributing to the effective mobilization and deployment of human and material resources of the country to deal successfully with the social requirements of change, thereby participating in nation-building."

[28] See UNDP, VFF-CRT & CECODES (2011-2017). Dimension 6 of the Viet Nam Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI) for an example of how to survey citizens on this criterion.

(indicator 16.9.1), it does *not* measure public satisfaction with the way civil registration services are provided. Likewise, while target 16.3 *(Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all)* speaks about 'access to justice for all', its two indicators (16.3.1 on the crime reporting rate and 16.3.2 on unsentenced detainees) do *not* measure public satisfaction with the provision of justice services.

Some considerations on justice services

There are arguments for and against the inclusion of 'justice services' in the core set of services assessed under SDG 16.6.2.

Amongst arguments in favor of including justice services, the following points are worth highlighting:

- Police and the courts are often used as instruments of the most (economically, politically or otherwise) influential elites in a country to exclude and marginalize less powerful individuals and groups. Measuring people's experiences with justice services would help scrutinize and strengthen their accessibility, inclusiveness, impartiality and accountability. As in other sectors, public satisfaction data can be very directly used to inform required policy changes.

- A repeatedly-made criticism of the two existing indicators under 16.3, on the crime reporting rate[29] and on the proportion of unsentenced detainees,[30] is that they do not measure the quality of justice services, nor do they capture people's views about their experience of the justice system. While one could argue that the crime reporting rate is in some way an indirect measure of 'trust in the justice system' (as low levels of trust will likely translate in low reporting rates), there are many other factors influencing the reporting rate, such as the physical availability of 'competent authorities' to whom one can report a crime, as well as many other barriers (financial, linguistic, gender-related, socio-cultural, etc.) which come into play, and which makes it impossible to assume a direct correlation between trust levels in the justice system and crime reporting rates. While target 16.3 aims to "*ensure equal access to justice for all*", there is a host of factors - including access to financial legal aid, to information on laws and legal procedures, legal and administrative literacy and capability – that are key to enable equal treatment before the law for all citizens which are not currently captured by existing indicators.

- Another widespread criticism about these two indicators is that they are both focused on the criminal justice system, thus leaving out disputes in the domain of civil law that represent the bulk of 'everyday problems' faced by people (e.g. issues related to land ownership, forced evictions, divorce/child custody, labor grievances, public service provision, etc.) This shortcoming was addressed when an additional indicator was proposed under target 16.3 at the 2017 meeting of the UN Statistical Commission[31], on '*access to civil justice.*' While methodological work has yet to start on this possible 'additional indicator', proposals that have been made so far are mainly focused on *access* to dispute resolution mechanisms (e.g. "*proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or*

---

[29] *16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms*

[30] *16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population*

[31] See 2017 Report of the UNSC on SDG indicators https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/48th-session/documents/2017-2-IAEG-SDGs-E.pdf

traditional dispute resolution mechanism"). Other dimensions related to people's appreciation of the quality and fairness of such mechanisms/services are unlikely to be assessed by this indicator, and this is a gap that indicator 16.6.2 could usefully fill. (It may also be added that it will take time before this proposed 'additional indicator' is officially adopted and integrated in countries' monitoring activities. In the meantime, it will be useful to have interim metrics on access to and satisfaction with justice services, under 16.6.2, that a new indicator could build on later on.)

- Finally, it is worth noting that another 'additional indicator' on 'trust in different public institutions' was proposed for target 16.6 ("*Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels*") at the 2017 UN Statistical Commission. While work on this proposed additional indicator has not started yet, it is likely to adopt the OECD recommended measures of trust[32], which cover the tryptic of police services, parliament and civil service. The justice system is *not* included in this 'core set of measures' proposed by the OECD as the basis for international comparisons on trust.

Meanwhile, the measurement of public satisfaction with justice services is affected by a number of definitional and methodological challenges:

- Justice services are defined differently across jurisdictions. In some countries, they are categorized as 'public services' (e.g. in Norway) while in others they fall under the authority of the judiciary system (e.g. in Viet Nam). The nature of services included in 'justice services' also varies across countries: in some countries, police and law and order services are part of justice services, while in others, justice services include only court services and administrative services (e.g. registration of births, deaths and marriages).

- Justice services (especially those provided in the domain of civil law) are provided by a wide range of formal (e.g. courts) and informal (e.g. though arbitration, or through customary arrangements at the community level) actors and institutions, and people may have different appreciations of the quality of justice services received depending on who was their provider. Survey questions need to distinguish between these various providers.

- The number of people in any given country who have used *formal* justice services in their lifetime is limited; as such, survey questions administered on a representative population sample and asking about people's 'last experience with justice services' are unlikely to generate reliable estimates.

- To address this issue of low usage rate of formal justice services, NSO surveys reviewed for this study often ask about people's "trust in the courts/the judicial system", thus avoiding the need for respondents to base their response on their "last experience of public services" (as per the formulation of indicator 16.6.2).

This being said, these challenges are not insurmountable, as shown by ongoing surveys (at both global and national levels) on public satisfaction with justice services:
- More general questions on 'experiences of disputes' and actions subsequently taken, such as those asked by the General Population Poll conducted by the World Justice Project (WJP), are

---

[32] See OECD Guidelines on Measuring Trust: http://www.oecd.org/publications/oecd-guidelines-on-measuring-trust-9789264278219-en.htm

applicable to the general population: the WJP poll reveals that about a third of individuals experienced a 'dispute' over the past 12 months[33] -- which includes for instance land disputes, administrative disputes, divorce/separation, domestic violence, inheritance, workforce disputes and other types of disputes. Indeed, the proportion of people likely to use civil and administrative justice services is known to be significantly larger than the proportion of people using criminal justice services – so by focusing on this particular type of justice services, it can be ensured that a larger proportion of survey respondents can respond based on experience.

- Even while 'justice services' are defined differently by different countries (as noted above), the OECD's Serving Citizens Framework focuses on civil, administrative and commercial justice services and uses survey data from the WJP's General Population Poll (with almost universal coverage) to measure:
    1) whether people can access and afford civil justice;
    2) whether alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are accessible, impartial and effective
    3) the time needed to resolve cases
    4) whether civil justice is effectively enforced
    5) whether civil justice is free from improper government influence
    6) whether people use use violence to redress personal grievances

- This WJP's Poll survey also asks why a respondent who has experienced a dispute did not take action, and generates statistics on those who did not take action because they have limited confidence in the dispute resolution mechanisms in their country, or due to access barriers, including physical barriers ("the person who could assist was too far"), financial barriers and lack of information and awareness about the procedures ("did not know what to do or where to go"). Similarly, statistics are also produced on respondents who received legal assistance or councelling (received from a local leader, an attorney, a paralegal, etc.) and on reasons for not seeking such assistance (because of financial barriers, lack of awareness on who to contact to obtain legal assistance, distrust of lawyers or perceptions that they are ineffective, etc.)

Dimensions for Measuring Satisfaction in SDG 16.6.2

This section proposes a framework for NSOs to monitor "citizens' satisfaction with last experiences of public services" which draws from the ServQual and OECD frameworks introduced in the section 'Methodological considerations', as well as from suggestions made by interlocutors. The intention is to measure citizen satisfaction using experience-based attributes. It is suggested that the service quality attribute questions be followed by a 'leaving no-one behind' measure (along the lines of the 'match of services to special needs' attribute being used by OECD[34]) and an overall satisfaction measure, asked last after users have provided feedback on specific attributes.

---

[33] See OECD report "Government at a Glance 2017", Chpater 14 – Serving Citizens: Access to Justice and Legal Services, http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/4217001e.pdf?expires=1511472413&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=F1F161F4DD3B42506691D99D81440562. It should be noted that the WJP polls are very urban centric, as they select only three municipalities per country to survey on.

[34] See Annex 3 for a review of OECD's approach and international organisations' potential inputs for SDG 16.6.2 indicator.

Table 13: A Recommended Framework for SDG 16.6.2 Monitoring by NSOs

Dimension	Criteria	Possible Specific Attributes	Grading (*)
Access	- Affordability - Geographical proximity - Access to information	- fees/charges are reasonable - distance from home reasonable - information about fees, procedures, processes made available for users to obtain before coming to or at the service premises	3
Responsiveness	- Courtesy and treatment - Timeliness	- staff's courtesy was professional / staff's attitude was nice - staff's behaviour was fair/impartial - timeliness of service	2
Tangibles	- Appearance of physical facilities, equipment, - Appearance of personnel - Available communication materials	- availability of equipment - availability of staff - publicised standard operation procedures, processes	3
Inclusivity / Fairness (Leaving No One Behind)	- Match of services to special needs	- accessibility for the disabled, the elderly, the illiterate, ethnic minorities using different languages (from users' observation when using public services), gender, etc.	1
Satisfaction	Overall Satisfaction	- satisfaction upon rating above specific attributes	1

The 'Grading (*)' column is added to illustrate how scores on various service dimensions (for any given service) could be weighted and aggregated into a composite index on 'citizen satisfaction with public services'. In Table 9 above, weights assigned to various dimensions of citizen satisfaction add up to 10 points. It is nonetheless suggested to aim for equal weights (i.e. to treat every dimension equally) in order to simplify the computation of the indicator, and to reflect the equal importance assigned to each one of these dimensions by the international human rights framework (see section on 'Defining Public Services').

Finally, in terms of indexing, it is also important to note that when the number of services evaluated is higher, the proportion of the population expressing 'satisfaction' with at least one of them will automatically be higher – and the overall satisfaction level will be higher. This is because such composite indices usually count respondents who have expressed satisfaction with *at least one service*, and the probability that a respondent will be statisfied with at least one service will be higher if the respondent is asked about six rather than only three services, for instance.

But, as the saying goes, 'the devil is in the detail'. It is therefore suggested that data be presented separately for each one of the four suggested public sectors, as it is this type of disaggregated data that can be most useful to governments in identifying where exactly citizens are satisfied/dissatisfied with public service provision.

Recommended Question Formats to Collect Citizen Experience Data

This section provides recommendations on question design for each one of the four types of public services identified as most relevant to include under indicator 16.6.2. These proposed questions, several

of which are used in existing surveys[35], cover key service quality dimensions and attributes as suggested in earlier sections of this report. The intention is to measure citizen satisfaction using experience-based attributes. Survey data from national household surveys can then be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, disability, literacy, and other demographic characteristics as outlined in para 74g of the 2030 Agenda.

Health

1. When did you or a member of your household <u>last use</u> <u>a hospital/clinic/healthcare service</u>[36]?
      ☐ 1. YYYY
      ☐ 0. Never *[skip 2 and 3]*
      ☐ 999. Can't remember *[skip 2 and 3]*

2. *[IF 1 = YYYY]* As I read you the following statements about <u>that healthcare facility</u>, please tell me whether you agree or disagree with them. *[0-1 scale – convenient for interviews through phones and in person. Don't Know and Refuse to Answer are not uttered during interviews, but respondents will tell enumerators.]*

Attributes	Yes	No	*[Don't Know]*	*[Refuse to Answer]*
a. The healthcare service was accessible within a reasonable time (within an hour).	1	0	888	999
b. The consultation room was clean.	1	0	888	999
c. Patients were treated with respect.	1	0	888	999
d. I/my family members were informed about the health problem, consequences and solutions	1	0	888	999
e. Expenses for the treatment were reasonable.				
f. The waiting time until I/my family member received the treatment was reasonable.	1	0	888	999
g. I/my family member didn't have to pay bribes to obtain better treatment service from healthcare workers.	1	0	888	999
h. The injury/disease was cured.	1	0	888	999
i. Every patient (including persons with disabilities, the elderly, ethnic minority people, etc.) was treated equally by healthcare workers. *[for services that are not door-to-door]*	1	0	888	999

3. *[If 1 = YYYY]* How satisfied were you with the healthcare service you/your household member received? *[1-5 scale]*
      ☐ 5. Very satisfied   ☐ 4. Satisfied
      ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfied   ☐ 2. Not satisfied   ☐ 1. Not satisfied at all
      ☐ *888. [DK]*   ☐ *999. [RA]*

---

[35] Some of the suggestions are adapted from UNDP's PAPI surveys and Mexico's ENCIGs.

[36] An assessment of services received in a hospital would require a different set of questions, as they have different attributes for evaluation (and a different probability of providing outpatient or inpatient care) from those of primary healthcare services. The focus of these suggested questions therefore considers attributes of outpatient care only.

Education

The following questions can be asked after a question about whether the informant's family has had a child or children attending primary schools in the past 12 months or 'n' years, depending on the frequency of countries' household surveys.

1. As I read you the following statements about that primary school, please tell me whether you agree or disagree with them. *[0-1 scale – convenient for interviews through phones and in person]*

Attributes	Yes	No	*[Don't Know]*	*[Refuse to Answer]*
a. School walls are made of bricks.	1	0	*888*	*999*
b. There are clean toilets.	1	0	*888*	*999*
c. School provides free safe drinking water for to children.	1	0	*888*	*999*
d. Classrooms have fewer than 36 students.	1	0	*888*	*999*
e. The school doesn't have three shifts.	1	0	*888*	*999*
f. I/my family don't have to pay bribes to teachers or administrators to get favours for my child at school.	1	0	*888*	*999*
g. Parents receive regular feedback from teachers on the performance of their children.	1	0	*888*	*999*
h. Parents are fully informed of school's revenues and expenditure.	1	0	*888*	*999*
i. Every child (including those with disabilities, ethnic minority people, etc.) was treated equally at the school. *[for services that are not door-to-door]*	1	0	*888*	*999*

2. How satisfied were you with the education service you/your household member received? *[1-5 scale]*
- ☐ 5. Very satisfied
- ☐ 4. Satisfied
- ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfied
- ☐ 2. Not satisfied
- ☐ 1. Not satisfied at all
- ☐ *888- [DK]*
- ☐ *999- [RA]*

Civil Registration

Based on survey questionnaires being conducted in participating countries, and suggestions by the country interlocutors, birth registration and identification registration tend to be the areas of focus for civil registration services. Below are suggestions about how to ask the questions.

1. When did you or a member of your household last use the service for civil registration (for birth registration or identification documents like a passport or an ID card)?
- ☐ 1. YYYY *[to be cleaned later to match the frequency of household surveys in each country]*
- ☐ 0. Never *[skip 2 and 3]*
- ☐ 999. Can't remember *[skip 2 and 3]*

2. *[IF 1 = YYYY]* As I read you the following statements about that office, please tell me whether you agree or disagree with them. *[0-1 scale – convenient for interviews through phones and in person. Don't Know and Refuse to Answer are not uttered during interviews, but respondents will tell enumerators.]*

Attributes	Yes	No	DK	RA
a. Processes and procedures were publicly displayed	1	0	888	999
b. Fees and charges were reasonable	1	0	888	999
c. The amount I/my family member would have to pay in fees for the service was publicly displayed.	1	0	888	999
d. The office was accessible within a reasonable time (within an hour).	1	0	888	999
e. There were seating arrangements for me/my family member while waiting for my/their turn.	1	0	888	999
f. I/my family member was attended professionally by the officials.	1	0	888	999
g. The officials were competent.	1	0	888	999
h. The officials treated me/my family member with respect.	1	0	888	999
i. I/my family member didn't have to pay bribes to obtain the service.	1	0	888	999
j. The service was performed within the informed deadline.	1	0	888	999
k. Everyone (including persons with disabilities, the elderly, ethnic minority people, etc.) was treated equally at the office when I was there. *[for services that are not door-to-door]*	1	0	888	999

3. How satisfied were you with the service you/household member received? *[1-5 scale]*

- ☐ 5. Very satisfied
- ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfied
- ☐ 1. Not satisfied at all
- ☐ 4. Satisfied
- ☐ 2. Not satisfied
- ☐ *888. [DK]*
- ☐ *999. [RA]*

Justice Services

1. In the past 12 months, have you or a member of your household experienced one of the following disputes or problems? *[Choose one most important dispute from the following list]*

Types of dispute	Yes	No	DK	RA
a. Dispute over land	1	0	888	999
b. Dispute over livestock	1	0	888	999
c. Dispute with a government institution to obtain official documents (e.g. certificates, identity documents, marriage/divorce papers)	1	0	888	999
d. Dispute with a government institution to receive financial entitlements (e.g. compensation for damages suffered)	1	0	888	999
e. Family dispute (e.g. contested divorce, child support/child custody, contested inheritance (excluding land disputes) (yes/no	1	0	888	999
f. Commercial dispute (e.g. enforcement of business agreement, repayment of loans (excluding land disputes and disputes with family members or government)	1	0	888	999
g. Occupational dispute (employment-related problems)	1	0	888	999
h. Tenancy or landlord dispute (e.g. disputes over rent payments)	1	0	888	999

2. For the (01) most important dispute you have experienced, did you or a member of your family go to the local court to look for a resolution?

- ☐ 1. Yes *[skip to 6]*
- ☐ 0. No *[skip to 3]*
- ☐ 777. I/my family didn't go to the local court but used another channel *[skip to 4]*
- ☐ 999. Can't remember *[skip 2 and 3]*

3. *[If 2 = no]* If you didn't go to the local court, what were the main reason(s)? *[multiple choices allowed]*
☐ 6. It is too difficult to understand how the justice system works
☐ 5. The court was too far
☐ 4. It would cost too much
☐ 3. Court processes are too long
☐ 2. In most cases, judges and court staff cannot be trusted
☐ 1. The dispute was solved directly amongst the parties
☐ *888. [DK]*   ☐ *999. [RA]*

4. *[If 2 = I/my family didn't go to the local court but used another channel]* Which channel did you/your family member used instead? *[multiple choice allowed]*
☐ 6. The arbitrator we know / the local arbitators association
☐ 5. The legal aid centre in our community
☐ 4. The mediator/mediators group in my community
☐ 3. Police
☐ 2. Community or religious leaders
☐ 1. Other (please specify) ....
☐ *888. [DK]*   ☐ *999. [RA]*

5. *[If 2 = I/my family didn't go to the local court but used another channel]* How satisfied were you/your family member with the way the dispute was handled by this channel? *[1-5 scale]*
☐ 5. Very satisfied   ☐ 4. Satisfied   ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfied
☐ 2. Not satisfied   ☐ 1. Not satisfied at all
☐ *888. [DK]*   ☐ *999. [RA]*

6. *[IF 2 = YYYY]* As I read you the following statements about that court, please tell me whether you agree or disagree with them. *[0-1 scale – convenient for interviews through phones and in person. Don't Know and Refuse to Answer are not uttered during interviews, but respondents will tell enumerators.]*

Attributes[37]	Yes	No	*[Don't Know]*	*[Refuse to Answer]*
a. Getting to the courthouse was easy.	1	0	888	999
b. I/my family member had no difficulty getting the information needed when I/my family member got to the courthouse.	1	0	888	999
c. I/my family member felt safe in the courthouse.	1	0	888	999
d. Court personnel treated me/my family member with respect.	1	0	888	999
e. The judge or other judicial officer hearing me/my family member's case listened to me/them.	1	0	888	999
f. I/my family member understood the instructions of the court on what to do next.	1	0	888	999
g. The case or other related business I/my family member had with the court was handled in a timely manner.	1	0	888	999
h. I/my family member was treated fairly. My/my family member's ethnicity, sex, social/economic status or age made no difference in how I/s/he was treated by the court.	1	0	888	999

---

[37] Suggested attributes come from the *Framework for Court Users' Satisfaction Survey* proposed by the International Consortium for Court Excellence in their June 2017 report on "Global Measures of Court Performance", pp. 25-38 (Measure 1: Court User Satisfaction) – Available at http://www.courtexcellence.com/~/media/Microsites/Files/ICCE/GLOBAL%20MEASURES%20Advance%20Review%20Copy%20Jun%202017.ashx

Attributes[37]	Yes	No	[Don't Know]	[Refuse to Answer]
i. Using the court services was inexpensive.	1	0	888	999
j. I/my family member was not asked to pay a bribe or other inducement for the services of court staff, police or judges	1	0	888	999
k. I/my family member received legal assistance during the process	1	0	888	999
l. In your opinion, and irrespective of the outcome, was the process objective and unbiased?	1	0	888	999

7. *[If 1 = YYYY]* How satisfied were you/your family member with the court service you/your household member received? *[1-5 scale]*

  ☐ 5. Very satisfied
  ☐ 4. Satisfied
  ☐ 3. Somewhat satisfied
  ☐ 2. Not satisfied
  ☐ 1. Not satisfied at all
  ☐ *888. [DK]*   ☐ *999. [RA]*

Key Considerations

Approaches to engaging NSOs in adopting citizen satisfaction questions in national household surveys:

- Developing new methodologies for SDG indicators is a process, not an end in itself. Different approaches can be tested before, say 2020, for countries to test various approaches to measuring SDG 16.6.2. Voluntary country reports on SDG implementation can be a good source for understanding what works better for NSOs to collect data for indicator 16.6.2.

- Questions about citizens' satisfaction with their last experience of public services should be incorporated in regular national household surveys (such as national living standard surveys) to lower financial and coordination costs.

- It should be made clear to NSOs that indicator 16.6.2, measured from citizen surveys, is an important complement to other SDG indicators (such as SDG 3.8.1 on coverage of essential health services[38] and SDG 4.a.1 on school facilities[39]) that draw from administrative sources to measure public service provision. While these indicators address similar dimensions of 'access' and 'tangibles', they may not reflect people's actual experience of education facilities or healthcare services due to a variety of reasons related to the methodological challenges of collecting data from administrative sources. Furthermore, applying a citizen-centred approach to public service delivery requires service providers to take into account the experiences and perspectives of users to improve service delivery, in addition to tracking inputs and outputs from administrative sources.

- In addition to global reporting on SDG indicator 16.6.2, data on citizen satisfaction with public services can serve as a useful policy tool allowing for two-way communication between governments and their citizens and for specific follow-up actions to improve service delivery at the local level. In this regard, sector-specific indicators may be more useful to pinpoint areas in need of improvements/reforms, rather than aggregated index scores.

Additional methodological considerations:
- It is important to note that the dimension of 'access', measured directly from citizens' experience, will be tracked by **indicator 1.4.1** ("Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services") using national household surveys, for a wide range of public services. Indicator 1.4.1 however will draw from existing indicators (and therefore may not cover dimensions of quality or fairness that are not covered by these indicators, and that are relevant to 'public satisfaction') and will not cover any governance-related indicators (such as justice and civil registration services).

- It is also important to note that there are already two population survey-based indicators (derived from surveys run by UNICEF-WHO) measuring access to **safe drinking water and to sanitation services,**

---

[38] 3.8.1 Coverage of essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population)

[39] 4.A.1 Proportion of schools with access to: (a) electricity; (b) the Internet for pedagogical purposes; (c) computers for pedagogical purposes; (d) adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities; (e) basic drinking water; (f) single-sex basic sanitation facilities; and (g) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions) See metadata here: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-4.pdf

under Goal 6 (indicator 6.1.1 "Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services"[40] and 6.2.1 "*Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water"*). These indicators look at dimensions of 'availability', 'access' and 'quality', and disaggregate drinking water and sanitation services by service level (including no services, unimproved, limited, basic, and safely managed services).

- Since 16.6.2 refers to people's **'last experience'** with public services, the indicator needs to focus on user experiences rather than on non-users' perceptions. Also, it is very important to define the reference period when asking about "the last experience", to avoid memory biases if the "last" experience of a public service was a long time ago. While sample questions provided above ask respondents to say when (i.e. what year) is the last time they used a given public service, an alternative approach could be to set a timeframe in the question itself (e.g. *Have you or any member of your family received in the last year / last two years medical care in a clinic or health center from the public health system? Y, N, NR)*

- To realise the imperative of '**leaving no one behind'** in public service provision, two alternative approaches can be considered. First, as suggested in the above sample survey questions, users can be asked to provide a general appraisal of how *other people* are treated, i.e. how inclusive and fair are public service providers towards users of different characteristics and backgrounds[41], based on what they/their family members observe. Alternatively, respondents could be asked about their *personal* experiences of having (or not) been treated fairly. Data on personal experiences might be seen as more reliable. For instance, when asking respondents to assess how other people are treated, one possible concern could be that if you are not at a disadvantage yourself, you may not be paying close attention to aspects of service delivery and/or infrastructure-related aspects – notably for the disabled – that are not of direct relevance to you, and as such your assessment may not reflect the actual situation/practices.

- Regarding **sampling protocols**, there is a need to further define the target population for 16.6.2 survey questions, as well as methodological guidance regarding the selection of respondents.

- On **scaling**, it is suggested that one type of scaling be used consistently for longitudinal and cross-national comparison purposes when monitoring one type of public services (see suggested question designs in the previous section). User satisfaction experts (like Gregg g. Van Ryzin, 2004, Survey Monkey experts and others) suggest that Likert scales might fit for the purpose of measuring overall citizen satisfaction consistently, as they can ensure better internal consistency and predictive validity of collected data. Survey methodologists suggest that five-scale points be used for a unipolar scale (from 'extremely satisfied', to 'not satisfied at all', and seven-scale points for a bipolar scale where a 'neutral' option is introduced, from 'extremely satisfied' to 'neutral', and then to 'extremely dissatisfied').[42] A 'yes = 1'/'no =0' narrative scale can be introduced to questions when agreement or disagreement with a given statement about an attribute needs to be obtained. It is often used in a long question with a certain number of attributes/statements.

---

[40] Meatadata for indicator 6.1.1 can be accessed here: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf)
[41] See Rothstein et al. (2005) for discussion about impartiality and quality of government
[42] Tips in using Likert scales in satisfaction surveys can be found at https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/likert-scale/

- The issue of how to **report** on indicator 16.6.2 also needs to be discussed[43]. Data can be presented as a composite index that covers all four suggested public sectors. This holistic approach requires that a consistent approach to weighing different sectoral data be applied systematically by all NSOs. But as the saying goes, 'the devil is in the detail' and as such, it is recommended that data be (also) presented separately for each one of the four suggested public sectors.

- Various methodological options for **indexing** need to be discussed (i.e. indexing of several service attributes into a single 'score' for a given type of public service, and indexing of several public services into a singlescore on 'citizen satisfaction with public services'). Aside from considerations around assigning different weights to various service dimensions, another important consideration to keep in mind is that when the number of services evaluated is increased, the proportion of the population expressing 'satisfaction' with at least one of them will automatically be higher – and the overall satisfaction level will be higher. This is because such composite indices usually count respondents who have expressed satisfaction with *at least one service*, and the probability that a respondent will be statisfied with at least one service will be higher if the respondent is asked about say, six rather than only three services.

Challenges and Opportunities:

- There may be a challenge in developing a methodology for 16.6.2 that meets the harmonization imperative of SDG indicators (i.e. allowing for cross-country comparability) while taking into account wide variations in public service provision across national contexts. For instance, suggested questions related to 'school walls made of bricks' and 'schools providing safe drinking water for children' will be less relevant to OECD countries. To stay true to the universal nature of the 2030 Agenda (i.e. not only a set of Goals to be met by least developed/developing countries), one option could be to allow countries to select attribute-specific questions that are appropriate in their national context, while ensuring that each country tracks the same dimensions for the same set of public services. For instance, for the dimension of 'tangibles', instead of asking about brick walls, OECD countries may want to ask about internet access in classrooms. The metadata could provide a list of possible questions (i.e. categorized based on various levels of development), for each dimension and for each type of service, so countries could simply draw on such 'suggested question lists' to select the most appropriate questions in their context. While such an approach would not allow for 'pure' cross-country comparisons of data, it would be aligned with the Agenda's emphasis on 'localization', and would still produce comparable data at the level of dimensions (i.e. responsiveness, access, etc. would still get tracked by all countries). This approach would also help ensure that countries get something useful (in terms of policy relevance) for their particular context out of monitoring 16.6.2, rather than simply 'ticking the box' and measuring things that don't really matter to them.

---

[43] This consideration is also raised in UNODC's paper reviewing existing best practices to measure the experience of corruption under SDG 16.5.1 and SDG 16.5.2 indicators. See Giulia Megellini (2017) report for the discussions.

Bibliography

African Barometer (1999-2017). An African-led series of national public attitude surveys on democracy and governance in Africa. Survey Questionnaires

American Customer Satisfaction Index LLC (2016). ACSI Federal Government Report 2016 *[in which 2,380 users randomly selected, contacted via email and asked about their recent experiences with federal government services]*. Available at http://www.theacsi.org/images/stories/images/reports/17jan-Gov-report-2016.pdf

Alvarez, R. Michael, and Brehm, John (2000). "Binding the frame: how important are frames for survey response?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, August 31–September 2

Basab, Dasgupta, Ambar Narayan, Emmanuel Skoufias (2009). Measuring the Quality of Education and Health Services: The Use of Perception Data from Indonesia http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/814671468040542129/pdf/WPS5033.pdf

Bo, Rothstein, Centre for Public Sector Research and Jan Teorell (2005). What Is Quality of Government? A Theory of Impartial Political Institutions. Available at http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un-dpadm/unpan044549.pdf

Charron, Nicholas (2013). European Quality of Government Index 2013: *Survey questions*.

Cláudia, Carvalho & Carlos, Brito (2012). Assessing Users' Perceptions on how to Improve Public Services Quality. Public Management Review. Vol. 14, 2012. Issue 4, pp. 451-472

Dave, Vannette (April 22, 2015). Three Tips for Effectively Designing Rating Scales. Available at https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/three-tips-for-effectively-using-scale-point-questions/

Druckman, James (2001). "The Implications of Framing Effects for Citizen Competence." *Political Behavior* 23(3) September: 227-256

Ellen Lust, Lindsay J. Benstead, Pierre F. Landry, and Dhafer Malouche (2015). The Local Governance Performance Index (LGPI): Report Paper. Information about LGPI available at http://gld.gu.se/en/research-projects/lgpi/

European Commission (2011). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A Quality Framework for Services of General Interest in Europe. Available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/procedure/EN/201238

Giulia Megellini (2017). Critical Review of Existing Best Practices to Measure the Experience of Corruption. Centre of Excellence in Statistical Information on Government, Crime, Victimisation and Justice. A Report for UNODC.

Gregg G. Van Ryzin (2004). The Measurement of Overall Citizen Satisfaction, Public Performance & Management Review, 27:3, 9-28. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2004.11051805

Hiil (2017). Justice Needs in Tunisia - 2017 Available at http://www.hiil.org/data/sitemanagement/media/HiiL%20Tunisia%20JNST%20English%20-%20web.pdf

Institute for Citizen-Centred Service (2015). Citizens First 7. Report for the Government of Northwest Territories, Canada. Available at http://www.assembly.gov.nt.ca/sites/default/files/td253-175.pdf

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

Janet M. Kelly & David Swindell (2003). The case for inexperienced user: Rethinking Filter Questions in Citizen Satisfaction Surveys. American Review of Public Administration, Vol. 33 No. 1, March 2003 91-108. DOI: 10.1177/0275074002250256. Available at http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0275074002250256?journalCode=arpb

Marcus Tannenberg (2017). The Autocratic Trust Bias: Politically Sensitive Survey Items and Self-censorship. Working Paper Series 2017:49. The Varieties of Democracy Institute, University of Gothenburg. Available at https://www.v-dem.net/media/filer_public/41/87/41873911-3093-4a08-a2b9-f80cb24d3975/v-dem_working_paper_2017_49.pdf

Mitchel N. Herian and Alan J. Tomkins (2012). Citizen Satisfaction Survey Data: A Mode Comparison of the Derived Importance–Performance Approach. The American Review of Public Administration 42(1) 66–86. P. 67

New Zealand Government (2016). New Zealanders' satisfaction with public services: 'Kiwis Count' Annual Report.

Nick Thijs (2011). Measure to Improve: Improving public sector performance by using citizen - user satisfaction information. Available at http://www.eupan.eu/files/repository/20111230120429_Measure_to__Improve.pdf

OECD (2015), "The OECD serving citizens' framework", in Government at a Glance 2015, OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2017), "Serving Citizens Scorecards", in Government at a Glance 2017, OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/gov_glance-2017-en

OECD (2017), "Citizen satisfaction with public services and institutions", in *Government at a Glance 2017*, OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/gov_glance-2017-82-en

Parasuraman, A, Ziethaml, V. and Berry, L.L., "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality' *Journal of Retailing,* Vol. 62, no. 1, 1988, p. 22, 25 and 29. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Valarie_Zeithaml/publication/225083802_SERVQUAL_A_multiple-_Item_Scale_for_measuring_consumer_perceptions_of_service_quality/links/5429a4540cf27e39fa8e6531/SERVQUAL-A-multiple-Item-Scale-for-measuring-consumer-perceptions-of-service-quality.pdf

Rashid Al-Abri and Amina Al-Balushi (2014). Patient Satisfaction Survey as a Tool Towards Quality Improvement. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3910415/

Survey Monkey (2017). Five tips on how to use Likert scales. Available at https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/likert-scale/

The Program for East Asia Democratic Studies Asian (*date unknown*). Asian Barometer's Survey of Democracy, Governance and Development – Fourth Wave. Available at http://www.asianbarometer.org/data/core-questionnaire

The World Bank (2010). Citizen-centric Governance Indicators: Measuring and Monitoring Governance by Listening to the People and Not the Interest Groups. World Bank Institute Research Working Paper No. 5181. Available at http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/190241468340284322/Citizen-centric-governance-indicators-measuring-and-monitoring-governance-by-listening-to-the-people-and-not-the-interest-groups

The World Bank Group (2011). World Bank Governance and Anti-corruption (GAC) Diagnostic Survey. Available at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/Resources/285741-1357839017667/GovernanceDiagnosticBriefjan2011.pdf

The World Bank Group (2017). Indicators of Citizen-Centric Public Service Delivery. June 2017 Final Draft.

The United Nations (11 May 2017). Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. Report of the Secrecretary-General at High-level political forum on sustainable development, convened under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council, 2017 Session. Available at https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2017/secretary-general-sdg-report-2017--EN.pdf

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2016). Citizen Engagement in Service Delivery – The Critical Role of Public Officials. Global Center for Public Service Excellence. Available at http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/capacity-development/English/Singapore%20Centre/GCPSE_CitizenEngagement_2016.pdf

UNDP, VFF-CRT & CECODES (2011-2017). The Viet Nam Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI): Measuring Citizens' Experiences. Available at www.papi.org.vn/eng

UNDP, VLA & CECODES (2012, 2015). Viet Nam's Justice Index (VJI): Towards a justice system for the people. Available at www.chisocongly.vn/en/

UNDP (2016). Human Development Index. Available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi

UNDP (2015). From Old Public Administration to New Public Service – Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries. Global Center for Public Service Excellence. Available at http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/PS-Reform.html

UNDP (2015). Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services in Georgia: 2015. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Swiss Cooperation Office (SCO) for the South Caucasus, Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC): November 2015. Available at http://www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/library/democratic_governance/citizen-satisfaction-with-public-services-in-georgia--2015.html

World Justice Project (2016). WJP Rule of Law Index 2016. Available at https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/wjp-rule-law-index/wjp-rule-law-index-2016