



Good Governance for Development
(GfD)
in Arab Countries

Working Group 2 on E-government and Administrative Simplification

-

High Level Seminar on Measuring and Evaluating E-government and 3rd
Working Group Meeting

DOC N3

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF E-GOVERNMENT IN
OECD COUNTRIES

12/13 March 2007

Dubai, United Arab Emirates

The text of this paper is part of the section on monitoring and evaluation of the OECD report “E-government Imperative” (2003). It gives an overview of the practices and discusses specific tools that OECD countries have developed to monitor and evaluate e-government (assessment of costs, benefits, demand and service quality) at the time the report was written.

While the paper in large part reflects the status of the discussion on this topic at the time the report was produced, many considerations outlined in this paper are still relevant in today’s debate on this topic and could help Arab countries in their attempt to better understand the risks and opportunities associated to monitoring and evaluating e-government.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF E-GOVERNMENT

It is necessary to monitor and evaluate e-government to understand demand, assess the benefits to users of alternative proposals and evaluate the effectiveness of proposals in meeting their objectives. Evaluation is needed to argue the case for new projects and expenditure, to justify continuing with initiatives, to allocate additional IT funds, to assess progress towards programme goals and to understand impacts. Additionally, monitoring and evaluation can assist with programme consolidation and selection of standards. OECD countries recognise the importance of this issue, and e-government policies and strategies reflect this recognition.

A number of promising initiatives exist in this area, although OECD countries acknowledge the need for improvement. Current efforts may be suitable for evaluating online services but do not take into account the back-office changes that accompany e-government.

Background and context

Current tools for programme and project evaluation provided by the private sector are a good starting point to evaluate e-government initiatives but should also take into account the public dimension of e-government in order to be effectively applied. Evaluation tools in this context demonstrate the limits to capturing the qualitative and/or financial value generated by large ICTs projects. (Van Gils, 2002):

- E-business evaluation tools like the **DMR Results Chain**, the **E-business Balanced Scorecard** and **Cranfield’s Process Model** have been successful in evaluating e-business, but to be suitable for e-government, they would need to incorporate social dimensions and the expected benefits of governance goals.
- The **EFQM Excellence Model** was introduced in 1992 for self-assessment of quality in organisations. Building on this model, the **Common Assessment Framework (CAF)** was designed for self-assessment in the public sector. While both frameworks are useful for government assessment, neither takes into account the difficulty of measuring the benefits of ICTs.

Obstacles to evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of government programmes is generally difficult, given the frequent lack of clarity of objectives owing to the different and often competing views held by different stakeholders. In addition, overlapping initiatives and policies and continuous fine-tuning of initiatives complicate monitoring and evaluation efforts. The fact that e-government is relatively new and that there are few advanced services means fewer models and actual outcome experiences that can be used for benchmarking.

These problems are magnified when attempting to monitor and evaluate e-government programmes. ICT projects are hard to evaluate because of the pervasive nature of ICTs, the integration of ICT goals with policy goals and the organisational changes that necessarily accompany e-government initiatives. Effective evaluation requires good metrics, regular monitoring and reporting, disciplined and professional use of robust evaluation frameworks and the use of long-term evaluation practices. These qualities depend on a government's overall evaluation culture. Table 3 summarises some of the barriers to e-government evaluation and gives various examples.

Obstacles to evaluating e-government

Obstacle	Example
Lack of clarity of objectives -- stated goals may not have associated measures of progress; there may be multiple objectives	Hard to measure "quality of life"
Hard to define success	If people are spending more time online, is that good or bad?
Easy to be too ambitious	Several countries have set targets of "all services online" by specific dates. But not all services are appropriate to put online.
Information paradox	The benefits of ICT investment may not be visible for some time (see OECD Growth Study)
Question of who are the clients; multiple clients	Should one evaluate benefits for the users, the employees, the government at large, partners, etc.?
Hard to measure shared benefits	Shared infrastructure, multiple projects benefiting from shared portal, etc.
Private sector tools may not work for governments	Governments place importance on social values that are not incorporated into private sector tools and objectives
Available indicators may not be the good ones	Current indicators (such as number of employees with Internet connections) are helpful, but have limits
Government definitions and methodologies vary from one country to the next	Collecting data is easier at the local level, but at that level administrations are highly decentralised
Incentives to misstate evaluation results	If an organisation succeeds in saving money, telling others may result in their losing that money
Challenge of sharing results	Hard to get organisations to report unsatisfactory results
What you measure may become focus of organisation	If you measure number of services online, but not service quality, priority will be on putting services online but not on service quality

Source: OECD.

To overcome these barriers and monitor and evaluate e-government successfully, a number of issues must be addressed:

- **A framework for assessment must be prepared prior to initiation**, as well as a framework for evaluating efficiencies once the project is completed. The process to be improved or replaced by the proposed arrangements must be clearly defined. The project's full costs, including the costs of managing the associated organisational changes, also need to be identified. Furthermore, "success" needs to be clearly defined and if possible linked to the broader goals of the organisation and the national strategy. Both implementers and evaluators must agree on the definition of success.
- The knowledge that the evaluation may be used to determine the survival of the project or future funding creates a danger that the organisation's sole focus will be to meet specific targets. This is particularly a problem when the indicators for e-government evaluation may not be representative of the programme's goals. To the extent possible, **e-government indicators should be designed to reflect programme goals.**

- For an evaluation to be useful, **results need to be available to decision makers at the right time**. When information on longer-term outcomes is not available in the requisite timeframe, alternative indicators should be used. Evaluation procedures should be realistic and focused on specific issues of value. All e-government evaluation will inevitably be a compromise between rigorous evaluation on the one hand and practical realities on the other.
- The **evaluation process should be unbiased and independent**, so that it can be used as a basis for revising e-government initiatives. It should also be non-threatening to participants. It should be general enough to apply to more than one agency, initiative or programme.
- E-government evaluations should be **based on a mixture of qualitative and quantitative indicators**. Qualitative indicators are useful because they may be better suited to some e-government benefits (such as improved quality of life) than quantitative indicators. However, qualitative indicators may be difficult to use when comparing projects and levels of success. Quantitative indicators are useful because they are more readily comparable and can be used to demonstrate concrete benefits. However, quantitative indicators are not always suited to e-government goals, and there is the danger of overvaluing their importance. As evaluation efforts become more advanced, there may be a greater reliance on qualitative measures.
- The evaluation process should take into account both **direct and indirect costs and benefits**. While indicators should be based on stated targets, they should also be flexible enough to take into account unexpected outcomes or be adapted for a later point in time.
- Finally, **e-government should be repeatedly evaluated** over time. The process should include pre-analysis, implementation analysis and post analysis.

Benchmarking

Evaluating national policy

Evaluating e-government programmes at the national level involves assembling data from a wide range of inputs, using consistent definitions and methodologies. Benchmarking sectors or national efforts with other sectors and programmes requires common approaches and definitions.

It is much more difficult to measure e-government at the national level than to evaluate specific projects. Evaluation **requires a large degree of compatibility between data from different agencies**, but their data are rarely comparable.

Current efforts to evaluate national policy have largely focused on the evaluation of online services. These studies tend to focus on: online service breadth (*e.g.* the number of services provided); online service span (*e.g.* the customer target group to which online services are delivered); online service depth (*e.g.* the complexity of the online services provided); and to a lesser extent online service quality (*e.g.* the extent to which online services achieve their stated objectives). However, these measures are only for online services, and are not well suited to evaluating e-government at the back-office level (except for advanced services, which generally require back-office changes). Specific measures that can be used for a broader e-government evaluation include:

- Pre-requisites for online services (*e.g.* Internet penetration, necessary skills, etc.).
- Level of shared infrastructure (*e.g.* are different agencies sharing the same infrastructure resources, or is each obliged to build its own?).
- Channel delivery strategy and/or existence of a one-stop shop (*e.g.* one point of access for all government services, whether national, regional or local and whether all agencies are working through it).

- Level of regulatory framework and enforcement at national level (e.g. privacy and security standards, authentication).
- Prevalence of national standards.
- Extent of co-operation and co-ordination among organisations.
- Level of public-private partnerships.
- Existence of financing mechanisms supporting e-government.

Italy: E-government observatory

The Department of Public Administration has established as a pilot project an observatory to examine the impact of ICT on public administration. At both central and local level, the project aims at measuring quality improvements in the provision of a public service (mainly to citizens and businesses, but also to other branches of local and central government) as well as efficiency gains within public administrations. The observatory aims at providing policy makers as well as managers with a tool allowing more thorough decision concerning both e-government policy and projects

Source: Corsi and Gullo (2002).

Post-implementation reviews for e-government projects

Post-implementation guidelines provide evaluation requirements to be included by agencies in post implementation reviews (PIR). Once a project has reached its end, a PIR should be conducted, generally 3-12 months later. The focus of the PIR is to provide an assessment of the implemented project, including an evaluation of the development process and indicate the extent to which the organization's investment decision-making processes are sustaining or improving the success rate of IM/IT projects.

Three essential areas have to be evaluated as part of a complete PIR:

- Citizens/end users: Surveys should be conducted to determine users' satisfaction with the end product. Many of the intangible benefits identified at the outset will relate to how citizens and end users feel about the final projects.
- Mission/programme impact: A close look should be taken to determine whether the system implemented has achieved its intended effect and whether this effect still fits mission goals. There should be a focused look at how well the project supports the organisation's various processes. An assessment should also be made of other project-specific aspects, such as an estimate of the cost savings achieved, compliance with the information technology architecture, along with evaluations of the information product (accuracy, timeliness, adequacy and appropriateness of information) and identification of additional maintenance or security issues.
- Technical capability: Finally, an evaluation should be made of the technical aspects of the project, both current and future. This evaluation may focus on such factors as the competency of the work force to use the new system, employee satisfaction or retention, the extent to which advanced technology was used and the methodological expertise of the development team.

Source: Van Gils (2002)

Original Source: IM/IT Investment Evaluation Guide, based on http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/emf-cag/investeval/ieq-gei00_e.asp

International benchmarking

Measuring progress against other countries (international benchmarking) is a common way of determining the success of national policy. International benchmarking can be a powerful tool for capturing the attention of ministers and generating political commitment to achieving certain national goals. However, international benchmarking studies to date lack accuracy and are judgmental, so they can conceal as much as they reveal. Finding common measures across countries is a very difficult task, especially as countries take

different approaches to the provision of online services. Finding effective and comparable measures is also more difficult when dealing with complex variables such as quality versus the more simple quantity of services online. For this reason, existing statistical surveys tend to focus on the aspects of e-government that are easier to measure, such as percentage of services online or use of e-government services, but do not take into account the more complex and back-office changes that are fundamental to e-government.

Current benchmarking studies are limited for the following reasons:

- They tend to focus on the supply side and do not generally include the demand for and use of e-government.
- They tend to be output rather than outcome oriented.
- They focus on government-to-citizen and government-to-business interactions, but do not measure government-to-government or government-to-employee interactions.
- The process is not transparent to governments and does not include a clear methodological statement.
- The process is not internationally agreed (each survey employs its own definitions and measuring tools, and other countries are not consulted).
- A country's overall performance is measured on the basis of only a small number of elements.
- No account is taken of countries' priorities, approaches or e-government objectives.

The Netherlands: The need for evaluation tools

A recent Dutch study proposes developing a common system of concepts for measurement of e-government and international benchmarking. At present, there is scarcely any quantitative material available, at either the international or national level. The few internationally comparable publications often include no more than a few readiness indicators. While there are valuable national studies, they do not lend themselves to international comparison or benchmarking.

To measure e-government, OECD countries need to develop a measurement tool which covers all relevant aspects and indicators of e-government. Each country would measure and analyse its situation with regard to e-government using the same set of research tools, preferably during the same time period. Some adaptation would be possible, e.g. large countries might use a larger sample than smaller ones. In their report to the OECD, countries would be able to contextualise results in the light of specific national characteristics, such as the structure and extent of the government.

As a result, the benchmarking of e-government would be based on primary data and internationally comparable. However, it is also important to take countries' specific context into account when evaluating its implementation of e-government. A benchmarking exercise should offer space for considering qualitative aspects along with the quantitative data, thus providing a more nuanced view of each country's position.

Source: Holland (2002)

Standard OECD statistics

Using standard statistics to make international comparisons of e-government is not easy. Not only is it difficult to delineate the concept of e-government (it may range from publishing basic government information on the Internet to letting citizens engage in dialogue with elected officials), but governments have different structures for service delivery and e-government co-ordination.

The statistics produced by OECD countries often refer to evaluation of national policies on the information society, but even here the statistics may vary from country to country. The OECD's *Measuring*

the Information Economy (2002b) provides some internationally comparable statistics on aspects of e-government.

Very few countries implement dedicated surveys of e-government, i.e. surveys in which government agencies are asked how they use ICTs as tool for improved service and communication. Countries that do use such surveys include Australia, Canada, Denmark and Norway.

The OECD Working Party on Indicators for the Information Society (WPIIS) is currently developing guidelines and model surveys covering aspects of e-government. The model questionnaire on measuring ICT use and e-commerce currently includes one e-government question for enterprises, which asks about business use of the Internet to communicate with public authorities. For households and individuals, the model questionnaire includes questions about obtaining information from government Web sites, downloading or submitting forms and other dealings with government.

WPIIS is aiming eventually to create separate modules on e-government in the enterprise and household/individual model questionnaires by further developing the current questions, and adding one new one. By taking on this task, WPIIS hopes to act as a forum for developing common indicators on e-government demand and use. However, no plans exist for developing guidelines and model questionnaires for ICT use in government; the very different structures of government would make it difficult or impossible to compile comparable statistics.

Evaluation of e-government activity

A focused examination on **elements of e-government activity** would be very valuable to most OECD countries. Cost-benefits assessments can assist agency decision makers in facing specific choices when implementing projects or help central e-government co-ordinators identify priorities for limited central funds.

Monitoring and evaluation of e-government is a broad area. The following discussion focuses on aspects judged priorities by the project working group, namely: costs and benefits, demand and service quality.

Australia: National Evaluation of E-government, February 2003

In early 2002, the Australian National Office for the Information Economy (NOIE) commissioned a study into the demand for and benefits of e-government. The aim of the study was twofold: (i) the development and application of a methodology to assess the success of the Commonwealth's government online programme through an analysis of past and future demand, benefits and return of investment; and (ii) the development of a methodology for measuring the success of future online initiatives allowing comparison. Preliminary findings of the study were released in November 2002.

The Findings – Demand

From 1997/98 to 2001/2002, the Prime Minister's commitment and agency client service strategies appear to have provided the major stimulus for agencies to offer services online to citizens and businesses.

The study found that there is ongoing demand for online services and that users believe significant benefits are available. It found that future demand for online government services might increase by approximately 30% in the period 2002 to 2004.

Citizens and businesses indicated that in the next twelve months they would use the Internet to access Commonwealth Government information related to education, health, taxation, employment, weather, community support, and to a lesser extent family assistance information.

Benefits to Users

The vast majority of users of government online services see significant benefits from being able to access services online. 86% of government online users felt that the overall benefit of government online was either significant (36%) or moderate (50%). However, only 45% were able to quantify actual cost savings associated with interacting with Government online compared to traditional channels.

As a result of interacting with government online:

- over 80% of all users indicated a moderate to significant improvement in the ease of finding information;
- approximately 75% indicated some or significant improvement in service quality;
- 75% saw either some (24%) or significant improvement (51%) in their ability to make decisions;
- over 80% of businesses and nearly 90% of government employees saw either some or significant improvements in the quality of their decision-making; and
- access to public records was considered more open by 68% of all users.

Benefits to Government

The study estimated potential financial benefits over the period 2000 to 2004 to government agencies through a reduction in costs:

- 67% expected to reduce costs significantly due to improved business processes;
- 64% expected to reduce costs significantly by directly reducing costs of servicing – i.e. direct cost reductions, such as advertising, printed material, staff costs and client management costs; and
- 17% expected to reduce costs significantly by using multi agency delivery channels.

Future Beneficial Features

The study found that citizens and businesses considered that there would be further benefits from features, such as:

- a seamless online government presence that provides more information, structured so that it is easy to find and does not require an understanding of how the government works; and
- further integration and clustering of services across agencies at all levels of government.

The final results from the study are available on the NOIE website.

Source: www.noie.gov.au

Cost/benefit analysis

Discussions of the utility of cost-benefit analyses for e-government initiatives are ongoing. Some argue that countries should not rely on cost-benefit analysis as the single basis for public budgeting and that other non-financial gains must be considered. Cost-benefit analysis is typically readily calculable for bricks and mortar projects like dams and roads, but is less obviously of value for government initiatives where the expected benefit may be public convenience or even improved public perceptions of public services (Reeder, 2002).

For example, there is considerable debate regarding the economic value of small time savings. If the public, on average, spends 30 minutes less time waiting in line for a driver's licence to be issued, are those small increments truly recoverable and put to other economically productive uses? Put differently, if 100 000 individuals each save 30 minutes once a year, has the economy realised the equivalent of 25 work years in savings?

Cost and benefits need separate measures before they can be combined into cost/benefit analysis. A few areas for consideration include:

- Available tools to measure the costs of an e-government project and justify launching an initiative.
- Comparing costs of an e-service and the traditional equivalent.
- Investment and uptake costs.
- Operational costs, including maintenance and training.
- Long-term costs, including the cost of updating systems and depreciation.
- Expected cost savings in the longer term.

- Opportunity costs of launching an e-government initiative.

The benefits flowing from ICT investments can be difficult to identify, given the integration of ICTs into broader policy goals and organisational change. More specifically, assessing the benefits of e-government initiatives to governments and to service users is difficult because:

- Benefits may be unclear, overlapping and reliant on the performance of other initiatives.
- Goals may be expressed in terms of putting services online, or putting infrastructure in place. While these goals can be evaluated in their own terms, they do not take into account uptake or the actual benefits desired or achieved by end users.
- It may not be clear who actually benefits from e-government initiatives (government, users, employees, etc.), especially as some of the beneficiaries may be unintended. It is also unclear whose benefits should be counted when adding up benefits.
- Benefits from shared arrangements such as common infrastructure can be difficult to assess.
- Benefits include both direct outputs (such as the reduction in the time needed for compliance by small businesses using online services) and broader outcomes (such as the impact of the reduced time on business viability).
- Benefits will inevitably involve elements that are both quantifiable (e.g. cost and time savings) and non-quantifiable (e.g. improved service quality), raising the issue of valuation of non-financial benefits.
- Benefits will not be static, but will change over the life of the initiative as user expectations evolve.

In practice, the evaluation of benefits has focused on estimates of efficiencies in government and improved convenience for users. These estimates are often made at the project initiation stage, to justify commencing a project. Assessment of realised benefits resulting from initiatives also needs to be emphasised to identify lessons learned from project implementation and operation.

Australia: The Victoria Government Online intermediate benefits review, 2001

The Victorian State government, a leader of e-government efforts in Australia, undertook an intermediate benefits review (IBR) of its government online programme. The goal was to provide an accurate summary of delivered and planned GOL benefits and funding in Victoria. An independent consultant conducted the IBR in three phases over a 20-week period commencing 13 November 2000. Some 460 online government projects encompassing 155 programmes, 56 agencies and a sample of 274 citizens, as well as in-depth analysis of 26 individual case studies, were surveyed. At the time of the IBR, 46% of programmes were described as complete and 54% were still in progress.

Phase 1 involved surveying project data from agencies of the Victorian Public Service over a four-week period. As it was assumed that benefit tracking was not a core competency of all Victorian government agencies, the consultant hosted pre-survey briefing sessions to prepare the respondents for calculating expected benefits and cost savings. Agencies were asked to specify expected and delivered benefits of social worth ranging from nil to significant and agency worth in financial terms across a range of bands. Finally, the agencies were asked to estimate the extent to which benefits had been realised and what risks might prevent the benefits from being realised. Agencies were asked to supply where possible or at least identify suitable metrics and baseline data for future time series analysis. When the survey ended, the consultant performed a quality-control analysis of the data before freezing the database.

Phase 2 involved surveying a sample of users of GOL services (Victorian citizens, businesses and departments) to confirm the benefits identified in phase 1 from a social perspective and identify unexpected benefits and gaps where benefits were not achieved.

Phase 3 concerned future funding recommendations.

The benefits framework was built on the basis of GOL objectives, benefits estimations developed by the consultant and validation of data by opinion surveys of the population.

Source: Van Gils (2002)

Original source: Victoria Government Online – Intermediate Benefits Review, 2001 –

<http://www.egov.vic.gov.au/>

Assessing demand

A major focus of e-government activity has been increasing the supply of online services with relevant targets. Given their relative novelty, many services were developed without reference to potential demand. However, as services become more complex and include transactional services, **assessment of demand becomes critical** to ensure that the benefits of initiatives both to governments and to end users match the costs involved.

As for other forms of service delivery, measuring demand for potential online services is complex. Issues to be addressed include identifying the potential pool of users, assessment of accessibility, including general online access by the target group, ease of use and the requirements of groups with special needs, such as the disabled.

Experience has shown the difficulty of predicting usage patterns before the online services are implemented. Potential users cannot be expected to have identified specific requirements for online services, as these emerge only in the light of actual experience. As services become more complex, the need for pilot testing and prototyping becomes more important. As services are implemented, **structured feedback arrangements** enable adjustments to be made in the light of experience.

Finland: E-government-related surveys

Since 1999, the Ministry of the Interior has made annual surveys of citizens' views on the delivery of electronic services by the public administration. The results have suggested that while citizens are familiar with services provided by their own municipality or local state authority, they have little awareness of other public-sector electronic services. These limited surveys indicate that Finns support the development of public e-service, but they do not reveal much about the level of citizen demand for e-government.

As a part of building the national citizen portal, the Ministry of Finance carried out a user survey of 100 citizens and civil servants in 2000. The results showed that citizens recognised the need for a portal that could provide: *i*) information about public-sector organisations and their services; *ii*) advanced electronic services for which transactions are possible; and *iii*) feedback mechanisms on specific questions.

For regional portals, the most commonly used services were public services. Even though the attitude towards these services was positive and they were frequently used, these services were also seen as the ones that needed the most development.

The Chamber of Commerce and the Association of small and medium-sized enterprises have also conducted several surveys on companies' interest in electronic services.

Source: OECD report on E-Government in Finland (2003).

United Kingdom: The People's Panel

In 1998, the Cabinet Office's Modernising Public Services Group set up the "People's Panel" to be better able to provide the services that people want. Citizens' panels had already been used in local government for many years, but this initiative was a world first at the national level. The panel is composed of 5 000 members and is representative of the UK population in terms of age, gender, region and a wide range of other demographic indicators. An additional 830 members were recruited from ethnic minorities to ensure that the sample of minority groups is large enough to be used for quantitative research.

The government is using the People's Panel for many service delivery issues on a regular basis and has recommended that departments use it when starting and implementing e-government projects and programmes.

For instance, in April and May 2000, the Cabinet Office's Performance and Innovation Unit (PIU) created six focus groups from the People's Panel to get a better understanding of people's attitudes towards electronic delivery of public services. The findings have been used by PIU in compiling their report on e-government, "Electronic Government Services for the 21 Century".

Source: http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/servicefirst/consumerfocus/guide_general.htm#The%20People's%20Panel

Australia: Victoria Tourism Online

Victoria Tourism Online has performed customer surveys to establish performance baselines, conducted focus groups with representative users and participated in industry forums to understand the likely need for tourism services online. This knowledge of customer demand is cited as a critical element of the project's success.

Source: Detailed Benefits Report, Multimedia Victoria Government Online, Intermediate Benefits Review, Phase 2, 27 June 2001.

Service quality

Measuring service quality is of particular importance for e-government, as most governments regard improvement of the quality of public services as an important objective of e-government programmes. Quality standards, which will vary for individual projects, need to be developed in the context of broader service charters and standards. The quality of e-government services is often assessed as citizen satisfaction, measured through interviews or online questionnaires. Frequent **surveys of citizen satisfaction** are of particular importance in e-government, as customer's expectations and habits are evolving rapidly in a changing service environment. Results from these surveys may be used to identify improvements that meet user needs by making services more accessible and effective. Results may also be used to update service quality standards.

United Kingdom: Customer segmentation and Web site testing

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has used a number of means to better understand customers' needs. Throughout 2001, customer-segmented focus groups examined its product portfolios, the type of data provided and how best to deliver it – on paper or electronically via the Web site, for example. Customers were segmented by type and by how frequently they used the data. On the basis of this research, the ONS decided how to deliver data and services for each group.

The ONS launched a new Web site in 2001 after conducting the focus groups and laboratory usability testing to understand how its users navigated to find the information they needed.

These findings were systematically used as part of a development programme. Users are being involved at key stages of development and will influence the look, feel and functionality of the site.

Source: National Audit Office (2002).

Canada: Service quality and Common Measurement Tool (CMT)

The CMT was developed by the Canadian Centre for Management Development's Citizen-Centred Service Network to improve the measurement of client satisfaction. The CMT asks questions about service delivery at the operational level. It is conceived around five key elements: client expectations, perceptions of the service experience, satisfaction levels of importance, and priorities for improvements. There is a core set of questions for inter-jurisdictional comparisons of client satisfaction in a few key areas of service delivery, as well as a larger question bank from which organisations can choose based on their needs and particular situations.

Source: http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-as/tools-outils/tools-outilstb_e.asp

Monitoring and evaluation – the role of e-government co-ordinators

Improving monitoring and evaluation is a major task for e-government co-ordinators. Improvements in this area will require a balance between the practical needs of agencies – producing information that will actually be used – and the difficulty of maintaining a quality evaluation and analysis process. While countries' priorities will differ, the need to better articulate the benefits of e-government activity means that the focus should be on the benefits of initiatives. Without clearly stated benefits, e-government implementers cannot expect political and public support. E-government co-ordinators should consider the following action:

- Establishing a network of practice across key agencies, focused on e-government evaluation issues.
- With the use of this network, developing a framework for assessment of demand, benefits and user satisfaction for use by agencies to assess individual agency projects.
- Gaining agreement of central budget authorities to use this framework as a standard, acceptable method for assessing these impacts for the purpose of budget decision making.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CORSI, M. and GULLO, E. (2002),
“Measuring E-Government in Italy”.
- HOLLAND, C., BONGERS, F., VANDEBERG, R., KELLER, W. and TE VELDE, R. (2002),
“Building Blocks and Recommendations for a Standardised Measuring Tool”.
- REEDER, F. S. and PANDY, S. M. (2002),
“Identifying Effective Funding Models for E-Government”.
- VAN GILS, D. (2002),
“Evaluation Practices used by OECD Member Countries to Assess E-Government”.
- OECD (2002b),
Measuring the Information Economy, Paris.