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**Introduction**

Besides creating infrastructure such as schools, roads, hospitals, etc., public service delivery also involves administering a wide array of softer services related to permits, clearances, census, registration, license renewals, amongst others. These services, often referred to as the Commonly Availed Services (CAS), provide citizens with an interface to interact with public sector organizations, placing its delivery channels and service outcomes as vital avenues for building trust in the government. Therefore, it is vital to ensure that interactions at designated service centers are as efficient and effective as possible to improve service delivery.

Conventionally, the relationship between service providers and citizens is unidirectional and linear in nature, wherein public agencies act solely as ‘providers’ and citizens simply as ‘receivers’, perhaps resulting in a four decades-old provider-controlled service delivery system. To reposition the role of providers and citizens into a constructive two-way process, the Royal Civil Service Commission (RCSC), Public Service Delivery Division (PSDD) under the Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC), and UNDP Bhutan embarked on an initiative to improve public service delivery by engaging citizens in its monitoring and assessment process. Within the UNDP CO, the initiative has been a joint venture between the Governance unit and the Accelerator Lab. A six-member task team was formed with representatives from each of these organizations to test out this new role.

The revised role requires interventions towards:

✔ Enhancing accountability mechanism by reflecting user experiences in service delivery
✔ Adopting a user-centric approach towards service delivery design
✔ Providing awareness of their rights and responsibilities in the service delivery ecosystem
✔ Providing citizens with new areas of ownership by allowing partnership models to co-design service delivery process

These measures are echoed in SDG 16 goals and targets under the domain of promoting peaceful and inclusive societies and building effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions. Goal 16.6 states the development of effective accountable and transparent institutions at all levels and, target 16.6.2 highlights the proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services.

To set the stage, the task team undertook a system-based approach to understand public service delivery and to gain awareness not only on the bureaucratic performance but also on their complexity and uncertainty. Deep user interviews, collective intelligence workshops, and structured surveys were conducted to identify the pain points faced by both users and providers. A portfolio of interventions was identified to overcome few of the systemic challenges faced in the service delivery ecosystem. The co-creation and experimentation of a public service evaluation tool (ServE Tool) were one of the interventions highlighted. The ServE Tool aims to generate and use the information to assess the performance of service-providing agencies by measuring service users’ level of satisfaction with public services. The present report provides an overview of the process and the experiment that was rolled out to test the viability and effectiveness of the ServE Tool.
Background note to a system-based approach to public service delivery

A system-based approach was adopted to understand how complex service delivery systems function, focusing on understanding the dynamic relationships amongst the system components. The objective was to adopt a holistic approach towards studying the whole instead of individual drivers and service delivery barriers. Taking account of various connections and interdependencies helped evaluate the ineffectiveness of siloed and narrow interventions. It also enabled the team to understand the existing gaps and provided a broader scope for identifying a portfolio of interventions.

For this, the task team adopted a quick two-step approach towards systems thinking in public service delivery.

1. **Identifying drivers and pain points:** Consecutive collective intelligence workshops with service providers from both supervisory & support, and professional & management categories, and with service users were held in five Dzongkhags to brainstorm key barriers and drivers. Graph Commons was used to map out the links and connections between each of the drivers.

   Comprehensive systems thinking helped recognize the inter-dependence of the multiple elements interacting in the service delivery ecosystem. For instance, siloed approaches across service-providing agencies may lead to limited avenues in improving delivery processes. Likewise, a limited citizen-centric accountability mechanism is interdependent with poor feedback culture. A systems map outlining the key barriers and interrelations within the public service delivery ecosystem helped understand the complexity of how service delivery systems function and how the interdependencies between different barriers can lead to unintended consequences and unforeseen complications.
Thematic analysis of the key drivers led to the development of micro-narratives, which formed the basis for the formulation of a portfolio of interventions in the second stage. A four-level stakeholder system in service delivery was also rationalized.

Figure 2: An adapted\(^1\) four-level public service delivery system

At the first level, the main actors are the service users, whose needs and preferences should be reflected in defining the service delivery system. An increase in expectations and a more active

---

\(^1\) Building a Better Delivery System: A New Engineering/Health Care Partnership (2005)
Chapter: 2 A Framework for a Systems Approach to Health Care Delivery
role here help drive the change in the system for improved quality of services. Service users also need to be presented with opportunities to communicate informed needs and to participate in decision-making processes regarding service delivery. The second level of the delivery system comprises service providers, whose collective efforts result in the delivery of the services. The role and needs of providers undergo changes parallel to the service users. They require to be equipped with the knowledge and the expertise to ensure effective communication and coordination between service users and other members of the organization to be able to serve as a trusted provider.

The third level is represented by the organization that provides infrastructure and other needs to support service delivery. It encompasses decision-making systems to operationalize, inform, re-engineer and coordinate functions of multiple teams in the service delivery ecosystem. This level would need to develop a learning culture that emphasizes the needs of service users. The final level is characterized by the political and economic environment wherein aspects like the support of regulatory policies play a major role in simplification of delivery processes at the organizational level and, through them, all other levels of the system.

2. Streamlining the portfolio of interventions

The portfolio of interventions here refers to a highly interlinked and inter-dependent set of interventions, to be tested out to overcome a portion of the systemic challenges faced in the service delivery ecosystem.

Based on the barriers under each of the micro-narratives, a list of interventions was discussed and compiled. A series of portfolio sense-making workshops was held within the task team and beyond with citizens and service providers, in order to prioritize potential in the short, medium and long term. The deliberations were largely based on the following guideline:

1. Is there a demonstrated need or a related ongoing initiative from implementing agencies on the intervention?
   - High (An expressed need or an ongoing initiative by implementers)
   - Medium (Addresses a gap in the existing work by implementers)
   - Low (Already being addressed by implementers)

2. Is the intervention feasible (ease of measuring and evaluating impact) within the experiment duration and available resources?
   - High (Clear pathway to experimentation)
   - Medium (Reasonable pathway to experimentation)
   - Low (Expensive, and unclear path to experimentation)

3. Is the intervention far-reaching?
   - High (Informs policy, environment, and determinants of service delivery)
   - Medium (Involves a long-term practice)
   - Low (Downstream/emergency response)

---

The guideline helped restructure the interventions to convert strategic priorities and measurable learning goals into a series of defined innovative experiments. The experiments were also selected based on the strategic imperative of the implementing partners.

The portfolio of interventions included 1) co-designing and experimenting with a public service evaluation tool to enhance accountability 2) co-creating and testing the training module for building empathy in front liners of service centres 3) testing the involvement of service users in improving accessibility to service centres and 4) shortening the service delivery process. For all four interventions, solutions are being tested in collaboration with the Department of Civil Registration and Census on two services; issuance of new CID and inter-Dzongkhag census transfer. All four experimentations, we may have used different intervention formats but were founded on the same design thinking techniques that bases citizen (or service user) centered design approaches as follows:

Table 1: Deliberations resulted in streamlining of the following four interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment name</th>
<th>Learning goal</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Data required</th>
<th>Measurement methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big bet: Testing viability of the public service evaluation tool</td>
<td>How can we engage citizens effectively in strengthening service delivery?</td>
<td>If we have a service evaluation tool, then more service users will provide feedback, leading to service providers having a better understanding of their requirements and identifying solutions for improvement.</td>
<td>What indicators need to be reflected in the rating tool? Are service users open to providing feedback? Are users receptive to service evaluation tools?</td>
<td>Co-design a service rating tool and test it out on a few service-providing agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risky and moderately sized: Improving attitude of frontliners through empathy skills training</td>
<td>How can we improve the attitude of service providers at the service centers?</td>
<td>If we provide frontliners with empathy skills, then they will be able to put into practice these skills at their workplace (service centers)</td>
<td>What type of modules should be reflected? How far can empathy skills training help in improving the attitude of frontliners?</td>
<td>Co-design a module and test its impact on behavioral changes brought about in frontliners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risky and moderately sized: Improving accessibility to service center through a user-centric design</td>
<td>How can we design a user-centric service center to help improve accessibility?</td>
<td>If we invest in inclusive infrastructure, it will lead to improvement in service delivery.</td>
<td>What are the infrastructure gaps? Are the needs of the vulnerable groups reflected in the service centers?</td>
<td>Co-design the service center to improve accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly risky: Improving service delivery process through a user-centric service delivery design</td>
<td>How can we shorten the turnaround time for services?</td>
<td>If we remove some of the stages in the service delivery process, it will shorten the turnaround time for service users.</td>
<td>What stages can be revised and re-oriented? What are the existing laws and regulations that need to be adhered to? How can we get buy-ins?</td>
<td>Co-design the revised service delivery process and test out the proposed system on few service users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the experimentation journey, four building blocks were referred to serve the context:

i. **Purpose**: What is the purpose of the strategic outcome of the experimentation work?

ii. **Problems**: What problems or challenges does the experimentation work aim to solve?

iii. **People**: What ways can a co-creation community build through this experimentation process?

iv. **Progress**: Where are we in the experiment journey? How can we make the services reliable and effective in the long run?

Traditional strategic planning is insufficient for addressing current complex barriers and where expectations of service users are changing. Setting and achieving strategy requires agility, and experimentation is a key process towards achieving agility. The four experiments are highly interlinked with one another, and the common underpinning theme is the need to put citizens at the center of service provision by enabling citizens to monitor service levels and quality.

**Intervention design**

The current report presents learnings from the big bet experiment on the public service evaluation tools. In May 2021, the team ventured into a learning journey towards developing and experimenting with a service evaluation tool on two service-providing agencies that are the Department of Civil Registration and Census and the National Land Commission Secretariat. Given the limited usage of users’ experiences and journeys in the improvement of service delivery, the two primary innovations of the rating tool proposed to, firstly, develop and assess its reliability and feasibility and, secondly, to explore the possibility of reflecting those measures as a part of the overall performance management scoring system.

**Figure 3**: Six stages of the design-thinking process were applied to experiment the ServE Tool

---

Stage 1: **Empathize**

**Deep listening:** This phase was about casting aside all assumptions and gathering data. The team began with a brief pulse survey with the citizens to better understand the nature and importance of challenges faced and to track current experiences and expectations regarding service delivery. 320 citizens participated. Findings from the pulse survey indicated:

**Figure 4: How satisfied are you regarding public service delivery in the country?**

At least 41% reported ‘dissatisfied’ with the public service delivery. A higher proportion of respondents who had a lower level of education were satisfied with the service delivery as compared to those with a higher level of education. Some of the reasons provided were long turnaround time, lengthy complex processes, and unprofessional behavior of officials at counter and over phone.

---

4 RCSC and UNDP Bhutan carried out a rapid pulse survey to gather information experiences and opinions of service users regarding public services in general, as well as provide insights into the drivers of citizens’ satisfaction. Responses to the survey were strictly confidential. 320 respondents self-administered the online survey form from a period of 9th to 16th February 2021. It must be noted that the sample is not chosen at random, the inherent bias in convenience sampling means that the sample is unlikely to be representative of the population being studied. This undermines our ability to make confirmatory analysis from our sample to the population we are studying.
Figure 5: Ten key components that respondent’s value most in public service delivery

A majority (71%) of respondents have never referred to the Service Delivery Standards. The top five key components that respondents valued most in service delivery are: a) promptness of service providers b) professionalism (empathy) of service providers c) Efficient turnaround time d) Information on service availability e) comfort of the service centers.

Figure 6: Types of feedback/grievance platforms used by respondents

A series of deep user interviews has been conducted using empathy templates assisted by semi-structured questions to map out user journeys. A narrative inquiry method was adopted to immerse into lived experiences of 10 service users and 6 service providers both from rural and urban settings.
Three rounds of collective intelligence workshops were carried out with community representatives, including those from public service, youth groups, the business sector, and students, to map stakeholders and their existing roles in service delivery.

*Picture 1: Carrying out a deep user interview to map user journey map, May 2021, Tsirang. Source: Task team, PSD*

Stage 2: Define

**Sensing:** This phase involved putting together the data collected from the earlier stage. The team organized a series of sense-making workshops to cluster insights and observations made from the data. Thematic analysis was conducted to identify patterns and pain points across the users and providers.

*What did they say?*

- “The biggest issue with public service delivery is that frontliners lack empathy, we get yelled at, we get scared. They are downright rude! I have accumulated negative thoughts about public service.”
- “The hotline numbers are not ‘HOT’!”
- “‘Offices are so far away from each other. Availing services burns a hole in our pocket with pricey taxi fares.”
- “We never dare to visit offices after lunch hours, it is a common understanding that service providers would never be there after lunch hours.”
- “There are no waiting rooms so we just have to stand there in the corridor and it is very awkward and uncomfortable!”
- “Have to go through the PING PONG EXPERIENCE. We are made to go from agency A to agency B and from B to agency C, only to be reverted to the agency A again.”
- “I feel a deep sense of gratitude when service providers do not scold us. I guess we have been accustomed to their rude behaviour.”

*Stage 2: Define*

**Sensing:** This phase involved putting together the data collected from the earlier stage. The team organized a series of sense-making workshops to cluster insights and observations made from the data. Thematic analysis was conducted to identify patterns and pain points across the users and providers.
A workshop to reflect on the influencers of public service delivery stressed the importance of citizen’s feedback in enhancing service delivery. It was observed that citizens received disproportionate attention in the improvement of service delivery. For example, there were limited platforms for citizens to participate and to share information directly with the service providers. A recurrent insight was to develop a survey-based quantitative assessment of public services based on user feedback and not opinions and perceptions, and the need to use these feedbacks to involve citizens in gathering evidence of governmental performance.

More importantly, during discussions it was shared that citizens can be empowered vis-à-vis public officials to monitor and assess delivery channels and its outcomes. This would also aid in strengthening people’s capacity to express voice and influence service delivery.
Stage 3: **Ideate**

**Co-creating:** Experience of service users was to be used to evaluate services. This approach naturally focuses on the interpersonal relations between users and service providers in contact. Three main sources of contentment with respect to the service-receiving experience\(^5\) were identified; capacity of the frontliners to personalize service, how service outcomes are resolved, and experiences that occur in between. These factors determine the perceived service quality, which results from the comparisons between expectations and performances.

Earlier data from pulse surveys and collective intelligence workshops emphasized vital dimensions of a service experience such as responsiveness, courtesy, communication, empathy, timeliness, turnaround time etc. These determinants of service user satisfaction were used to co-design key parameters (timeliness, accessibility, attitude, feedback and integrity) to measure service quality.

---

Stage 4: **Prototype**

**Drafting questionnaire:** The team used the principles of survey design suggested by Vaus\(^6\) to draft the questionnaire. Initially, deliberations laid out the conceptual basis of the questionnaire before designing specific questions. A literature search on public service evaluation measures was conducted. The first version consisted of 50 questions under the key parameters with a response option on a five item Likert scale. Additional 8 questions covered demographic information.

**Assessing face validity:** This version was pre-piloted with several service users and providers using in-depth interview techniques to establish face validity. It involved examining the applicability of the existing questionnaire in evaluating specific parameters. Participants were asked to comment on omissions and irrelevant items and rewording several questions to fit the purposes. At the end of these exercises, the second version of the questionnaire ended up having 30 questions to evaluate the extent to which service users were satisfied with the experiences they have had while availing services.

Picture 5: Collective intelligence workshop with service users, May 2021, Thimphu. 
Source: Task team, PSD
**Pre-testing:** Based on the pre-defined parameters and indicators, a Likert scale questionnaire was developed to assess the level of satisfaction. The instrument was to be administered to users who had experience in availing service in person from a specific service center. To increase its validity and reliability and to reduce measurement errors, the questionnaire was pretested on a sample (n=50) of users using computer-assisted/in-person interviews. After the pretest, the questionnaire underwent revision and was further shortened. It was observed that service users prefer not to reveal some demographic details like age or occupation level; as a result, the demographic section was removed from the questionnaire. It was felt that it is more important to get their view on service delivery. The revised version comprised 10 questions, 2 under each of the 5 parameters.

**Scoring:** Each question was rated on a 5-point Likert scale, which was further translated into a minimum score of 2 and maximum of 10. The total score amounted to 100.

**Assessing content validity:** Expert panel was established from relevant agencies having expertise on rating tools, including National Statistics Bureau (NSB), Evaluation Association of Bhutan (EAB), Bhutan Interdisciplinary Research and Development (BIRD), to further review its validity. The panel carried out the content evaluation of the questionnaire in terms of both structures and concepts. Narrative comments about usability and mechanisms of shortening questions, concerns about privacy aspects were shared. The feasibility, simplicity, and time required to answer the questionnaire were also assessed.

![expert panels, June 2021, Thimphu.](Picture 6: Gathering insights on ServE Tool from)

*Source: Task team, PSD*

**Translating:** The questionnaire was translated into the national language by a linguist and then reverse translated to ensure that appropriate renditions of items are kept intact, particularly the intent of the questions.
**Timeliness:** The parameter aims to evaluate the time taken by service users to receive the service. Waiting time is one of the two measures of the parameter. Excessive waiting times may affect not only the perception of the quality of the service but also the expected impact of the service. Likewise, the other measure, which is turnaround time, refers to the processing time starting from the time they reached out to a service provider in a service center until they receive the service.

**Attitude:** An appropriate attitude of frontline employees positively influences the level of service user engagement. The parameter focuses on assessing basic etiquette principles that service providers would need to apply when interacting with their users, such as displaying a welcoming attitude and courtesy amongst others.

**Integrity:** The parameter aims to evaluate the service provider's level of commitment to integrity, fairness, and transparency by providing equal access to services to every kind of service user without any biases and prejudices.

**Accessibility:** The parameter emphasizes the principle of information sharing on processes involved in accessing services. It also aims to evaluate the facility layout and design of the service center as to how easy it would be to locate it by the service users.

**Feedback:** Feedback channels provide service users with the freedom to provide open and honest reactions, which can be referred for service delivery improvement. The parameter provides avenues to assess if there are adequate feedback channels and whether service users are open to providing feedback.
Stage 5: **Experiment**

After the tool was comprehensively and sufficiently reviewed, a quick experiment was conducted on ServE tool to:

i. Test validity and reliability of the tool  
ii. Assess the method of Computer Assisted Telephonic Interview  
iii. Assess receptiveness of the service users

**Platform:** A pre-coded, structured rating questionnaire was designed using an online survey solutions questionnaire designer. The questionnaire consisted of three sections. The first part covered demographic characteristics like the location where service was availed and the modality. The second section asked the service users to rate the indicators under the five parameters. The questionnaire is framed on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The last section included open-ended questions on feedback. Some questions have a link, depending on the responses obtained, which would result in eliminating a block of queries and, accordingly, reducing the questionnaire to up to 80% of its original scope. The digital format of the questionnaire enables the automatic jump of non-applied questions according to the prior answer. These steps could guarantee agility in the conduction of the interviews.

**Preparation:** 20 enumerators were hired and grouped. They were trained over a period of three days. The training included introducing survey objectives, instructions on how to administer the questionnaire, and thorough field experience of using computer-assisted/cell phone-based interviews. It also entailed explanations on survey operations and logistics, going over the field tools in detail, and conducting role-plays to get used to the questionnaire and interview flow.

A stratified random sampling method was applied on the list of users who had availed the two services (issuance of CID card and inter-Dzongkhag census transfer) in the past two months (May and June). Total sample size for the experiment was around 1000 users of the two services, however, the enumerators were able to reach out to only 772 service users, resulting in a non-response rate of 22%.

Non-response was due to several reasons; the contact numbers being wrongly assigned or no longer being used, being consistently engaged, and service users refusing or too busy to respond. At least two attempts were made by enumerators at different points in time to reach out to the users.
Picture 7: Experimenting ServE Tool using cell-based phone interview, July 2021, Thimphu. Source: Task team, PSD

**Process:** Two methods were used to complete the questionnaires. Enumerators largely conducted interviews over the phone, while a few self-administered questionnaires were also tested out by sharing the links with the online survey instrument. The questions were read directly on the computer screen and tablets, and the answers were immediately recorded in the system. The data collection was done over a five-day period. One interview averaged around 20 minutes. Each enumerator was assigned a service users list. Interviewers were directly supervised by the assigned group supervisors. Teams of 5 interviewers were assigned 1 supervisor. Any challenges identified were immediately reported and resolved by the team.

**Analysis:** Service quality ratings were cleaned using R Studio. Data entry errors were considered as missing responses. Tabulations and charts were done using Microsoft EXCEL.

**Trial results**

**Demographic characteristics:** The most visited service centers varied depending on the type of the service availed. For instance, for service type 1, the frequently visited service center is the headquarters.
Out of the 772 service users, 290 availed service type 1 while the rest had availed service type 2. For both service types, the majority of the service users availed services in person.

General findings: To provide an insight into the overall performance of selected services as assessed by the sample of service users, a service index score (ranging from 0 to 100) was computed by simply aggregating the responses of the 10 indicators. The overall score for service type 1 was higher than that for service type 2: 85.32 (SD 28.24 and SE 1.015) versus 82.91 (SD 29.57 and SE 1.13). The difference was not observed to be significant.
Services are rated generally on a higher side for all the service centers. However, scores for individual aspects of the services vary as shown in the figure below.

An analysis of the individual aspects of service delivery for the two services reveal the following scores, service type 1 is higher on attitude (18.4), accessibility, timeliness but low on feedback. Likewise, service type 2 is high on attitude and relatively low on feedback.
The service ratings as per the indicators differ across service centers. For instance, for service type 1, community centers in the sample fare well in terms of attitude, accessibility, and timeliness but are rated poorly in terms of integrity and feedback. Similarly, thromde centers are rated lower on accessibility as compared to integrity. Regarding service type 2, both service centers are rated almost equally with the highest scores on attitude of service providers followed by integrity and accessibility. Timeliness and feedback were rated low.

As a general trend, more than 50% rated at least ‘satisfied’ with each of the 10 indicators. Overall, indicators under the feedback parameter seem to be rated low. Most (more than 50%) of the service users, who had availed service type, stated that there were not adequate channels to provide feedback.
Table 2: Level of satisfaction with each of the indicators for service type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Waiting time</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Impartiality</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Adequate channels</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to service type 1, most of the service users of service type 2 also reported that they were dissatisfied with the existing feedback channels.

Table 3: Level of satisfaction with each of the indicators for service type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Waiting time</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnaround Time</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Impartiality</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Channels</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall satisfaction rating on service delivery was also posed towards the end of the interview. 83% of the users rated at least ‘satisfied’ with the overall service delivery, while 59% of the service type 2 users rated ‘satisfied’.
A correlation matrix analysis across the 10 indicators was also carried out to systematically assess the redundancy nature of indicators identified. The evaluation of the matrix helped identify any clusters of variables with similar behaviour. All associations were less than 0.5, implying mutually independent indicators, as reported in the table below.

**Table 4: Correlation matrix of the indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waiting time</th>
<th>Turnaround time</th>
<th>Courtesy</th>
<th>Effective communication</th>
<th>Impartiality</th>
<th>Morality</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Adequate channel</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiting time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impartiality</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning**

The experiment has led to several learning under the following themes:

1. Data collection using cell phone-based interview:
   a. Data entry error: Responses need to be entered and typed into the data entry software, which can leave room for error. Few interviewers also found it difficult to modify previous answers as navigating backward is more challenging than when using pen-and-paper questionnaires.
   b. Responsiveness: Cell phone-based interview is new in Bhutanese culture, and enumerators face challenges to build trust with their respondents over the phone,
which may lower participation rates. Likewise, scheduling initial and repeat calls to service users who are either engaged or switched off serves the important purpose of maximizing the return on time through calling. Important considerations in scheduling second and subsequent calls include the length of time between call attempts, the type of the first contact, and variation in the timing and schedule of contacts.

c. Non-response and incomplete responses: Network can also pose challenges depending on where the service user is located. There were incidents wherein service users would get disconnected due to poor network. The portable nature of cell phones and the mobility of their users add further logistical barriers to completing telephone surveys with cell phone respondents. The potential for the connection to be dropped in the middle of the survey administration—an event likely to happen more frequently if the respondent is moving in and out of areas with cell service—requires procedures for appropriate handling to be placed.

d. Period of calling: Different demographics prefer to receive telephonic surveys at different times of the day. It was observed that the call times that would produce the best response rates for educated people were during the afternoon and in the evening.

2. Questionnaire length: Although literature shows that questionnaire length per se might not have a significant effect on the response burden, it was observed that if the interview length is prolonged, then it leads to respondent fatigue. There were cases in which service users either responded in a straight-line manner or gave perfunctory answers. Overall, service users preferred short questionnaires with contents that are precise for easy comprehension. Interview length was found to be a crucial factor in encouraging responsiveness.

3. Enumerator recruitment and training: Hiring enumerators who are multilingual is essential as most illiterate service users prefer interviews in their mother tongue. Dominant dialects include tshanglakha and lhotshampa. The capacity of the potential enumerators also may need to be tested, particularly in terms of their interpersonal skills. Enumerator training is an extremely important part of the data collection process. Field practice sessions were also observed to be useful. The field manual acted as an important resource for enumerators, as it contained all field protocols and provided crucial guidelines to the survey rating tool.

4. Feedback culture: The success of the ServE Tool depends on an active feedback culture amongst citizens. For now, feedback is almost non-existent, except for a few anecdotal experiences shared on social media. Enumerators shared the incidence of the social desirability bias, which influenced the answers to the questionnaire: service users responded in a manner that is deemed favorable by others, which led to over-reporting positive ratings or under-reporting negative ones. For example, service users may selectively suppress information due to the existing scenario of limited feedback culture in society. Awareness of the rights and responsibilities of service users also seems to be limited.

5. Recollection bias: Conventional measurements of satisfaction level with how services were delivered in the service centers involves surveys at a certain point in time. While this approach seems cost-effective and logical, confounding factors exist. Firstly, service

---

users’ understanding or experiences of the constructs under evaluation changes over time. For instance, a service user may not be able to effectively recollect the experiences with respect to the 10 indicators as clearly as he or she would have in case information was collected in real-time. Secondly, there are also dangers of ratings being relative in nature, in the sense comparisons were made to how services were delivered in the past, in a few cases also a generation ago. Such a response shift is of particular concern in retrospective survey questions.

**Recommendation**

1. **Cell phone-based interviews are encouraged.** In COVID-affected times, interviewing respondents by phone offers two distinct advantages – it is not affected by safety concerns and travel restrictions, and cost efficiency can be significantly higher than personal interviews. In this case, the CATI survey took only 5 days compared with 30 days (including travel time) originally budgeted for face-to-face interviews.

2. **Keep interview length up to 15 minutes:** One of the learnings from the experiment has been the respondent burden caused by a lengthy questionnaire. Generally, longer surveys result in a lower response rate or lower participation rate. Therefore, it is suggested for the questionnaire to be further shortened.

3. **Maintain confidentiality:** While collecting the evaluations and ratings, confidentiality is always an important consideration. Reassurances about the confidentiality of the information provided must be continuously sought from the service user’s side. While for telephonic surveys, the privacy of the responses may be conveyed, it is recommended to integrate a statement on ensuring privacy for self-administered surveys. For instance, randomized sample lists that will be shared with enumerators should always avoid having fields that can be used either alone or with other information to identify survey participants. The survey responses must be anonymized when shared with relevant stakeholders. Disclosure of personal information will have to be kept to a minimum.

4. **Effective training of enumerators:** Enumerators need to be effectively trained to minimize errors. Adequate emphasis must be placed on the quality and frequency of training of interviewers as they play a key role in ensuring a high response rate. Make every effort to balance the language representation among interviewers to keep projects on track and manage interviewer involvement. The need for a culturally diverse interviewing team is all too imperative.

5. **Advocate for service users’ rights and responsibilities:** to counter the limited feedback culture, a concerted communication campaign needs to be held to advocate for the users, their rights, and responsibilities. Service users will have been given the opportunity to not only exercise their rights by monitoring the quality of public services but also to hold the service-providing agencies accountable.

6. **Web-based application system for ServE Tool:** One of the major learning has been the recall bias inherent in retrospective surveys. A system geared towards collecting near real-time ratings from service users would enable reducing such errors. Hence, having a web-based application system would help configure real-time dashboards of the ratings and enable service providers to respond with greater speed and accuracy to user needs.
7. Develop a process guideline: An overall process guideline must be developed to reflect the protocol involved in the collection of the ratings from service users. For instance, streamlining the various stages of the data collection period, its estimation into scores and finally the integration of the scores into the accountability mechanism. This protocol needs to be co-designed with the relevant agencies.

Conclusion

A robust citizen-centric monitoring and assessment framework is essential to ensure that the public service delivery channels respond to the needs and expectations of citizens. The ServE tool is aimed at supporting such a framework and helps quantify citizen experiences and satisfaction levels across a set of easily understood and robust set of indicators representing vital aspects of service delivery. The tool is designed to be applied to all commonly availed services provided by the government. It allows comparison across service providers as well as the nature of services.

The experiment helped us understand the challenges posed in operationalizing such a tool as well as provided us with test ground to experiment with it on a few service-providing agencies. Although several learnings have been made, ServE Tool needs to be further tested across various commonly availed services before scaling up. The nature and type of service may have a bearing on the application of the rating tool.

However, there is no contest on the usefulness of the information collected through the ServE Tool. Such information can help public managers identify which elements of service delivery drive satisfaction, as well as monitor the impact of reforms on end-users. Measuring citizen satisfaction is also a means of allowing policymakers and managers to better understand their customer base, helping to identify sub-groups of users and needs or gaps in accessibility. Moreover, citizen satisfaction can be an important outcome indicator of overall government performance.
### Appendix

#### Table 5: ServE Tool Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demography</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Type of service</td>
<td>Select the service received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Which modality did you use to access the service?</td>
<td>Completely in-person/ mostly in-person/ Completely online/ mostly online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In case the service user has accessed the service completely online or mostly online, then go straight to Q14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which Dzongkhag/ Thromde did you receive the service from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which Gewog/ Yenlag Thromde did you receive the service from?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service center</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many service center(s) did you visit to receive this service?</td>
<td>Community Center/ Gewog administration/ Dzongkhag/ Thromde/ Headquarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Among the service centers you visited, which service center would you like to rate?</td>
<td>CC/ Gewog/ Dzongkhag/ Thromde/ Headquarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q #</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>How easy was it for you to access any service-related information from the service center you visited?</td>
<td>Very easy, Easy, Neither easy nor difficult, Difficult, Very difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Was it easy to identify/locate the service center?</td>
<td>Very easy, Easy, Neither easy nor difficult, Difficult, Very difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Waiting time</td>
<td>How long did you wait to meet the service provider?</td>
<td>Number of minutes, hours etc. for each of the center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were you satisfied with the time you had to wait to meet the service provider?</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td>How long did it take for you to apply and successfully receive the service?</td>
<td>Number of minutes/ hours/ days/ months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>How satisfied were you with the time it took to apply, complete the processes and receive the service outcome?</td>
<td>Very satisfied, Satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Were the service provider(s) polite when you visited the service center?</td>
<td>Very polite, Polite, Neither polite nor impolite, Impolite, Very impolite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Did the service provider(s) listen attentively and communicate clearly that you readily understood what was being conveyed?</td>
<td>Extremely clear, Somewhat clear, Neither clear nor unclear, Somewhat unclear, Extremely unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Would you agree that you were given the same treatment as any other service user?</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Would you agree the service provider(s) did not seek favours/bribes to facilitate or speed up the processing of the service?</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Did you provide feedback with regard to this service?</td>
<td>Binary scale (0-1, No-Yes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Would you agree that there were adequate ways to provide feedback?</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Would you agree that you will be able to provide feedback to the service center without fear of reprisals?</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Would you like to provide any feedback to improve this service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ServE Tool Enumerator Manual

This instruction manual is a guideline for filling up the ServE Tool questionnaire. It aims to provide background information on the objectives and intentions of the parameters and indicators determined for the ServE Tool. It has been developed to support the training of enumerators and to ensure consistency in the directives and queries posed during the interview.

_Enumerators and supervisors should refrain from offering their own interpretations of the parameters and indicators._

The questionnaire contains **five parameters and ten indicators.**

**Table 6: Parameters and Indicators of the ServE Tool Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Accessibility | 1. Information  
                      2. Direction |
| 2  | Timeliness   | 1. Waiting time  
                      2. Turnaround time |
| 3  | Attitude     | 1. Courtesy  
                      2. Effective communication |
| 4  | Integrity    | 1. Impartiality  
                      2. Morality |
| 5  | Feedback     | 1. Adequate Channel  
                      2. Confidence |

**Note:** Although every attempt has been made to cover all the issues which may generally be encountered in filling up the questionnaire, there may be rare occurrences when there is some ambiguity. One is requested to reach out to supervisors concerned for further clarifications.

**Duration:** The interview is expected to last on average 15 minutes but may take longer depending on the comprehension and literacy level of the survey respondent. The questionnaire is designed for Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI), however, it can also be used for Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) and Paper-based Personal Interview (PAPI). For in-person interviews, ensure the interview is carried out privately in a space that will allow him or her to respond without any disturbances. If the interview is carried out over the phone, then do seek assurance on their availability.

**Survey questions:** Different types of questions and response categories are used in the questionnaire.

1. **Close-ended questions:** Respondents must choose among the options already provided to them. For instance, they can select one response to answer this question ‘Were the service provider(s) polite when you visited the service center?’
2. **Open-ended questions:** Respondents must provide answers as per the directives in the questionnaire. For example, open-ended questions would include; ‘Would you like to provide any feedback to improve this service?’

**Role of enumerator:**

1. Ask questions and record responses accurately
2. Respond effectively to queries posed by respondent
3. Set the pace of the interview and keep the respondent focused and interested
4. Be well versed with the flow and contents of the survey questionnaire

*A thorough preparation, as well as extensive practice, will guarantee that this is achieved.*

**Role of supervisor:**

1. Monitor the progress and quality of the interview conducted
2. Ensure that enumerators are on track with their roles and responsibilities
3. Handle the logistics for the data collection
4. Train enumerators and ensure standardized interviewing techniques are observed when asking questions, clarifying, probing, and giving feedback
5. Monitor quality of data collected and entered
6. Organize debrief on a regular basis with enumerators

**5 key points to note during the interview:**

1. **Ethical consideration:** The enumerator must clearly communicate the objectives of the survey to the respondent, receive an acknowledgment for collecting his/her user experiences and ratings on the service that s/he has availed recently.
2. **Making a good impression:** The interviewer can use the following introduction:

   **Example:** “Kuzuzangpola, my name is…and on behalf of RCSC I would like to interview you. The reason I am contacting you is that we are conducting a survey to collect information on service users' experiences while accessing services. It will take around 15 minutes...In this interview, we are really interested in learning about your experiences... Let me assure you that whatever information you provide us will not be disclosed to anyone”.

   You should speak slowly and clearly to set the tone for the interview. You should adapt your introduction to the respondent, as different respondents require different amounts of information.

1. **Clarity in asking questions:** Do not skip questions even if the respondent has given the answer earlier. Verify information given by the respondent earlier, acknowledging the information she/he has already provided. Assumptions should never be made about the respondents’ answers. Clarification is particularly needed when the respondent does not seem to understand the question and gives an inappropriate reply. Also, provide adequate time in case the respondent hesitates to answer the question posed.
1. **Probing:** This is needed when the respondent seems to understand the question but gives a response that is not appropriate, misinterprets the question, or cannot make up his/her mind.

**Probing techniques:**

- Simply repeat the question - The respondent may come up with the right answer if she/he hears the question a second time.
- Pause - This gives the respondent time to collect his/her thoughts and expand on his/her answer if she/he has more to say.
- Repeat the respondent’s reply - This is often an effective way of having the respondent reflect on the answer s/he has just given.

1. **Displaying gratitude:** It is important that the enumerator ends with a positive display of gratitude for his/her time. Do not forget to thank the respondent at the end of the interview.

**Note:** Respondents digress from the questions by giving lengthy responses or unnecessary information. In such instances, you may say, “I have many more questions to ask, so we should really move on. If you would like to talk more about that, perhaps we can do it at the end of the interview.”

You should be prepared to answer or face questions from respondents, so please answer smartly and refrain from providing false/promising and unsure information. Do not mention unnecessary/unethical points or remarks which may trigger their opinions.

**Note on calls:**

1. *In case the calls are not received the first time, enumerators are encouraged to call at least three times in intervals of 1 to 2 hours (same day). If the calls are either not received or engaged or switched off even after the third call, then exclude the service user from the sample list.*

2. *At times enumerators may receive calls from service users before 9 AM and after 5 pm, it is advised that such calls should be politely ended, stating they shall be reached during a proposed time.*

**Questionnaire specifications**

**Section 1: Identifier**

**Identifier:** Each of the enumerators can be identified by a unique number. The number will be provided by the supervisor before the data collection process. The enumerator will have to enter his/her unique number here.

Enter the enumerator number

**Date:** Enter the date on which the interview took place.

Enter the date of the interview
Section 2: Service Information

Service type: Select the service that the respondent has recently availed. This information will be known; however, enumerators are still encouraged to ask for confirmation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which service did you receive?</th>
<th>Service 1</th>
<th>Service 2</th>
<th>Service 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Service modality: Enter the modality option that the respondent used mostly to access the service. If the response is ‘completely in person/ mostly in person,’ then the respondent will have to respond to every question in the survey. If the response is ‘completely online/ mostly online,’ then the respondent would need to answer only questions under the ‘general’ section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which modality did you use to access the service?</th>
<th>1. Completely in person</th>
<th>2. Mostly in person</th>
<th>3. Completely online</th>
<th>4. Mostly online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section 3: Demography

Dzongkhag: Enter the specified Dzongkhag. While determining the Dzongkhag for the respondent, it should be the one where she/he has availed the service from, and not where she/he was born or had civil registration or is currently residing. However, note that it may be the case that the Dzongkhag by which the service has been availed is the respondent’s residential district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which Dzongkhag/Thromde did you receive the service from?</th>
<th>1. Dzongkhag 1</th>
<th>2. Dzongkhag 2...</th>
<th>3. ......Dzongkhag 20</th>
<th>4. +4 Thromdes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Gewog/Thromde: Select the name of the Gewog or thromde that has availed the service. Please be mindful that you ask the respondent on the specific gewog by which service was availed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which Gewog/Yenlag Thromde did you receive the service from?</th>
<th>1. Gewog 1</th>
<th>2. Gewog 2...</th>
<th>3. +Yenlag thromdes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Service center: There are two questions to specify the service centers visited by the respondent, based on the earlier option on the service type. Ask the respondent which service center she/he
would prefer to rate. Continue to remind the respondent that, during the survey, she/he must refer to one particular service center only.

*Please note that the experiences in the specified service center are to be referred throughout the survey.*

| How many service center(s) did you visit to receive this service? | 1. Community Center  
2. Gewog Administration  
3. Dzongkhag  
4. Thromde  
5. Headquarters |
|---|---|
| Among the service center(s) you visited, which service center would you like to rate? | 1. Community center  
2. Gewog administration  
3. Dzongkhag  
4. Thromde  
5. Headquarters |

**Note:** In case the service user has not experienced the processes involved then end the conversation politely. For instance, there might be cases in which services will be provided by service providers in groups. (E.g. Tshogpa coordinating a group of service users to avail the ‘Issuance of New CID Card’ from the Dzongkhag Civil Registration & Census Office).

**Parameter 1: Accessibility**

**Indicator 1: Information**

Ask the respondents whether information related to the service (e.g. contact numbers of focal officials, hotlines, pamphlets, notice boards, internet, online platforms, audio visuals) could be easily found. In other words, ask about the availability of the information materials and the awareness programmes carried out by the service providers.

**Indicator 2: Direction**

This indicator aims to assess the ease of identification of service centers. Ask the respondent if she/he were able to easily locate the service center and whether there were adequate signboards for guidance.

**Parameter 2: Timeliness**

**Indicator 1: Waiting time**

Quantitative: Enter the duration in numeric form. Please enter in minutes; for instance, if it is half an hour then, enter 30, if it is one and half hours then, enter 90. If the respondent has visited the service center more than once, then record the average waiting time.
Qualitative: Enter the level of satisfaction regarding the time spent waiting to be in contact with a service provider. Based on the response to the preceding question, ask if the time that it took for them to be in contact was satisfactory or too long.

**Indicator 2: Turnaround Time (TAT)**

Quantitative: Enter the duration that is the number of days it took for the respondent to receive the service availed. For instance, TAT would count the number of days it took from the day the respondent applied for a service until the day the service was received. Enumerators may ask the day the first visit was made to the service center and the day service was received. That is the time since the application (1st step towards availing the service) was submitted to the first service access point (Rural: gewog center, Urban: service centers).

Qualitative: The purpose of this question is to determine the respondent's satisfaction with the time taken for the service to be delivered. Based on the responses from the preceding question, ask the respondent whether they consider the specified number of days satisfactory or too big.

**Parameter 3: Attitude**

**Indicator 1: Courtesy**

The question aims to assess the friendliness and courteous nature of the service provider(s). Ask the respondent if the service provider was polite, respectful, or considerate during the interactions at the service center.

**Indicator 2: Effective communication**

For this question, ask the respondents if they were able to understand the messages conveyed by the service provider(s). It involves evaluating the service provider(s) ability to share thoughts, knowledge, and information in simple language in ways best understood by the respondent.

For instance, ask the respondents if the officials made an attempt to explain technical terms and concepts involved in the process, fill in forms, etc.

The following options have to be considered:

- ‘Extremely clear’ refers to a situation wherein no matter the frequency of visits to the service center, the service provider(s) clearly communicated messages all the time.

- ‘Somewhat clear’ response option is most suitable for a situation wherein the service provider(s) was able to clearly communicate most of the time.

- ‘Neither clear nor unclear’ refers to an option wherein the service provider(s) was able to clearly communicate some of the time.

- ‘Somewhat unclear’ refers to an instance wherein the respondent was rarely able to understand the messages conveyed by the service provider(s).

- ‘Extremely unclear’ response option refers to a situation wherein the respondent was not able to understand any of the messages conveyed by the service provider(s).
Parameter 3: Integrity

Indicator 1: Impartiality

This question intends to evaluate the level of fairness regardless of your personal network, income, age, gender, social status, dialects. Ask respondents if they experience any level of nepotism or favoritism while accessing the service. Select ‘strongly agree’ if the respondent has experienced strong levels of partiality while accessing service.

Indicator 2: Morality

This question aims to evaluate the respondent's agreement on whether the service provider sought favours (e.g. fees beyond the normal service charge) for priority access. Please note that favours include both in kind and cash such as fees beyond the normal service charge.

Parameter 5: Feedback

Ask the respondent if she/he provided feedback with regard to the service availed.

Indicator 1: Adequate Channel

This question evaluates the number of channels available to provide feedback. Ask respondents if they experienced or perceived that there were adequate ways to provide feedback on the service that they availed.

Indicator 2: Confidence

Ask this question to check if they agree that they are able to provide feedback to service providers through official channels without fear of reprisals. Note that the response may be perceptual (via observation or hearsay) or experiential.

Feedback: Probe the respondent to provide feedback related to any stage of the service delivery process. Ask respondents what could be changed to improve the processes, what solutions could be suggested. Make an effort to provide an opportunity for the respondent to recall the steps involved in accessing the service and ask which particular stages could be revised. Provide a concrete summary of the narrative with a maximum of 150 words.

Note regarding survey solution

At the end of the survey, there is a space to provide feedback to the supervisor. The feedback may include any unusual observations made during the time of the interview, for example, challenges faced such as the respondent was not able to comprehend the questions or if the respondent was in a hurry etc.

Scoring methodology for the ServE Tool

Scoring is relatively simple as indicated in the table below

Table 7: Scoring Methodology for the ServE Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>(min of 1-max of 5)</th>
<th>(min of 2-max of 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impartiality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate channel</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>