

ASEAN Guidelines on Public Service Delivery



one vision
one identity
one community



ASEAN Guidelines on Public Service Delivery

The ASEAN Secretariat
Jakarta

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was established on 8 August 1967. The Member States are Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam. The ASEAN Secretariat is based in Jakarta, Indonesia.

For inquiries, contact:

The ASEAN Secretariat
Community Relations Division (CRD)
70A Jalan Sisingamangaraja
Jakarta 12110
Indonesia
Phone : (62 21) 724-3372, 726-2991
Fax : (62 21) 739-8234, 724-3504
E-mail : public@asean.org

Catalogue-in-Publication Data

ASEAN Guidelines on Public Service Delivery

Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat, December 2020

352.0601

1. ASEAN – Civil Service
2. Public Service – Public Delivery System

ISBN 978-623-6945-03-2

ISBN 978-623-6945-03-2



ASEAN: A Community of Opportunities for All

The text of this publication may be freely quoted or reprinted, provided proper acknowledgement is given and a copy containing the reprinted material is sent to the Community Relations Division (CRD) of the ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta.

General information on ASEAN appears online at the ASEAN Website: www.asean.org

Copyright Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) 2020.
All rights reserved.

The development of the ASEAN Guidelines on Public Service Delivery was supported by the ASEAN Plus Three Cooperation Fund.

FOREWORD

Over the years, ASEAN Cooperation on Civil Service Matters (ACCSM) has served as a key mechanism to strengthen collaboration among ASEAN Member States and promote assistance in maximising our potentials and resources to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of civil service. We have developed and implemented various initiatives, programmes and activities under the ACCSM Work Plans which contributed to great achievements so far.



Currently, we have successfully accomplished our task in developing the new ACCSM Work Plan for the year 2021-2025 with an aim to tackle our shared challenges and priority concerns at present and in the future. This new work plan will lay a solid foundation for ACCSM to work even more closely and more effectively in helping civil servants and public services across ASEAN keep up with the rapid and emerging disruptions.

For all these efforts and achievements, I would like to emphasise a crucial role of the civil service in providing effective, efficient, and responsive public services, improving citizens' quality of life, and promoting inclusive and sustainable development of each nation and ASEAN region. Particularly, amidst the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic which has posed a significant threat to the lives and well-being of people in many aspects, civil service has increasingly become an important actor in addressing and overcoming the challenges brought about by the pandemic and mitigating impacts of the COVID-19 on people of all groups.

Therefore, I wish to convey my congratulations and appreciation to Cambodia for initiating the ASEAN Public Service Delivery Guidelines under the ACCSM Work Plan (2016-2020) with kind supports from the ASEAN Plus Three Cooperation Fund and ASEAN Secretariat. The guidelines, developed in consultation with ASEAN Member States, will certainly pave the way for us to accelerate capacity and capability of civil service and shape the future of public service that can better serve and benefit people.

I honestly believe that the principles, best practices, and recommendations proposed by these guidelines can contribute to continuous improvements in public service delivery to respond to increasing expectations of the citizen and government, the rapid pace of changes and innovations as well as the new normal after the pandemic effectively.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Pal Dev', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

M.L. Patcharapakorn Devakula
Secretary-General
Office of the Civil Service Commission, Thailand
The 20th ACCSM Chair

FOREWORD



Since it's established in 1967, ASEAN has contributed immensely to regional peace and stability, remarkable economic growth and social development. The peace dividend has enabled economies to transition from low-income to middle-income countries, resulting in higher standards of living, human development, and technological advancements. The advent of digital technology has also contributed to the delivery of public service in a more efficient and effective manner.

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted lives and livelihood of our people. The ASEAN economy is projected to contract -2.1% in 2020, underlining the urgency in addressing the timely needs of people. ASEAN remains committed in sustaining pre-pandemic social and human developments by providing quality public service delivery.

As the backbone of good governance, the civil service plays a central role in driving national development and managing the evolving relationship between the government and the people. This is evident when governments engage and empower their communities to improve public services delivery, increasingly with the help of information and communication technology. Adapting to the rapid pace of technological change and its impact on shaping public expectations is key to ASEAN's future. To this end, the ASEAN Member States have issued a joint statement on the need to enhance the capacities of the ASEAN civil service to be agile, efficient, and people-centered, especially in this era of disruptive technology.

It therefore gives me great pleasure to present you with the ASEAN Public Service Delivery Guidelines, which is an initiative championed by Cambodia under the ASEAN Cooperation on Civil Service Matters (ACCSM) Work Plan (2016-2020) and supported by the ASEAN Plus Three Cooperation Fund. These guidelines are the result of extensive regional workshops and consultations among ASEAN Member States, and promotes principles of best practices that aim to drive progress in the region's public service delivery.

I am confident that the best practices and recommendations outlined in this Guidelines will accelerate ASEAN's efforts to become more resilient and innovative in the post-pandemic era, as well as contribute towards the realisation of the role of the civil service as a catalyst in achieving the ASEAN Community Vision 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to be 'Lim Jock Ho'. The signature is fluid and cursive, written in a professional style.

DATO LIM JOCK HOI
Secretary-General of ASEAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Theoretical considerations for a public service delivery system	1
B. The need for guidelines on improving public service delivery	2
C. Objective of the guidelines	3
D. Potential users of the guidelines.....	4
E. Structure of the guidelines.....	4
II. THE PRINCIPLES, PROCESSES AND INDICATORS OF A PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM	5
A. Definition of the principles of a public service delivery system	5
B. Process for implementing principles of a public service delivery system	5
C. Indicators for applying the five principles.....	6
III. BEST PRACTICE GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY IN THE ASEAN REGION	8
A. International and regional best practices and lessons learned	8
B. Proposed pathways to emulate the lessons learned from the best practices in public service delivery.....	18
1. People empowerment and public service delivery system in ASEAN.....	18
2. Possible scenarios for ASEAN.....	18
3. Tools for improving service delivery, including ICT.....	19
4. Citizen-centric civil service approach.....	19
5. Building institutional capacities and interagency coordination	20
IV. IMPLEMENTING IMPROVEMENTS IN PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY	21
Framework 1: Setting service standards.....	21
Framework 2: Policy-making and regulation-making.....	22
Framework 3: Monitoring and evaluation.....	22
Framework 4: Feedback-handling mechanism	23
Framework 5: Customer satisfaction.....	24
V. IMPLEMENTING AND MONITORING THE GUIDELINES	25
A. Voluntary-based implementation and monitoring by Member States	25
B. Periodic reporting of Member States on the implementation of the guidelines to the meetings of ASEAN Cooperation on Civil Service Matters	25
REFERENCES	26
ANNEX 1. CHECKLIST FOR SELF-EVALUATION	27
ANNEX 2. INDICATORS	30

A. Theoretical considerations for a public service delivery system

The historical development of public service delivery closely relates to the iterative progression of public administration, at least its evolution over four primary models: old public administration, new public administration, new public management and new public service.

The “old” public administration view was strongly influenced by German sociologist, philosopher and political economist Max Weber’s nineteenth-century idea of a modern bureaucracy that emphasizes hierarchy and meritocracy (Robinson, 2015). Through centralized control, clear rules and guidelines, an articulated separation between policy-making and its implementation and a clear organizational structure, a bureaucracy is expected to work efficiently and effectively. Bureaucratic rules and compliance by executors to their organization are the chief elements of public service delivery in the old public administration approach (Sager and Rosser, 2009).

In the 1970s, the onset of the “new” public administration paradigm set in motion a questioning of that notion of efficiency and effectiveness because the old public administration model did not address issues related to social justice in the delivery of public services. The orientation of internal interests of the bureaucracy prevailed over values slanted towards the public interest. The new public administration thus added the issue of social justice as an important element of public service.

Fifteen years later, “new public management” emerged as a model mimicking the managerial style of private companies. It emphasized the importance of entrepreneurial leadership in every public organization rather than just obedience to the rules. In addition, control of inputs and outputs, performance management, monitoring and evaluation and auditing became expected responsibilities of a public organization (Cheung, 2013; Christensen and Laegreid, 2007).

But then doubts with the new public management model began to emerge, with increasing emphasis on technical and economic rationality and self-interest. The new emphasis, however, reduced the quality of services that citizens received.

At the turn of this current century came the “new public service” model and its shift towards a focus on strategic rationality and citizen interests (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2003). The new view positions public service as a process involving various actors, from politicians and bureaucrats to citizens and the private sector (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2015; 2000). In this view, citizens are both customers and agents for themselves, with the right to be involved in policy-making and public service (World Bank, 2018; Holmes, 2011). The government functions as a “serving organization” by building coalitions with various organizations.

The paradigm changes in public service delivery followed a similar iteration, as reflected in the evolution from Government 1.0 to Government 4.0. In Government 1.0, the operating system is a one-way model that is government oriented, with maximizing efficiency as the main goal. In Government 2.0, the operating system is a two-way model but is citizen-oriented, with democracy and bidirectional service its principal values. Government 3.0 is individual-oriented and focuses on the provision of services that aim to achieve personalized happiness for every

citizen. The system is also characterized by interaction of citizens with the government through the use of mobile smart phones. And Government 4.0 operations make use of big data, data analytics, artificial intelligence, smart cities and intelligent robots.

B. The need for guidelines on improving public service delivery in ASEAN Member States

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) comprises 10 member states: Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR), Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam. The ASEAN Member States are marked by their commonalities as well as differences in terms of socioeconomic development, their geophysical environment, culture, history and composition of political institutions, among other factors. The ASEAN region is also characterized by its rapid economic growth. With a total population of more than 642 million people (ASEAN Secretariat, 2018), the 10 Member States currently contribute around US\$2.7 trillion (Statista, 2019) in combined gross domestic product.

Despite the various challenges confronting the region overall (inequality, for instance), the Member States have registered significant improvement in social welfare, which is reflected in improved access to sanitation, education, health and other public services, including a good performance ranking in the Human Development Index (ASEAN Secretariat, 2018). But with many economies transitioning from low-income to middle-income countries, new challenges have emerged.

Prominent among these challenges is the rise in expectations of citizens as a direct consequence of rising incomes, a high standard of living and participation in public service delivery (James, 2011). Additionally, "the public" as a collective group has become even more complex and diverse. Citizens increasingly expect more personalized services that respond to their individual needs. To deliver, governments are expected to provide better public services, create greater access to information and increase involvement of other actors in public decision-making (John, 2009; Osborne, 2008). Governments are also expected to provide public services tailored to the needs of each individual member of society.

The influence of technological change on public service delivery is no longer trivial because it will bear heavily on how public expectations in the future will be gratified. The rapid pace of the technological change already has wide-ranging impact on how public services are organized and delivered to citizens. And yet, many public leaders are not ready for what these technological changes mean in terms of how they, the leaders, interact and engage with society (Hamner, 2009).

The region is well known for its diversity. But even though the governance structures across the 10 Member States are based on the range of political and philosophical ideologies, from communism in Lao PDR and Viet Nam to Islam in Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia, liberal democracy in the Philippines to state developmentalism in Singapore and Pancasila in Indonesia, there is need now for a common platform to guide each of them towards increasing the quality of their public services. A common platform would foster the sharing of principles, values and practices for providing better public service delivery regardless of the government system and foster greater unity. And in an ideal form, such a platform should be capable of reviewing, monitoring and evaluating any public service delivery initiative.

Each ASEAN Member State has its own way to deliver public services to citizens according to their capacities and level of development. Each of the States also faces challenges and obstacles in implementing their programme. Despite the problems and challenges, each government must ensure that its public servants are capable of providing satisfactory service, making improvements and keeping up with the latest technological and other developments (state of the art).

Inevitably, public service delivery reform is highly complicated because it is bound with ideology, moral values and principles as well as techniques and processes. Therefore, a range of questions should be discussed on how public services are to be performed: How should public services be provided and delivered and to whom? In what aspect should public personnel be developed? To whom and how should they be accountable? How is performance to be measured, by whom and for what purpose?

Public administration reform over the years has emphasized the need to make government more efficient, transparent, accountable, responsive and citizen centric (Bourgon, 2007). A recent study on public service delivery in the ASEAN Member States (as well as China, Japan and the Republic of Korea) assessed the state and performance of public service delivery practices and found need for reform (Ministry of Civil Service of Cambodia, 2018). That study involved a series of consultations with government officials representing home affairs, public services and administration, education, health services, public works and finance. The study also included an investment analysis of public service delivery system in each Member State.

After deliberating on the study's findings during a workshop, Member State representatives agreed on five principles that should reflect the region's public service delivery: accessibility to information, participation, responsiveness, accountability, and non-discrimination and inclusiveness. The principles became the basis of a road map for improving service delivery in the ASEAN Member States.

This paper thus outlines the recommended guidelines, also agreed by the workshop Member State participants, for each government to use for streamlining the delivery of public services to reflect the five principles. These guidelines offer a structure for providing public service agencies that can help drive progress by monitoring and evaluating public service delivery. The Member State study on public service delivery captured the challenges confronting each country as well as ways to overcome some of the problems. Those practices are also included in these guidelines for all governments to draw upon.

C. Objective of the guidelines

The general purpose of these guidelines is to help governments provide efficient and effective service delivery to citizens. These guidelines provide suggested inputs for assessing processes and procedures that can help transform public systems in the Member States into dynamic, professional, efficient and effective providers of services that are essential for achieving the ASEAN development goals.

D. Potential users of the guidelines

These guidelines reflect best practices when it comes to principles, policy development and the process for public services delivery. The public delivery system in China, Japan and the Republic of Korea were also included in the study of systems in the 10 ASEAN Member States. These guidelines are not limited to government officials at the national and subnational level but speak also to multinational development agencies, academia and other research institutions and non-state organizations with a keen interest in advancing the quality of public services in the Member States and beyond.

E. Structure of the guidelines

Beyond this introduction, the next section presents the five principles of a good-quality public service delivery system, its processes and the indicators and tools to apply responsiveness to the five principles. The third section features the best practices from the study on public service delivery in Member States plus China, Japan and the Republic of Korea. Using those best practices as well as the five principles as a basis, the fourth section offers recommended actions related to public service delivery for application in the Member States. The final section then provides a platform for the implementation and monitoring of the guidelines.

This section refers to the five principles that should be represented in a public service delivery system, based on assessments and reforms of public administration found in the literature and agreed to by Member States as the basis for improving service in the region: accessibility, participation, accountability, non-discrimination, and inclusiveness and responsiveness. It also reflects how the principles should be applied through the proposed indicators, which can be used for monitoring implementation of the principles in a public service delivery system.

A. Definition of the principles of a public service delivery system

A strong and good-quality public service delivery system should be grounded on the following five principles, as defined here.

Principle 1: Accessibility

Definition: Citizens must be informed in a complete, timely and easily accessible manner of any activities of government relevant to the exercise of their rights, and this must include opportunity for the public to scrutinize government decision-making.

Principle 2: Participation

Definition: The right of citizens to have their views and relevant information considered before a decision is made by the government, at all levels.

Principle 3: Accountability

Definition: The obligation of government to meet adequate standards of transparency, participation and legality by providing effective review of the rules and decisions it makes.

Principle 4: Non-discrimination and inclusiveness

Definition: The equal right of every citizen to access or receive public service delivery and to have equal opportunity to participate in government activities.

Principle 5: Responsiveness

Definition: The capacity of government to satisfy the needs of citizens and ensuring that citizens are served responsibly by government agencies and officials.

B. Process for implementing principles of a public service delivery system

1. Accessibility

- Accessible: The availability of access and the openness of the information.
- Intelligible: The quality of the information disclosed, understood as precise and relevant.
- Reliable: The availability of the information in a timely manner.

2. Participation

- Breadth: The degree to which a government's decision-making adequately incorporates public values.
- Depth: The quality of involving citizens and addressing the levels of exchange between citizens and government in a participatory process.
- Outcomes: The goals of the participatory process are in line with the vision of citizens.

3. Accountability

- Awareness: Providing constant information to citizens.
- Ownership: Accepting responsibility for past, present and future initiatives of actions and results.
- Trustworthy: Providing public service delivery that is responsive, honest and competent, even in the absence of constant scrutiny.

4. Non-discrimination and inclusiveness

- Equitable treatment: Providing public service delivery to a socially, ethnically, culturally and economically diverse society designed to meet individual needs.
- Respect: Creating excellent public service delivery by having professional interaction with citizens (passionate, listen and focus on the resolution).
- Mutual trust: Cultivating a culture that promotes a good relationship between citizens and government, in which citizens trust the government and the government trusts citizens.

5. Responsiveness

- Partnering with citizens: Governments are increasingly engaging with citizens to ensure government responsiveness in public services.
- Policy communication: Information flows on policy actions reach all citizens.
- Policy representation: The views and opinions of citizens are reflected in policy-making.

C. Indicators for applying the five principles

The following are the indicators (discussed and agreed by the ASEAN Member States) that can be used to apply the principles of good-quality public service delivery and monitoring whether the government stays true to them. See the annexes for the tools that can be used in this process.

1. Accessibility

- How is information disclosure of local government activities accessed?
- How can government documents and data be requested in a timely manner?
- How are government regulations published in a timely manner?
- How does government regularly disclose all information required by citizens (including the amount of fees to be paid, if any)?
- How do dedicated platforms of the government manage and disclose information to the public?
- Do citizens easily understand government information?

2. Participation

Breadth

- Who participates (government should take into account representation of intended targets and vital sectors)?
- How many people participate?
- How often do people participate?
- How are citizens' identities protected when necessary?

Depth

- How are citizens involved in different ways?
- How is the two-way flow of information fostered through meetings, hearings and surveys?
- How are citizens and institutional relationships promoted?
(It will be measured by the number of meetings and the use of information from citizens to improve the government policy).

Outcomes

- How do citizens influence decision-making processes?
- How is the quality of decisions improved?
- How does government contribute to citizens' knowledge?
(It will be measured by the level of understanding and capacity of the citizens.)

3. Accountability

- How does government guarantee the freedom of the press (reasonable access to information and protection of journalists)?
- How does government respect the rights and freedoms of minorities (ethnic, religious, linguistic and immigrants)?
- How reliable is the government budget (its completeness, credibility and performance as determined by a reliable audit)?

4. Non-discrimination and inclusiveness

- Does government provide equal treatment for ethnic minorities and vulnerable citizens (women and impoverished, poorly educated, disabled, young and older persons)?
- Is the government provision for basic needs (education and health services) affordable and equal for every citizen?
- How does the government create employment and provide equal access to financial resources to all citizens?
- How does government provide equal political, gender and cultural representation for citizens to participate in government activities?

5. Responsiveness

- Does the government listen and stay informed of citizens' sentiments?
- Does the government explain and provide credible justification for its policy decisions?
- Does the government adapt and adjust policy decisions to citizens' demands?

A. International and regional best practices and lessons learned

Over the past decade, the interaction of citizens with the world outside their country has intensified. Their perception and appreciation of quality public services, which their respective government provides, is no longer seen only from the internal historical perspective of the country but is also increasingly influenced by their exposure and interaction with public service delivery experiences in other countries, both developing and developed economies.

Ideally, public service delivery should be based on the perspective of citizen engagement and empowerment. Public service delivery must be citizen-oriented in which the government has in place at least one mechanism to engage with citizens or beneficiaries in the context of public service delivery. And public service delivery outcomes should include a mechanism for citizen and beneficiary feedback to monitor their engagement throughout the public service delivery system. Citizen engagement can be considered as a powerful source of ideas to tackle societal problems; citizens may be better positioned to assess the relevance and effectiveness of public services and thus they must be involved in the evaluation of public services. Citizens contribute considerably to the process of improving policies and services. The active role of citizens is helpful for the government in each country to improve and respond to the demands for service delivery.

The following is a summary of the best practices relating to the principles of quality public service delivery found across the ASEAN region and in China, Japan and the Republic of Korea to inspire all Member States to assess their services and see where they could improve and even adopt the appropriate elements of these examples. The examples provided here were provided by each country. As it turned out, the exemplar practices that were submitted only demonstrated four of the five principles (participation, voice and accountability, responsiveness, non-discrimination and inclusiveness). Nonetheless, they also illustrate the fifth principle of accessibility where a government uses technology to communicate its programmes and other vital information to citizens and to allow citizens access to government agencies.

PARTICIPATION

Case #1 Singapore: Policy communication and engagement

The Singaporean Public Service is enhancing its engagement with its citizenry by expanding outreach channels using both digital and offline platforms. The Ministry of Communication and Information's REACH Listening Points and its Facebook live chats provide channels for agencies to reach out to the heartland and online community to obtain opinions on various issues.

The Public Service is also working on enhancing its service delivery by firstly, re-organising services around citizens rather than around agencies; and secondly, improving the last mile service delivery and experience for specific segments of the population. For instance, the Silver Generation Office has established a network of Silver Generation Ambassadors, who make

door-to-door visits to explain government policies to older persons and gather their feedback. They also identify older persons with needs and work with service providers to link them to ageing-related, befriending and care services. Since the beginning of 2018, they have engaged around 280,000 older persons. In September 2019, the government launched active ageing features in its Moments of Life app to complement the outreach efforts and allow older persons to engage with government services. Using the app, older persons can check the government benefits they are eligible for, find active ageing programmes near them and be sent advisories relevant to them (such as the enhanced subsidies for the Merdeka Generation older persons programme). The Silver Generation Offices link up services, policies and schemes across the public service for seniors, regardless which ministry or agency these belong to. For instance, during the outbreak of COVID 19, Silver Generation Ambassadors distributed food to seniors living alone, called to check on them, and distributed TraceTogether tokens to them from door to door.

Singapore has also piloted innovative engagement techniques to strengthen its policy co-creation process with its citizens. For example, in 2017–2018, the Ministry of Health carried out the country's first Citizens' Jury, which deliberated on tackling diabetes. In that two-month programme, 76 citizens of various age, race and educational background (including caregivers, health care providers and people living with and without diabetes), developed community-based solutions and submitted their recommendations in a report to the Ministry. The participants were equipped with the information and resources to make informed decisions on policy and were empowered to step up and make policy recommendations.

Case #2 Philippines: Complaints-handling mechanism using information technology

A national contact centre, known as Contact Center ng Bayan, was set up to receive and attend to public comments, complaints, and recommendations from the public through different modes of communication: via text, e-mail, telephone, regular mail or walk-in visits. Through the contact centre, the public began to assume an active role and be a partner towards improving government services. Through the feedback generated from the public through the contact centre, government agencies are informed of the need to improve and/or sustain the delivery of their services. Agency heads are provided with updated data on the number of reports made, the nature of the reports, the resolution rate and recommended courses of action.

Case #3 Brunei Darussalam: Customer satisfaction survey and service quality improvement

The implementation of Customer Satisfaction survey (KSTP) has become one of the key measurements in Civil Service Framework (CSF) under the objective 3a (implement policies and regulatory reforms that encourage economic activities). This objective is under the responsibility of the Director of the Management Service Department. The Civil Service Framework (CSF) has set a target for the percentage of customer satisfaction that needs to be reached by targeted government agencies. The objectives of this initiative are to identify the level of customer satisfaction and to know the customers' perception toward the quality of service delivery in the government agencies.

Case #4 Malaysia: Complaints-handling mechanism

The government of Malaysia established the Public Complaints Bureau to resolve complaints from the public. It represents one of the responsibilities of the government to the public to ensure that they receive quality services from government departments and agencies. Through the Public Complaints Bureau, the public or other interested parties can forward

complaints or grievances regarding the quality of services, such as unprofessional conduct, mismanagement, negligence and misuse of power, and seek remedial measures on their complaints from the relevant agency. In 2009, the government established an Integrated Public Complaints Management System, which is a central platform that facilitates the channelling of public complaints in a convenient, easily accessible, fast and efficient manner. The integrated system helps enhance the quality of public service delivery through data collection on public complaints, which are analysed to determine any problems. Identifying problems contributes to improving policies, regulations, work processes and procedures relating to public service delivery.

Case #5 Viet Nam: Two-tier complaints-handling mechanism

The Complaints Law of 2008 stipulates the public's right to express complaints through the postal system, e-mail or telephone (hotline number) regarding the public services they receive. The Government Inspectorate coordinates the complaints handling system at the central level; it organizes reception and the forwarding of the complaints to the relevant ministries and follows up on the resolutions. The head of the state administrative organ receives complaints and then forwards them to the Government Inspectorate and relevant agency or technical section for handling.

Case #6 Lao PDR: Complaints-handling mechanism

The Lao government recognizes the importance of a complaints-handling mechanism for improving the quality of public services. Government institutions have established hotlines and complaint boxes that serve as channels for the public to vent grievances about public services they receive (or do not receive), those they would like to receive and about public service providers and the system in general. In addition to the traditional hotlines and boxes, the government also now uses Facebook and e-mail. Government ministries and agencies that have established complaints-handling mechanisms include the State Inspection and Anti-Corruption Authority, the Ministry of Public Finances, the Ministry of Planning and Investment, the Ministry of Education and the Prime Minister's Office. In 2017-2018, around 3,000 complaints were received. The State Inspection and Anti-Corruption Authority alone received 200 complaints concerning suspicions of misconduct by public officials.

Case #7 Malaysia: Public consultation and engagement

Public consultation is a regulatory process by which the government of Malaysia seeks, obtains and incorporates public input on matters affecting them. This is done to improve the efficiency, transparency and public involvement in large-scale projects or laws, regulations and policies. It is a formal process through which citizens and other stakeholders can give feedback on policy analysis, proposals and options presented by the executive branch of government. It can take place at various stages of the policy process, from exploring ideas set out in policy papers to scrutinizing drafts of legislation. The process uses e-consultation channels to foster continuous consultation sessions that provide public feedback and to provide follow-up information from public service providers to the public. Some of the initiatives that have evolved as a result of e-consultation include:

- **My Thought**

My Thought is a medium for people to contribute ideas and suggestions to improve the quality of service delivery of the Ministry of Human Resources. It solicits ideas for improving the welfare of workers, employers and unions. See <http://app1.mohr.gov.my/mohrideas/>.

- **Youth Bank of Ideas**

Youth Bank of Ideas is a web portal and programme launched by the Ministry of Youth and Sports for young people to channel problems, ideas, issues and complaints.

- **Budget consultation session**

In the planning and drafting of the annual financial budget, a consultation is organized to collect views and opinions from the private sector, non-government organizations, statutory bodies, government agencies and finance institutions. The process involves a physical discussion with stakeholders but the findings are uploaded to the Ministry of Finance portal.

- **Communities' Online application**

Communities' Online, better known as COOL, is an online engagement platform to facilitate collaboration between Selangor citizens and the state government (state assemblymen) to plan and implement various community development programmes. COOL seeks to improve citizen engagement to ultimately improve their quality of life, which in turn will contribute towards making Selangor a more prosperous state.

Case #8 Lao PDR: Improving health service provision

Reforms in health service delivery include improvement in the quality of human resources; improving the quality of services for mothers, children and poor households by providing free medical treatment, including birth deliveries; and making a community insurance scheme available for rural communities. The improved services have helped reduced maternal and infant mortality.

Case #9 Cambodia: Increasing public participation through decentralization of public service delivery

The Cambodian government, through a decentralization programme and strategy under the National Programme for Democratic Development at the Subnational Level, 2010-2019, sought to devolve public services from the central government to local governments (communes, districts and provinces) after enhancing institutional and operational capacity (human resources, property and management capacity) as well as financial resources. The process has brought service providers closer to service users and led to greater public participation and engagement in the process.

Case #10 Singapore: Increasing timeliness of service delivery through continuous human resource development and leveraging digitalisation

The Singapore Public Service places great emphasis on deepening the skills of its service delivery workforce. It has put in place a robust competency framework that articulates the behaviours, skills and knowledge that service staff at different levels have to demonstrate. This provides the basis for HR interventions and decisions, such as recruitment, job rotation and skills training. Particular emphasis is placed on improving the care and empathy that service staff should display, in their interactions with members of the public, as well as skills sets related to digitalization and data analytics. Beyond the workforce involved in service delivery, the Public Service Division is emphasising the training of all public officers in good citizen engagement skills, digital literacy and instilling a One Public Service mindset. Public officers are encouraged and recognised for efforts to reduce unnecessary processes in serving citizens

and businesses and for working with colleagues in other agencies to come up with solutions to better serve citizens and businesses.

The Municipal Services Office has established a OneService@SG system to consolidate, analyse and better respond to municipal feedback across Singapore. It is able to analyse the feedback received on municipal services across the island, identify problem areas where agencies should zoom into and deploy more resources to improve the situation on ground (e.g. to improve cleanliness or estate maintenance).

Case #11 Indonesia: Budget allocation on education services

Based on the Indonesian Constitution (1945), the government is obliged to allocate at least 20 per cent of the annual budget on education, which it began doing in 2009. That year, IDR207.4 trillion was allocated, which more than doubled to IDR492.5 trillion a decade later. The 20 percent requirement also applies to district- and provincial-level budgets. However, the increased spending on education has only been able to improve access and equality in basic education and has not been enough to improve secondary and tertiary education significantly. In terms of the quality of education, there is still much work to be done.

Case #12 Myanmar: Enhancing responsiveness through decentralization

The government is working to enhance public service delivery quality, responsiveness and accountability through the decentralization of responsibility. It has established lower tiers of administrative units at the state and region level, which are divided into smaller administrative units down to the village and ward levels for rural and urban areas, respectively. The state and region administrations have developed the administrative and legal institutional capacity to manage the devolved functions from the central government. In addition, the ministry-level Regulatory Review Unit revised staff manuals, drafted a code of conduct and reviewed all directives and protocols for any necessary amendments. The Review Unit comprises two members of the Ministry's advisory board and staff from all other ministries and the General Administration Department. It is speeding up efforts to revise the Institute of Development Administration's curriculum to reflect international standards. For the public to easily access services, an online application system is used in the recruitment process. The public has thus far expressed satisfaction with the website's efficiency and user-friendliness. Investment in dedicated human resources functions and the IT-based approach has been increased to strengthen the roll-out of human resources practices.

Case #13 Lao PDR: Speedy driving-permit process

The Lao PDR uses a computer-based driving permit application and processing approach that takes one day. The process includes applying, doing the driving examination and processing the permit, at both the central government and provincial levels.

Case #14 Lao PDR: Improvement in investment climate

Reforms in the processing of investment permits that centralize the process in the Ministry of Planning and Investment, coupled with the establishment of one-stop service points by integrating permits across various departments and ministries, have significantly reduced the days required to process investors' operating licenses. The waiting time for prospective small enterprise investors has reduced to 25 days, while the processing time for big projects and concession schemes is only 65 days.

Case #15 Philippines: Better services through improved human resource systems

Delivery of efficient public service depends to a significant extent on the people whose responsibility it is to render them. It is essential that they possess the necessary skills and competencies, are clear on work expectations and are motivated to effectively perform their responsibilities. In the Philippine civil service, four core human resource management systems on recruitment and selection, learning and development, performance management and rewards and recognition aim to maintain a diligent workforce. Through the Program to Institutionalize Meritocracy and Excellence in Human Resource Management (PRIME-HRM), the four human resources systems of agencies are assessed and are provided with technical assistance and development interventions to enable them to upgrade their systems. PRIME-HRM spurs agencies to transform their human resources management system. With gaps in people management being addressed, employees are better able to attend to their tasks in serving citizens.

Case #16 Philippines: Measuring stakeholder satisfaction of responsive governance

As an institution mandated to promote efficiency, integrity and responsiveness in the civil service, the Philippine Civil Service Commission regards customer or stakeholder satisfaction as a measure of its effectiveness and its efforts in building responsive governance. The Commission measures satisfaction on government policies through an online rating tool in terms of four criteria: awareness, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Respondents can be from national government agencies, government-owned and controlled corporations, state universities and colleges, local government units and the private sector. In 2019, the Commission had three policies to be rated: (i) Accreditation of Learning and Development Institutions; (ii) Leadership and Management Certification Program; and (iii) Collective Negotiation Agreement Registration and Effectivity. Gauging stakeholder response enabled the Commission to review existing and/or draw up policies to address issues raised by stakeholders. The feedback also provides the basis for future policy-based or programme-enabled developmental initiatives.

Case #17 Viet Nam: Enhancing bureaucracy efficiency by cutting red tape

Viet Nam has improved its investment climate by cutting bureaucratic red tape. Implemented from 2007 to 2010, Project 30 (the name reflected the overarching objective of cutting bureaucratic procedures by 30 per cent) was a three-phase policy geared towards simplifying administrative procedures and legal regulations through the establishment of a centralized database of all public administration procedures. The database was later used to vet administrative procedures and regulations based on necessity, user friendliness and simplicity, and legal criteria. It simplified the rules and procedures by at least 30 per cent at the ministry and local government levels through self-reviews. It reformed more than 5,500 administrative procedures, eliminated 453 administrative procedures, amended 3,749 administrative procedures and replaced 288 administrative procedures. The success of Project 30 was reflected in the improvement of foreign direct investment, productivity, competitiveness and economic growth.

Case #18 Viet Nam: Investment climate improvement

Viet Nam established a one-stop-shop system at the commune, district, province and central government ministry levels. Some services are determined at the national level, with lower tiers serving as implementers, while others are optional, implying that they are offered based on the needs of the area where a one-stop shop is located. Each one-stop shop maintains a website that provides information on services provided, the costs, timeframes of the service and instructions for application and application forms for the various administrative procedures.

Services offered at the one-stop shops may differ based on the local context. The effectiveness of each one-stop shop lies in the complementarity of the services offered. Each one-stop shop at the provincial level specializes in offering services that are provincial wide in coverage and thus not offered at the district level; while those at the district level deliver services not available at the commune level. Each one-stop shop has a dedicated officer to process the services.

Case #19 Cambodia: Increasing responsiveness through one-stop service window

Cambodia set up One Window Service Offices and One Window Service Units, which work to increase and improve public access to government services in an easy, quick, effective, quality, transparent, corruption-free, accountable, simple, cheap and responsive manner.

Case #20 Cambodia: Budget allocation on public services

Quality service delivery partly depends on the availability of adequate funding for recurrent and development expenditures. Government budget allocation on public services can serve as a measure of its commitment to provide quality services. The Cambodian government demonstrates commitment to provide better services by allocating a substantial proportion of the national budget on education and health services. Of the US\$6 billion 2018 budget, US\$848 million was reserved for education, US\$610 million for transport and US\$485 million for health services.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Case #21 Thailand: Monitoring and evaluation

Since 2003, ministers and permanent secretaries in Thailand are required to sign Service Delivery Agreements, which outline what a ministry's output is required to achieve its objectives. Permanent secretaries are responsible for ensuring achievement of the outputs listed in the agreements, at the agreed cost, quantities, quality and time. At the agency level, performance indicators are used to monitor the achievement of the agreed outputs. Customer satisfaction surveys are conducted to measure the performance of each service delivery unit, including hospitals, by the Office of the Public Sector Development Committee, central government agencies, public universities, public health centres, independent organizations, the army, the police and provincial administration. Cash bonuses are granted to employees of units who achieve their performance indicators and output targets and pass the Office of the Public Sector Development Committee evaluation.

Case #22 Myanmar: Monitoring and evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation of civil servants involves the Union Civil Service Board and government departments and agencies. The Union Civil Service Board conducts performance evaluations of all senior civil servants at echelon 5 and above, while ministries and government agencies conduct the performance evaluation of civil servants at entry level up to and including echelon 4 officers. The two-stream evaluation of civil servants reduces the burden in terms of human and financial resources and time required for either the Union Civil Service Board or ministries and government agencies where civil servants work. The main goal of the performance review meeting is for civil servant staff to receive feedback from direct supervisors and for them to understand how their supervisor is viewing their performance. Ministries and government departments do not have to set aside separate budget allocations for the monitoring and evaluation of employees; rather, they make use of either the human resources or personnel

affairs section. Additionally, the monitoring and evaluation of civil servants' performance involves onsite visits to institutions by the Union Civil Service Board, senior officials charged with overseeing employee performance on a daily basis and other colleagues of employees. The process is rule based, with civil servants required to achieve minimum points based on the provisions of the law on civil service.

Case #23 Lao PDR: Monitoring and evaluation

The National Governance and Public Administration Reform Programme Secretariat conducts the Programme Monitoring Framework that involves all stakeholders. The monitoring and evaluation process is based on data for output and operations. The monitoring and evaluation activities of the ministries and agencies responsible for measuring programmes and projects that fall under their respective functions complement the nationwide monitoring and evaluation programme.

Case #24 Malaysia: Enhancing accountability

Accountability in the public sector requires public participation and cooperation. The Malaysian government established the National Centre for Governance, Integrity and Anti-Corruption in 2018 to focus on increasing the efficiency and transparency of government management. The national centre, which is under the Prime Minister's Department, reports directly to the Prime Minister. The agency advises the government on governance, integrity and anti-corruption aspects of various implementing agencies at the government and international levels. The National Anti-Corruption Policy is the first initiative of the national centre, developed to ensure its effective implementation by all lead agencies. It aims at contributing to the reforms of the anti-corruption and accountability strategies in Malaysia.

Case #25 Myanmar: Transparency and accountability

Myanmar adopted an Anti-Corruption Law and established an Anti-Corruption agency to ensure that the conduct of public service activities complies with good governance principles of transparency, accountability, integrity and responsiveness. To date, 32 Corruption Prevention Units have been formed in 18 ministries. The Corruption Prevention Units are urged to be practical in realizing their goals with a sense of responsibility. Civil servants are required to comply with a Code of Conduct on Ethical Action. The Union Civil Service Board convenes seminars and workshops to socialize awareness of performance expectations and the Code of Conduct.

Case #26 Philippines: Commitment to Excellence through a Citizen's Charter

The Philippine civil service places a premium on accountability and transparency, values that every public servant is expected to uphold. Among the recent initiatives to promote accountability and transparency in government operations is the Citizen's Charter, which is an accountability tool that tells the public what to expect from a government office. The Citizen's Charter must contain the following information: the front-line services offered, the step-by-step procedure for a particular service, the officer or employee responsible for each step, the maximum time to conclude the process, the documents to be presented, the amount of fees, the procedure for filing complaints and who to contact for complaints. This information, written in English, Filipino or in a local dialect, must be available on billboards at the main entrance of any government office or in a conspicuous place. The Citizen's Charter led to the streamlining of front-line service procedures, prompted government offices to review and identify unnecessary steps and fees that were then eliminated, eliminated fixers and provided the public with a

tool to expect and demand efficient public service. Employees must abide by the Charter's provisions. To ensure that it remains responsive to the public's needs, agencies must review their respective Charter every two years.

Case #27 Philippines: Strengthening the fight against red tape

Many of the Philippine initiatives on improving government delivery and cutting red tape are anchored with legislation. Among the most recent of laws is the Anti-Red Tape Act, passed in 2007, to eliminate excess bureaucracy, simplify front-line procedures, formulate service standards in every government transaction and make the standards known to citizens. After roughly a decade of implementing the law, another law was passed to sustain the gains made and address gaps of the Anti-Red Tape Act. The new law, the Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018 is geared to provide a programme for the adoption of simplified procedures and expedite business and non-business-related transactions in government. It calls for an Anti-Red Tape Authority to implement and oversee the national policy on ease of doing business and reforms. The agency is also tasked to monitor compliance with the new law by agencies and issue notices to erring and non-compliant state employees.

NON-DISCRIMINATION AND INCLUSIVENESS

Governments need to provide a welcoming and inclusive public service for diverse communities, regardless of age, race, disability, religion, sex, gender identity and national origin. Governments also must combat stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination in government institutions and treat their employees with dignity and respect.

Case #28 Indonesia: Minimum standard of services

The central government sets norms, standards, procedures and criteria for the delivery of public services. The Minimum Service Standards, or *Standard Pelayanan Minimal*, were developed by the Ministry of Home Affairs for use at both the central and local levels. Ministries have developed their own specific minimum standard guidelines for different functions. The main challenge for the Minimum Service Standards is implementation at the local level due to their lack of capacity and suitability to the local level's conditions. Standards set at the national level are thus difficult to implement at the local level. For example, in the education sector, a teacher should not teach more than 32 students in one classroom, but in many urban areas, the numbers of students per teacher is far more than 32, with as many 45 students in some areas.

Case #29 Thailand: Employment non-discrimination in Thailand

Labour Protection Act B.E. 2541, 2551 (1998, 2008), which provides protection for workers in the private sector, contains provisions that guarantee equal treatment for male and female workers, with some exceptions. The Act also contains special protection provisions for women workers, women in maternity, subcontracted workers and child and young workers. In addition, the Ministry of Labour Regulation on Thai Labour Standards, Social Responsibility of Thai Businesses B.E. 2550 (2007) covers payment of wages, provision of benefits, opportunity for training and development, job grading or promotion, employment termination or age of retirement. It prohibits discrimination against workers on numerous grounds, including nationality, race, religion, language, age, sex, marital status, sexual attitude, disability, labour union membership and political party affiliation.

Case #30 Cambodia: General standards and guidelines

In line with provisions of National Public Administrative Reform 2015-2018, the Ministry of Civil Service designed the system that ministries and agencies use to conduct monitoring and evaluation of public service performance in their respective areas. Monitoring activities are done quarterly, while evaluations are conducted once a year. All ministries use the system to monitor and evaluate the performance of civil servants and the operations of public service units at both the central and local government levels. The uniform monitoring and evaluation standards and system facilitate comparison of performance across ministries and agencies and generates benchmarks based on the leading performers that the others can follow to improve their performance.

Case #31 Philippines: Promoting inclusive behaviour in service delivery

The Philippine civil service has instituted several initiatives to promote inclusive and non-discriminatory practices in service delivery. Citizens, regardless of age, sex, social background, religious affiliation or economic status, can raise service delivery concerns against a government agency. Citizens are also provided with varied means for airing their comments, complaints and suggestions through short messaging service or text messages, phone call, e-mail, the postal system or walk-in visits. While many government agencies have dedicated hotlines for their clientele, the Office of the President operates a 24-hour hotline, 8888, which receives calls from citizens nationwide. The Philippine Civil Service Commission maintains the Contact Center ng Bayan. Individuals who want to work in government are provided opportunities regardless of religion, ethnicity or sex. The Philippine civil service encourages persons with disabilities to obtain civil service eligibility. Philippine laws provide for the equal employment opportunities for people with disabilities in the selection process based on qualification standards for a government post. They are subject to the same terms and conditions of employment, compensation, privileges, benefits, incentives or allowances of an able-bodied person. Government agencies are to reserve at least 1 percent of their regular and non-regular positions for persons with disabilities.

BEST PRACTICES FROM THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA, JAPAN AND CHINA

Best practices from the Republic of Korea

Accessibility. By introducing two new systems, the Korean government has greatly increased public administration accessibility: an online procurement system, known as KONEPS, is a one-stop e-procurement platform. Before KONEPS was established, suppliers had to visit public offices in person and waste time seeking details on bidding and preparing papers for bidding. KONEPS is straightforward, saves time and money for public organizations and businesses in the private sector. Procurement transparency has improved by 20 per cent, from 6.8 points in 2002 to 7.92 points in 2012, according to the Anti-corruption and Civil Rights Commission. The change is attributed to the disclosure on procurement in real time and the introduction of standard procedures.

Participation. The Korean government practises participatory budgeting to increase the public's accessibility to information and enhance citizens' trust in government by allowing them to engage in the process of budgeting. The government also developed a portal for citizen participation, called e-People, to receive and address grievances and creative ideas.

Non-discrimination and inclusiveness. The Korean government has established a national emergency plan to protect people with disabilities in times of national emergency, which includes methods to evacuate those in welfare facilities and accommodate them in designated shelters. Specific measures were put in place for older persons staying at home to meet their needs for mobility and changing medical care.

Best practices from Japan

Accessibility. The Japanese government provides one-stop services that anyone can access from anywhere at any time through convenient electronic services. This has led to reforms of the national and local government information systems, including disclosing government data to citizens and strengthening government IT leadership (Hiramoto, 2013).

Best practices from China

Participation. In the area of public engagement, solidary groups, which are local groups that have formed around local values and traditions but involve state officials, have contributed to improving public goods and services, such as roads, schools and water supply (GCPES, 2016: 47).

B. Proposed pathways to emulate the lessons learned from the best practices in public service delivery

1. People empowerment and public service delivery system in ASEAN

Citizen and community empowerment may improve public services, but it alone is not sufficient to guarantee the quality of public service. Thus, governments need to reform themselves. People empowerment in the context of public services can be exercised through community participation in decision-making and participatory performance monitoring. This empowerment can increase the public's awareness of their entitlements in the process of decision-making and public services delivery, empower people to claim their rights and increase the engagement of people in the service delivery process. Governments can improve people's access to the process of public services delivery by partnering with the private sector and non-government organizations. In this partnership with multiple stakeholders, information and communication technology (ICT) is key to the empowerment and public service delivery improvement.

2. Possible scenarios for ASEAN

Improving the public service delivery system is a process that must be carried out continuously. As an association, ASEAN needs to jointly build a commitment to improve public services for all its members. However, each country has different abilities. For this reason, there are several options:

- Priority for public services involving ASEAN member countries or across ASEAN countries (immigration, investment, labour). These three services are important because they relate to the ASEAN Economic Community commitment, which is concerned with the free flow of goods, services, skilled labour and investment.
- Priority for basic public services needed by each country (education, health and social services).
- Priority based on the needs of each country, whereby ASEAN provides a varied menu and each country takes according to their needs and abilities.

Priority setting should be a joint agreement among ASEAN members. The target time for improvement should be grouped according to a country's socioeconomic status: (a) very advanced; (b) developed; and (c) developing. By mutual agreement, commitment to improvement will be easier to implement.

3. Tools for improving service delivery, including ICT

The use of information and communication technology has become a necessity in public services. The government must re-orient the public services delivery system by incorporating the use of ICT in policy development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of performance and in citizenship engagement and complaints-handling mechanisms.

There are several advantages of using ICT in public services:

1. It facilitates institutions in information system management.
2. It facilitates institutions in managing internal and external activities.
3. It facilitates government interaction with citizens.
4. It facilitates government acceptance of inputs relating to policy issues and public services.
5. It increases the use of applications in public services.

Policies that should be carried out through ICT relate to the internal needs of the bureaucracy, which include, among others: e-planning, e-budgeting, e-procurement, e-monitoring and e-performance, and relate to public services for citizens, including e-permits, e-taxes, e-health services and e-learning.

Citizens who are not yet technologically literate should be given alternatives for engaging with government and receiving services. Groups of citizens who are less educated, those who are elderly and who live far from an urban area tend to be less accustomed to electronic-based services. Every citizen must have an alternative channel for accessing services, in accordance with their abilities and choices.

4. Citizen-centric civil service approach

To provide better public services, a people-centric approach is required. Improvement of public services must always be oriented to the interests of the citizens being served and not just to the interests of bureaucratic officials. For example, public services must provide citizens with comfort, convenience and affordability. Many examples of improvements in public services are carried out only to enhance work convenience, by making procedures easy for bureaucrats, affordability by officers and increased revenue for government agencies. When building a health service centre, the building or place of service must consider the proximity of the citizens to be served and not proximity to the home of a doctor or health care provider. When building educational services, the school must be provided in a place that is easy for students to reach and not only teachers.

Each unit that has the responsibility to provide public services should always be evaluated based on the results from citizens' assessments. Citizens' perceptions and expectations should be the basis for improving public services that are already available. For example, to what extent should public services at the health centre be improved? In this context, an evaluation can be done by assessing public expectations regarding the following issues: (a) perception

about the queue process for receiving services; (b) ease of the registration procedure for receiving services; (c) affordability of costs for services; and (d) comfort of the waiting area before receiving services.

5. Building institutional capacities and interagency coordination

The capacity of governments to provide public services is typically constrained, making it difficult to deliver quality services to all citizens. These limitations concern financial, human resources, competency and institutional issues. Citizens' demand for better public services is increasing in terms of quantity and quality, while governments cannot always respond to the demands for diverse public services quickly.

With the limitations, governments need to collaborate with various stakeholders. Collaboration can be carried out between government agencies vertically, between the central government, provincial governments and reGENCY or city governments, or horizontally, between the ministry of health, the ministry of education and other sector ministries. In addition to cooperation between government agencies, cooperation in public services can be done with private institutions, both profit-oriented and non-profit. Cooperation can be carried out within the same framework: both parties carry out the production function; the government provides a regulatory framework while the private sector is the service provider; the government provides a service production function while civil society oversees the performance of government services.

Related to service partnerships, governments can collaborate with private institutions for certain public services. In some ASEAN countries, services related to driving licenses and car registration are conducted by private institutions but follow the rules set by the government. The government is tasked with overseeing the implementation of services performed by private institutions. In the education sector, the role of the private sector is significant in providing educational services. Some quality private schools are far better than the education services provided by the State. The presence of private education institutions can complement government schools as well as competitors that can improve the quality of public schools.

The contribution of civil society institutions in partnership with government is to oversee the implementation of public services conducted by the administration. Thus, the presence of civil society groups, such as Corruption Watch, Public Service Watch, Ombudsman, Customer Protection Agency, is important to ensure public services work well.

This section lays out a recommended course of action considered vital to improving public service delivery practices in terms of setting service standards, making policies and regulations, monitoring and evaluation, handling complaints and satisfying citizens.

Framework 1: Setting service standards

Setting standard of services is an important part in the administration of public services. Standards are made to guarantee public services are running well and provide a minimum standard of service across government agencies. The institution that sets the standard of services is the sector ministry responsible for certain policies nationally.

There are several reasons for making a standard of services:

- achieve the public service targets as expected;
- achieve consistency in the quality and quantity of services provided by different regions;
- achieve consistency in the quality and quantity of services provided to individuals;
- continue the improvement of standards of services; and
- involve all relevant stakeholder in setting standards.

Good service standards include the following.

- **Input aspects**
Input aspects are resources allocated by the government for providing services that must meet justice for the citizenry (human resources, financial resources and facilities). For example: the ratio of the number of doctors to the total population; the ratio of the number of teachers to the number of students; education costs allocated per student or health costs allocated per population; computer facilities provided by each class; the maximum number of students in a class.
- **Process aspects**
Process aspects are the mechanisms and procedures to deliver the services that people will receive, such as length of time, cost of services and code of conduct.
- **Output aspect**
Output aspect is the target to be achieved by the government in providing services that must not be discriminatory (community coverage, quantity provided, quality).

Framework 2: Policy-making and regulation-making

Policies and regulations are important instruments and are the basis for the implementation of public services. The process for making policies and regulations determines the form and content of public services, which in turn determine the quality of public services.

The making of policies and regulations should abide by the following principles:

- a. The process should involve relevant stakeholder participation and consultation.
- b. The process should be evidence based.
- c. The process should use regulatory impact analysis.
- d. Before implementing a policy or regulation, stakeholders should be engaged wherever possible.
- e. Policies and regulations should be oriented to the interests of citizens and not to the interests of service providers.

Framework 3: Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring is carried out to assess how far a programme or activity is going well. Monitoring should identify the achievements and factors that caused the success or failure of a programme or activity.

- Availability of financial resources (insufficient or not).
- Availability of human resources (sufficient or not enough, competency is appropriate or not, good performance or not).
- Availability of supporting facilities (insufficient or not).
- Availability of implementing organizations (decision-making structures are hierarchical or autonomous, support of other organizations is adequate or not).
- Coordination and communication among actors vertically (central government, regional government and local government) and horizontally (among implementing agencies within local governments and interaction with non-government institutions).

Evaluation is carried out to assess whether a programme or activity resolved the problem and whether the changes that occurred in the community are really changes caused by the programme or activity. For example, is the teacher quality improvement programme successful in increasing the value of subjects and is the increase in the value of these subjects due to the programmes or activities that were carried out or because of the contribution of tutoring institutions outside of school?

Evaluation results are used to determine or make decisions about the following:

- Does the programme or activity generate any benefits or not?
- Should the programme or activity undertaken be continued or not?
- Is there need to improve the programme prior to its continuation?

There are several issues that need to be considered in monitoring and evaluation:

- What is assessed: to determine the focus to be carried out in monitoring and evaluation.
- Assessment time: the time for monitoring and evaluation must be done at the beginning of the program, in the middle and end of the programme.
- Internal versus external institutions: monitoring will be carried out by external parties or self-assessment by internal institutions.
- Use of monitoring and evaluation results to improve organizational and individual performance.

Framework 4: Feedback-handling mechanism

A feedback-handling system that is responsive and effective enables public services to reach beneficiaries and citizens to control the actions of service providers.

Organizational structure:

- a. Customer service: located in each service unit to handle citizen complaints.
- b. Head of the department or unit: who is responsible for handling complaints when residents are not satisfied with the handling done by customer service. The level of unit can vary from one country to another.
- c. Authority review officer: is an appellate body in the office that independently handles citizens who are not satisfied with the treatment carried out by the head of the office.
- d. Ombudsman: an institution outside the office that handles citizens who are dissatisfied with the treatment carried out by the authority review officer.

Forms of complaint facilities:

- a. Complaint box is provided in each service unit. Each service unit is expected to provide a form to assess performance.
- b. Hotline is a telephone channel and e-mail that can be used by citizens to submit complaints about public services.
- c. Letter to the editor is a channel provided by newspaper or magazine media that can be used to submit complaints about public services.
- d. Social media is a means of aspiration channels in the form of Facebook, Twitter and others. Given the reach, spread and speed of social media, parameters should be set on its use as a venue for complaints because complainants may post offensive words. A template or form may be prescribed for enabling basic facts to be posted.

Steps for handling complaints:

1. Admit complaints.
2. Assign allocation to receive complaints.
3. Establish a system for record-keeping.
4. Process and record complaints.
5. Investigate and analyse the complaints.

6. Keep the customer informed of the progress.
7. Establish protocol in receiving different categories of complaints.
8. Periodically analyse the complaints and improve the process.

Framework 5: Customer satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is an instrument to measure the level of citizen satisfaction with the services delivered under the public service delivery system. Assessing satisfaction is based on the quality of the public service delivery process and products users receive. Indicators of service delivery process include:

- convenience to reach out to agency;
- ease of service requirements;
- ease of service procedures;
- time to complete service interactions;
- the safety of interactions;
- affordability of services;
- friendliness;
- knowledgeable, completeness and accuracy of information given by service providers; and
- convenience of service places.

Indicators of product and service quality received include:

- accuracy of product quality;
- punctuality; and
- reasonable costs paid by the citizens to receive the service.

To continuously improve customer satisfaction, public service delivery system should have a mechanism like the following for gauging users' perception about the quality of the service delivery process and products and services delivered:

- a. Design assessment procedures and substance.
- b. Conduct a satisfaction assessment of citizens.
- c. Process the results of the assessment of citizen satisfaction.
- d. Follow up on the results of the assessment for service improvement.
- e. Determine the needs of service providers, which may include additional competencies and skills to enable them to perform their responsibilities in ensuring customer satisfaction.

The methods used to assess customer satisfaction are:

- Manually surveying users.
- Assessment directly using the touch screen.
- Electronic-based user survey.

A. Voluntary-based implementation and monitoring by Member States

ASEAN members who are committed to working together to improve the economy and common prosperity are expected to voluntarily implement public services based on these guidelines. Each ASEAN member country is expected to carry out regular evaluations.

- a. **Self-evaluation**, which is a method for evaluating the progress of individual implementation carried out by each ASEAN member country. In each country, a public service-related ministry is responsible for verifying the self-evaluation conducted by each sector ministry.
- b. **Voluntary-based external evaluation**, which is a method (subject to each Member States' willingness) for evaluating the progress achieved in implementing service delivery, in line with the indicators and best practices that are highlighted in this guideline report, and conducted by the ASEAN Secretariat or any other independent body.

In conducting the evaluation, the components of the assessment of the implementation of the guidelines include:

- Percentage of achievements for basic services (education, health, infrastructure and investment sectors). In the long term, the evaluation will cover all kinds of public services.
- Obstacles that cause the implementation of the guidelines.
- Action plans that are prepared for improving public service delivery.

B. Periodic reporting of Member States on the implementation of the guidelines to the meetings of ASEAN Cooperation on Civil Service Matters

The monitoring and evaluation activity aims at documenting and measuring the progress every Member State makes towards improving public service delivery, based on the best practices covered in the guidelines. The following mechanisms are recommended.

Some steps to be prepared are:

1. Identify the person in charge of the project in each country.
2. The person in charge of each country sends a report to the ASEAN Secretariat every six months.
3. The ASEAN Secretariat documents and summarizes all the reports about the progress, lessons learned, challenges, risks and improvement plans.
4. The ASEAN Secretariat manages the annual meetings for sharing experiences and suggestions for improvements.

REFERENCES

- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). 2018. *ASEAN Key Figures 2018*. Jakarta.
- Bourgon, J. 2007. Responsive, responsible and respected government: towards a New Public Administration theory. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 73, No. 1, pp. 7–26.
- Christensen, T., and Laegreid, P. 2007. The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 67, No. 6, pp. 1059–1066.
- Cheung, A.B. 2013. Public governance reform in Hong Kong: Rebuilding trust and governability. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 421–436.
- Denhardt, R.B., and Denhardt, J.V. 2000. The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 60, No. 6, pp. 549–559.
- Denhardt, R.B., and Denhardt, J.V. 2003. The new public service: an approach to reform. *International Review of Public Administration*, vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 3–10.
- Denhardt, J.V., and Denhardt, R.B. 2015. The new public service revisited. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 75, No. 5, pp. 664–672.
- Global Center for Public Service Excellence (GCPSE). 2016. *Citizen Engagement in Public Service Delivery: The Critical Role of Public Officials*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- Hamner, M. 2009. Expanding the technology acceptance model to examine personal computing technology utilization in government agencies in developing countries. *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 128–136.
- Hiramoto, K. 2013. *E-government and Open Government Data in Japan*. Tokyo: Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry. Available at https://cio.go.jp/assets/JAPN_OGD.pdf.
- Holmes, B. 2011. *Citizens' Engagement in Policymaking and the Design of Public Services*. Canberra: Parliamentary Library.
- James, O. 2011. Managing citizens' expectations of public service performance: evidence from observation and experimentation in local government. *Public Administration*, vol. 89, No. 4, pp. 1419–1435.
- John, P. 2009. Can citizen governance redress the representative bias of political participation? *Public Administration Review*, vol. 69, No. 3, pp. 494–503.
- Ministry of Civil Service of Cambodia. 2018. Public service improvement and standard. Presented in the first regional workshop for developing ASEAN guidelines on public service delivery. Cambodia.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2013. *Responsiveness of Public Services: Timeliness, in Government at a Glance 2013*, Paris: OECD Publishing. Available at https://doi.org/10.1787/gov_glance-2013-54-en.
- Osborne, S.P. 2008. *The Third Sector in Europe: Continuity and Change*. London: Routledge.
- Robinson, M. 2015. *From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service: Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries*. New York: UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence.
- Sager, F., and Rosser, C. 2009. Weber, Wilson, and Hegel: Theories of modern bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 69, No. 6, pp. 1136–1147.
- Statista (2019). Digital economy compass 2019. Available at <https://www.statista.com/study/52194/digital-economy-compass/> (accessed January 2020).
- World Bank. 2018. Worldwide governance indicators. Available at <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>.

ANNEX 1

CHECKLIST FOR SELF-EVALUATION

	EDUCATION		HEALTH		INVESTMENT	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Setting standards for services						
Is there any standard of services?						
a. It sets the coverage of beneficiary						
b. It sets the quality of service						
c. It sets the quantity of service						
d. It sets the time frame of service						
e. It sets the procedure of service						
f. It sets the cost of service						
Making policy and regulations						
Do we invite these stakeholders in formulating new regulations?						
a. We invite other divisions in our ministry or agency?						
b. We invite other ministries or agencies?						
c. We invite university professors?						
d. We invite the private sector?						
e. We invite community organizations?						
f. We invite journalists?						
g. We invite other divisions in our ministry or agency?						
How often do we invite the stakeholders?						
a. We invite stakeholders in the beginning of policy formulation?						
b. We invite stakeholders in making the detail of policy?						
Do we use social media to invite people's participation in formulating new regulations?						

In which way and capacity are stakeholders involved in the public policy process relating to public services?						
a. Policy agenda setting						
b. Policy formulation						
c. Policy adoption						
d. Policy implementation						
e. Monitoring and evaluation						
Monitoring and evaluation						
Is there any unit for monitoring programmes and activities?						
Is there any unit for evaluating programmes and activities?						
How do we often monitor the programmes and activities?						
Every month?						
Every three months?						
Every six months?						
Every year?						
Do we use social media to monitor our programmes and activities?						
Do we invite stakeholders to participate in the monitoring of programmes and activities?						
We invite people from within our ministry or agency?						
We invite people from another ministry or agency?						
We invite university professors?						
We invite program beneficiaries?						
We invite community organizations?						
We invite journalists?						
Do we invite stakeholders in evaluating programmes and activities?						
We invite people from within our ministry or agency?						
We invite people from another ministry or agency?						
We invite program beneficiaries?						
We invite community organizations?						

Ensuring customer satisfaction						
Is there any mechanism for measuring customer satisfaction?						
Customer survey by sending a set of questionnaires?						
Touch screen in each unit of service?						
Do we have any unit responsible for managing customer satisfaction?						
Do we use customer satisfaction data to improve the quality of public service?						
Handling complaints						
Do we have a complaints-handling mechanism?						
What kind of complaints-handling mechanism do we have?						
Complaint box						
E-mail						
Facebook and/or Twitter						

ANNEX 2 INDICATORS

Principle	Definition	Process	Measurement
Accessibility	The publicity of all the acts of government to provide and allow all citizens access to relevant information in a complete, timely, easily accessible manner to enable the public to scrutinize the government's decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessible The availability of access and the openness of the information. • Accuracy The quality of the information disclosed, understood as precise and relevant. • Responsiveness The availability of the information in a timely manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How accessible are public services? • How are government documents and data requested in a timely manner? • How are government regulations published in a timely manner? How does the government regularly disclose all information required to citizens (including amount of fees to be paid, if any)? • How are dedicated government platforms managing and disclosing information to the public? • How is government information easily understood by citizens?

Principle	Definition	Process	Measurement
Responsiveness	Public responsiveness reflects the capacity of government to satisfy the preferences of citizens and ensures that citizens are served responsibly by government agencies and officials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnering with citizens: Governments are increasingly engaging with citizens to ensure responsiveness in public services. • Policy communication • Information flows about policy actions • Policy representation: The views and opinions of citizens are reflected in policy-making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the government listening: staying informed about citizens' sentiments? • Is the government explaining: providing credible justification for policy decisions? • Is the government adapting: adjusting policy decisions in the direction of citizens' demands?
Participation	The right of citizens to have their views and relevant information considered before a decision is taken.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breadth The degree to which a government's decision-making adequately incorporates public values. • Depth The quality of involving citizens and addressing the levels of exchange between citizens and the government in a participatory process. 	<p>Breadth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who participates (government should take into account representation of relevant and vital sectors)? • How many citizens participate? • How often do people participate? • How are citizens' identities protected, when necessary? <p>Depth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are citizens involved in different ways? • How is the two-way flow of information fostered through meetings, hearings and surveys?

Principle	Definition	Process	Measurement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes The goals of a participatory process are in line with the vision of citizens. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the government promote citizens and institutional relationships? (It will be measured by the number of meetings and the use of information to improve government policies.) <p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do citizens influence the decision-making process? How does the government improve the quality of its decisions? How does the government contribute to citizens' knowledge? (It will be measured by the level of understanding and capacity of the citizens.)
Voice and accountability	The obligation of government to meet adequate standards of transparency, participation and legality by providing effective review of the rules and decisions it makes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness Providing constant information. Ownership Accepting responsibility for past, present and future initiatives of actions and results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the government guarantee the freedom of the press (reasonable access to citizens to information and protection of journalists)?

Principle	Definition	Process	Measurement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trustworthy Providing public service delivery that is responsive, honest and competent, even in the absence of constant scrutiny. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the government respect the rights and freedoms of minorities (including ethnic, religious, linguistic minorities and immigrants)? How reliable is the government budget (completeness, credibility, performance, audit)?
Non-discrimination and inclusiveness	The equal right for every citizen to receive public service delivery and equal opportunity to participate in government activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equitable treatment Providing public service delivery to a socially, ethnically, culturally and economically diverse society in a personalized way. Respect Creating excellent public service delivery by having professional interaction with the citizenry (passionate, listen and focus on the resolution). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the government provide equal treatment for ethnic minorities and vulnerable citizens (women and impoverished, poorly educated, disabled, young and older persons)? How does the government provide basic needs (education and health services) affordably and equally for every citizen? How does the government create access to employment, financial resources equally for citizens?

Principle	Definition	Process	Measurement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="790 224 1062 650">• Mutual trust Cultivating a culture that provides better relationships between citizens and the government so that citizens can trust government and government can trust citizens. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1085 224 1326 574">• How does the government provide equal political, gender and cultural representation for citizens to participate in government activities?



ASEAN: A Community of Opportunities for All

 ASEAN

 @ASEAN

 @asean

 www.asean.org