# Citizen's Charters in India

## Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation

### Indian Institute of Public Administration

Sponsored by

## Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances
## Government of India
## 2008

# Acknowledgements

implementation of the Citizens Charters confronted by these organisation as well as the accomplishments of the Charters.

We are also thankful to the officials in various Ministries/Departments/ Organisations and a large number of service users with whom discussions were held on the state of the Citizen's Charters. Discussions with civil society groups and academics have been useful. Numerous respondents among the service users have made a significant contribution to our effort at understanding the state of the Citizen's Charters and awareness about these and their capacity to improve administration and service delivery. While it s not possible to mention the names of all of them, we remain indebted to them for the valuable time and insights given by them.

Sh. B.S.Baswan, Director, IIPA, has been a source of inspiration and support throughout the project. We are thankful to him for his readiness to help and ensure that many hurdles in carrying out the mandate could be addressed without much difficulty.

Thanks are due to Shri A. Bannerji, Consultant and Dr. Jaya Chaturvedi, Research Associate for providing research support, as also, for approaching officials and service users to obtain response to the questionnaire developed for the purpose and for discussions. Obtaining responses to the questionnaires has not been easy and despite repeated efforts, it was not possible to get a written response from all the officers. Their reluctance to admit certain things in black and white was quite evident. It was considered important therefore to have detailed discussions with the concerned officers as well as users.

We are hopeful that the Report will help the process of change in the direction of responsive and effective governance and will contribute towards an improved service delivery.


**October 2008**


**Prof. Dolly Arora**

**(Project Director)**

# Contents

**Acknowledgements**

# I

## Citizen's Charters in India: An Introduction

The Preamble of the Constitution of India declares her a sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic republic, committed to secure social, economic and political justice, liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship and to promote fraternity, assuring the dignity of the individual and unity and integrity of the nation. The Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of State Policy in Part III and Part IV of the Constitution reinforce this faith of Constitution-makers pledging the nation to remove social imbalances by harmonizing the rival claims or the interests of different groups in the social structure and build a democratic welfare state.

These commitments require for their realisation an administration which is effective, efficient and sustainable. These further call for an accessible, responsive and participatory framework of administration that delivers outcomes in line with the concerns of the citizens of India and offers them a sense of ownership. The state of public administration in India, however, has invited the attention of critics for failures on these various grounds. Several attempts have been made since independence to address the administrative challenges and introduce institutional and procedural reforms aimed at a responsive and accountable bureaucracy, keeping the citizen at the centre-stage. It has not been possible to translate many of the reform initiatives, flowing from the recommendations of various important commissions and committees, into effective transformation of administration, with the result that public trust in state institutions in general and public service in particular has given way over the years to a serious state of cynicism. The public service providers are increasingly looked upon in many circles as outmoded, self-seeking, secretive and indifferent.

To an extent, this altered perception of state in general and public administration in particular has been characteristic of the political discourse the world over. A shift has been evident in the institutional preferences on grounds of failure of state and the poor

performance of public service. However, there has also been a concern evident at the level of state to recover its image and acceptability and to escape the pressures for privatisation. This concern became even more prominent with the realisation that both privatisation and civil society institutions cannot replace the state, which remains relevant to the lives of citizens. Many countries have introduced a range of public service reforms to institute accountability and to enhance citizen participation. The Citizen's Charter experiment of UK became a pioneering influence in shaping the initiatives taken across continents- these experiences have been discussed in Chapter III.

In India, a Conference of Chief Secretaries was held in 1996 in New Delhi to develop 'An Agenda for Effective and Responsive Administration'. The major recommendations emerging from this Conference were the following:

(i) Public accountability should be interpreted in a broader sense to include public satisfaction and responsive delivery of public services;

(ii) The Citizen's Charters should be introduced phase-wise for as many service institutions as possible; and

(iii) The Citizen's Charters should be introduced in the Departments of the Central and State Governments starting with those with a large public interface.

The first directive of the Union Government to the Ministries/Departments to initiate the exercise of formulation of Citizen's Charters was given in December 1996 forwarding a copy of 'the Citizen's Charters and requesting the Ministries/Departments 'to identify areas which have wide public interface'. This letter was followed by a letter of the then Cabinet Secretary to the Secretaries of the Ministries/Departments in January 1997, inviting their attention to the recommendations emerging from the Conference of Chief Secretaries held in November1996. The Cabinet Secretary highlighted the need for phased introduction of Citizen's Charters incorporating 'essentially citizen's entitlement to public services, wide publicity of standards of performance, quality of services and access to information'. Social audit was advised and it was desired that consumer organizations, citizen's groups, experts and retired public servants 'are involved in this process'.

Barely after six days of the Cabinet Secretary's letter, the then Additional Secretary, Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances wrote to the secretaries of the Union Ministries/Departments inviting their attention to the meetings convened by the then Cabinet Secretary in November and December1996 'in the context of the debate on effective and responsive administration covering transparency, accountability and efficiency'. The letter also referred to the following:

(i) A statement made by the then Prime Minister expressing 'the need for department-wise exercises on citizen-friendly procedures and Citizen's Charter'.

(ii) A decision taken by the Committee of Secretaries that 'each Ministry/Department may evolve its own series of consumer/ citizen-friendly initiatives and publish them in the form of Citizen's Charter so as to improve the overall quality of services provided by them'.

(iii) Another decision that each Ministry/Department should identify areas which have wide public interface in which 'the Charter could be introduced and implemented'.

The letter of Additional Secretary, Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances made a mention of the advice given to the Ministries/Departments to 'identify short and long term targets for improving the services and simplifying procedures'. This letter urged the Ministries/Departments to identify two to three specific areas of public interface in which the Charter could be introduced in 1997. They were requested to formulate the Charters 'within a month's time'. For this process, they were advised to 'set up review groups consisting of consumer organizations, experts and retired public servants' so as to ensure that the reforms proposed actually met the needs of the people.

In May 1997, the Conference of Chief Ministers was held in New Delhi adopting an 'Action Plan on Effective and Responsive Government'. The three main areas of the Action Plan discussed in the Conference of Chief Ministers were: (a) Making administration accountable and citizen-friendly; (b) Ensuring transparency and right to information; and (c) Taking measures to clear and motivate civil services. The Conference concluded with clear recommendations for (a) enforcing Citizen's Charters, (b) redress of public grievances, (c) decentralization and devolution of powers and (d)

review of laws, regulations and procedures. The overall aim of all these was to make the government citizen-friendly and accountable.

A major decision taken as a part of this Action Plan was to formulate Citizen's Charters both at the Centre and the States, beginning with the government departments and agencies with large public interface, such as the Indian Railways, Department of Posts, Department of Telecommunications and Department of Public Distribution System. The Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances of the Union Government has been coordinating formulation, operationalisation and evaluation of the Citizen's Charters of the Union Ministries/Departments and other Central Government organisations.

The earnestness of the Union Government to launch the programme of Citizen's Charters became evident in the numerous communications which followed in this connection. Till February 2008, 115 Citizen's Charters of the Union Ministries/Departments and other Central Government organisations could be finalized. During the same period, 650 Citizen's Charters were formulated by the Departments and other organisations of the State Governments. A comprehensive website, containing the Citizen's Charters issued by various Central Government Ministries/Departments/Organisations of Government of India (www.goicharters.nic.in) was launched by the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances in May 2002.

It is noteworthy that the initial visualisation of the Citizen's Charters by the DARPG underlined the need to incorporate the following elements:

(i)     Vision and Mission Statements;

(ii)    Details of business transacted by the organisation;

(iii)   Details of clients;

(iv)    Details of services provided to each client group;

(v)     Details of grievance redressal mechanism and how to access it; and

(vi)    Expectations from the clients.

The Citizen's Charter handbook identified six principles of Citizen's Charters as: published standards; openness and information; choice and consultation; courtesy and helpfulness; redress when things go wrong; value for money. There was no commitment to compensate for the failure to carry out the commitments. Regular monitoring, review and evaluation of the Charters, both internally and through external agencies, had indeed been enjoined in the initial visualisation of Charter programme. An evaluation of the Citizen's Charters of various government agencies was carried out by DARPG and Consumer Coordination Council, an NGO, in October 1998. A brief questionnaire was circulated to all Ministries/ Departments and State Governments/ Union Territories to enable them to undertake an in-house evaluation of their Citizen's Charters. Organisations were also advised to undertake external evaluations, preferably through a non- governmental organisation.

A hand-holding exercise was undertaken to further the goals of the Charter programme. Three major national level banks, namely, Punjab National Bank, Punjab and Sind Bank and Oriental Bank of Commerce, were selected for a hand-holding exercise by the DARPG in the year 2000 to build the banking sector as a model of excellence in the implementation of a Citizen's Charter. The key issues highlighted for exemplary implementation of their Citizen's Charters were: (i) Stakeholder involvement in the formulation of Citizen's Charters; (ii) Deployment of Citizen's Charters in the Banks by full involvement of the staff, specially the employees at the cutting-edge level; (iii) Creation of awareness about the Charters amongst the customers of the Banks; and (iv) Special training for employees at all levels about the concept and implementation of a Citizen's Charter.

In order to further the consultation process, four Regional Seminars on Citizen's Charters were organised during the year 2001-02, with a view to bring national and state level organisations along with other stakeholders, including NGOs, intelligentsia, media etc., on the same platform and to share experiences in formulation and implementation of Citizen's Charter. In addition, several capacity building exercises were also undertaken. In the year 2002-03, the DARPG also engaged a professional agency to develop a standardized model for internal and external evaluation of Citizen's Charters in a more effective, quantifiable and objective manner. This agency

also carried out an evaluation of the implementation of Charters in 5 Central Government Organisations and 15 Departments/ Organisations of three States. The Evaluation Report pointed towards the absence of a consultative process in the formulation of Charters; the lack of familiarity of the service providers with the philosophy, goals and main features of the Charter; lack of adequate publicity to the Charters by the Departments, which were evaluated; and funds not being specifically earmarked for awareness generation regarding Citizen's Charter or for orientation of staff on various components of the Charter.

Capacity building received some attention during the year 2002-03. Three Capacity Building Workshops on formulation and implementation of Citizen's Charters were organised. Besides, a Capacity Building Workshop for developing Trainers and Training Modules on Citizen's Charter was organised in December 2002. Six Capacity Building Workshops on formulation of Citizen's Charter were organised in various regions during 2003-04 and three during 2004-05. Thirteen one-day Department-specific Workshops were also organised with the twin objective of generating awareness amongst the public as well as employees and initiating the process of consultation during the year 2002-03.

Efforts were also made to set up the Information and Facilitation Counters and the Public Grievance Cells, two of the instruments through which Citizen's Charters were expected to materialise. A new software for public grievance redress and monitoring system was also developed. Later, a web enabled centralised system of redressal and monitoring was developed and training for its implementation has been conducted by the DARPG. Despite all concern for effective implementation of Citizen's Charters, there was little evidence of improved public service and affective, accountable and responsive administration actually being delivered. The Government of India was confronted with several challenging issues. These included the challenge of:

- Aligning public service delivery performance in India with citizen's expectations;

- Institutionalizing continuous improvement and assessment of performance in the Government organizations against clear and improving standards

- Benchmarking quality of service delivery by government organizations and grading them on performance;

- Providing public service providing government organizations a scheme for acquiring (and retaining) a symbol of excellence in service delivery.

A certification scheme called Sevottam has since been launched to address some of these issues. The scheme provides for the award of the Sevottam symbol of excellence to public service organizations that implement and are able to show compliance to a set of management system requirements that have been specified in a specially created standard document. It takes into account the unique conditions of service delivery by public service organizations in India and the sectoral and regional variations in service delivery standards and offers a systematic way to identify weaknesses in specific areas and rectify them through systemic changes and process re-engineering.

Obtaining a Sevottam symbol of excellence requires:

- Successful implementation of Citizen's Charters

- Service Delivery Preparedness and achievement of Results

- Sound Public Grievance Redress Mechanism.

Based on the objectives of Sevottam, the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) developed IS 15700:2005 after following the laid down procedures for standard formulation. A panel of 15 experts from 11 organizations including government departments, industry associations, public sector undertakings, DARPG, Tata Consultancy Services, Quality Council of India, Bureau of International Standards, prepared the draft standard, which was widely circulated for comments amongst 250 stakeholders, including the Secretaries of Government Departments, all major industry associations and others.

With the adoption of Sevottam, India became the first country in the world to publish a requirement standard for quality management of public service delivery. The standard highlights management responsibility for customer focus, use of tools for achieving quality standards like service quality policy and Citizen's Charters, internal and

external communications requirements, documentation requirements and the mechanism to implement, monitor, measure and improve delivery.

Although Citizen's Charter has been a major compliance criterion for being considered for Sevottam, it is also a significant module for process quality assessment and effectiveness assessment. The other two modules, public grievance redress and service delivery capability, too, are in fact central to the Citizen's Charter itself. It is important, however, to note that the Citizen's Charter has a bearing on the overall state of public administration too and should also be reviewed in the context of its bearing on the state of governance.

**II**

# Charters in India: A Review Exercise

The present exercise aimed at a review of the Charter programme in India began with an examination of the evolution of Charter concept and the existing understanding and experience of Charters as analyzed by DARPG, independent researchers and some civil society groups. Charter review and evaluation exercises attempted by DARPG over the years and the implementation of the recommendations emanating from these were also examined.

An exercise was undertaken to identify the parameters for the evaluation and review of Citizen's Charters. Twenty-eight parameters were considered important for the purpose in view of the understanding of the Charter programme, as it has evolved in India and elsewhere (see Annexure I). The Citizen's Charters of as many as 47 Union Ministries/ Departments/ Organizations, which were available either on the website of the DARPG or on the website of the Ministries/Departments, were reviewed along the twenty eight parameters to assess the extent of inclusion and exclusion of these. The findings were tabulated capturing the aggregate position of these on the identified parameters as well as the position of the specific parameters in these organizations. A copy of the tabular analysis was sent to the DARPG. The analysis enabled us to identify the areas on which the Citizens' Charters needed intervention for improvement (see Annexure II).

**I**

*Non-Existent and Out-dated Charters*

It is important to mention here that Citizen's Charters have still not been adopted by all Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations in the Government of India. There are several scenarios evident in this respect:

- Some Ministries are without a Charter because these are relatively new and have not been sufficiently pressured by either the DARPG or from within, or even from the public at large, to adopt a Charter. Ministry of Minority Affairs, Ministry of North-Eastern States, etc. are such examples.

- There are still other Ministries which have been carved out from an earlier Ministry, and are upgraded from the earlier status of Department to that of Ministry. These continue to live with their old Charter, which, in effect, is neither reflective of the structure nor communicative of the commitments of the Ministry. Ministry of Coal, for instance, continues to put on its web-site the Charter of the Department of Coal, which existed before this new Ministry was created.

- Some important Ministries have not adopted a Citizen's Charter on the ground that these are not public interface organisations. These include important Ministries like Ministry of Human Resource Development, Ministry of Home Affairs, etc. However, the absence of a Charter in their case cannot be justified on this ground because there are important programmes and schemes for which these organisations provide huge funds and their accountability towards the public for the appropriate utilisation of these funds cannot be undermined. Even when some of the organisations under them do have a Charter, it is not possible to overlook their own failure to realise the significance of a Charter.

- Other Ministries like the Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Ministry of Women and Child Development, have failed to work on a Charter despite having a large target group, which bears the effect of their performance.

- Some Departments under certain Ministries have not adopted a Charter even though some others do have a Charter.

- Likewise, certain organisations of some Ministries/ Departments have not adopted a Charter although certain others do have it.

*Lacking Precision on Standards, Commitments and Mechanisms*

In case of many Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations, although a Citizen's Charter has been adopted, it remains more of a ritualistic exercise without generating any capacity for people to use Charter commitments to obtain service improvement or for fulfillment of organisational commitments. The Citizen's Charters, which were reviewed, reflected a lack of organisational clarity about the objectives of the Charter programme. Most of the reviewed Charters lack precision on commitments and the mechanisms for their realization. These fall short of the competence to transform the organization and make it transparent, accountable and citizen-centric. Most of these Charters fails to create adequate space for citizen/ stakeholder participation in review, monitoring and evaluation of Charters. The capacity of the Charters to improve service delivery is also not established.  Nor is the commitment towards grievance-redress evident in any significant manner. The following observations may be noted in the context of the Charters which were reviewed for their content:

a)      Most of the Charters under review failed to communicate effectively the 'vision' of the organisation. 'Vision' statement was missing from nearly 60% of the reviewed Charters.

b)      The articulation of the 'mission' was also not found in nearly 40% of the reviewed Charters. And many of those which did include some kind of a mission statement, were not always very focused, clear or able to relate the mission to the vision. In some cases the objectives of the organisation were stated rather than any statement on the manner in which these were to be attained.

c)      The client groups/stakeholders/users were not identified at all in nearly 30% of the Charters reviewed. The identification was, at best, partial in case of many others. The commitment made by the organisation towards their specific concerns was not to be found in most Charters, including many of those which did identify these. Where competing groups of stakeholders with competing claims existed, Charter often remained silent on these rather than

suggest mechanism or processes through which the organisation sought to resolve these.

d)      The levels within the organisation were not indicated in about 27% of the Charters with the result that commitments and time-frame at each level did not find a place in the Charters.

e)      Service standards and timelines have been neglected in the Charters of most organisations. The service delivery standards were not mentioned in about 43% of the Charters reviewed. The service quality standards were missing from about 38% of them. These were poorly articulated in many others. Even those which mention some of these were quite ambiguous and lacked specificity and measurability. There were no clear commitments evident in the Charter when it was read from the viewpoint of the citizens/ clients/ stakeholders.

f)      As high as 40% of the Charters reviewed failed to give information about the processes of obtaining service benefits.17% of the Charters reviewed did not even provide the contact points of obtaining service benefits. Procedures/cost/charges were either not made available online, through display boards, booklets, inquiry counters etc., or the place was not specified in the Charter despite some of these being provided.

g)       Nearly 62% of the Charters reviewed did not offer any clue regarding the system for obtaining suggestions from the client groups/stakeholders/citizens. None of the Charters gave information about time frame for review of the suggestions. None of the Charters indicated that the organisation analysed the outcome of such a review to improve the functioning of the organisation. The mechanism for processing of suggestions and systematic review of suggestions were missing from nearly 98% of the Charters. Consequently, an equal percentage of the Charters failed to mention anything about the outcome of the review of suggestions.

h)      Almost 41% of the Charters under consideration did not indicate any timeframe for redress of public grievances. 61% of them did not indicate any timeframe for acknowledging the receipt of public grievances and nearly 43% of

them did not have the timeframe for responding to the petitioners. None of the Charters reviewed specified whether a petitioner would be conveyed the reasons for rejection of his grievance. Likewise, none of the Charters reviewed indicated any commitment of the organisation to convey the action taken to a petitioner whose grievance is accepted.

i)     There has been a complete neglect of the need to specify commitments related to a regular review and analysis of grievances received and responses offered in the Charter itself.  Most of the Charters reviewed failed to indicate any system of systematic review of the public grievances or any system of analysing the outcome of such a review to improve the functioning of the organisation.

j)     Even in the case of the Ministries/Departments, the Citizen's Charters of which mention that the time-frame of sending acknowledgements and final replies to the petitioners had been laid down, there was no indication as to how the Ministries/Departments ensure that the time-frame was being honoured by the officers/staff. Clear indications on how specific provision in the charter would be ensured in practice are wanting in most Charters.

k)     None of Charters reviewed gave any indication of a system of resolution offered to the client groups/stakeholders/citizens if the organisations or any of its levels failed to fulfill their commitments.

l)     Charters neglect the need to commit the organisation to information provision. Not many Charters make a mention of the concern of the organisation to provide for the information needs of the people in a proactive manner. The avenues for seeking information are not indicated in many Charters. Even a mention of an essential Charter component like Information Facilitation Counters(IFC) was missing from nearly 62% of the Charters and as high as 72% of them remained silent about the functions performed by the IFC and the facilities available therein.

m)     The Government of India has adopted the Right to Information Act which enables the citizens to seek information as a matter of right. It is expected

that the Charters would give information about the Act and information available under it. Nearly 77% of the Charters reviewed remained silent about the RTI Act and about 94% of them failed to even mention the Information Handbook brought out under the RTI Act.

n) None of the Charters reviewed gave any indication regarding the periodicity for a review of the Charter. The commitment to review itself was rare. Most Charters in existence had been framed several years ago and did not reflect even the contemporary state of the organisation, not to mention its commitments to citizens/ clients/ stakeholders in the rapidly changing organisational environment.

o) Any commitment towards the monitoring or review of Charter implementation was not found in the Charters. It was also found that most of the Charters have not been reviewed or updated for years together. In some cases, the Charters had lost any connection with the nature of activities and organisational structures, which had undergone significant changes over the years. The DARPG website itself required to be updated as it carried the Charters of Ministries which no longer existed.

From the review of Charter content, it emerged that the effectiveness of the Charter programme will essentially depend on a substantive review of the Charters. The Charters need to be made more explicit and forthcoming in specifying commitments and offering mechanisms and procedures to ensure the implementation and monitoring of commitments if these were to be realized and the nature of organization changed to make it more citizen-centric.

III

*The Framework of Citizen's Charter and Draft Charters*

A write-up on 'The Framework of Citizen's Charter' prepared to throw light on the nature and rationale of the parameters identified for Charter analysis and review was sent to the DARPG (see Annexure III). This was expected to enable these organizations to review their Charters in consultation with their employees and client groups/

14

stakeholders. The 'Framework' was also put on the web-site of the DARPG. The DARPG also communicated to Ministries/ Departments the readiness of IIPA to provide the support that was needed by the organisations to improve their respective Charters. Some of the Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations under them have taken initiative to revise/ frame their Citizen's Charter. Eighteen Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations sent their draft of Citizen's Charters for approval to the DARPG, which in turn sent these to IIPA for review. (A list is enclosed in Annexure IV). Observations on these Draft Charters have been sent to DARPG and the respective organisations through the DARPG. Most of these were found to be quite abstract in terms of laying down standards and specific commitments made to the citizens/ service users/ stakeholders. These also lack any clear strategy towards measurement and review of the effectiveness of the standards and the mechanisms for their implementation. It was also recommended that the organisations should consult the employees at various levels as well as the stakeholders for the purpose of formulation of their Charter and arriving at the specific commitments which organisation should make with regard to specific standards.

IV

*Assessing Charter Effectiveness*

In addition to the content of Citizen's Charters, it was felt that if the Charter programme had to deliver improvements in governance and service delivery, other dimensions concerning the internal processes meant for the effective implementation of Citizen's Charters in specific organisations also required to be looked into. A questionnaire was prepared to capture the processes of formulation, implementation, review and evaluation of Citizen's Charters, as also, to obtain insights into the very understanding of the objectives of the programme and the issues confronting their realisation. The questionnaire was sent to the Ministries with a request for an early response in order to enable us gain an insight into the in respect of their Citizen's Charter programme. The questionnaire was also made available by the DARPG through its website with a request to respond. However, many organisations did not respond to the questionnaire despite repeated requests. Informal discussions with officers revealed that their reluctance to admit in writing the lack of initiative in many respects was the main

reason for the poor response received from various organisations. Not surprisingly, even those which responded refrained from answering the questions which did not put them in good light as far as Charter formulation and implementation was concerned.

Formal and informal discussions were held with, besides officers and staff in various organisations, user groups and citizens in general, as also, representatives from civil society groups to ascertain the effectiveness and perceived relevance of the Citizen's Charter programme in general and specific Charters in particular. An attempt was made to ascertain the compatibility between the initial vision and the practice of Charter programme, including the content of Charters, their implementation, monitoring, review and evaluation of outcomes.

A Workshop was organised by IIPA and DARPG at the IIPA on the Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation of Citizen's Charters. Attended by the nodal officers of several Ministries/ Departments, the workshop reviewed the progress of the Charter programme and discussed the problems encountered by the Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations in the formulation, review and implementation of Charters. (A list of Participants is given in Annexure V). The findings of the review of Citizen's Charters of 47 organisations along the parameters of evaluation, identified for the purpose, was also discussed at the Workshop. The significance of expediting the process of formulation, implementation and review of Charters, especially the setting up and assessment of the quality and delivery standards by involving stakeholders/ users/ public at large in the process was admitted.

The Workshop threw light on the problems confronting the organisations in the formulation and implementation of Charters, especially because of the limits of staff and resources to fulfill commitments which citizens and stakeholders expect, but also because of the inability to resolve conflicts between different stakeholders. The apprehension of demand taking over the organisation and becoming unmanageable in the absence of an increase in resource availability was the most significant hurdle to the materialisation of Charters as mechanisms to improve administration.

*A Ritualistic and Received Document*

The perception of Citizen's Charter among the officials remains entrenched in the ritualistic framework. There is little interest in the organisations to be led by their Charter. It is view as a received document, which cannot be rejected, yet which invites little appreciation and interest of the staff which has to carry it towards meaning. The officers and staff look at the programme as imposition from outside, incapable of achieving any improvement in service quality without the requisite conditions of allocation of sufficient resources and delegation of decision-making authority. Most Charters have, in fact, been framed by a small group of individuals within the organisation, without involving the staff at the cutting edge level which is instrumental in the implementation of the Charter and without involving the stakeholders who should have a role in defining the standards as well as review and evaluation exercises.

*Invisible and Poorly Communicated*

On the communication front, Charter programme has been throttled on account of poor planning and resource commitment for publicity. In fact, the communication of Charter to the cutting edge level staff is also marked by failure. There is little awareness about the Charter even within the organisation, especially at the outlet level. Efforts towards the training of staff, especially at the cutting edge level, have been far short of the requirements of the programme. While awareness of Charter among the staff at the implementation level would have been automatically taken care of had these been involved in the process of formulation and review of Charters, this has not been paid any attention.

In as much as the communication of Charter to the public at large and stakeholders in particular is concerned, the language and design issues are also important. Most Charters have been framed in English language, although some of these have been translated in Hindi too. However, for the Charters to be able to establish a cord with citizens and for the latter to be able to use these effectively, their availability in the local language and display in all offices was crucial. Besides, in view of the fact that a large section of citizens continues to be non-literate, visual and audio modes of communication

should have been extensively used to publicise the Charters. But this has not happened to any significant extent.

While the fear of being flooded with demand for fulfilling commitments made in the Charter was an important factor inhibiting the publicity of the Charters, little attention to publicity and Charter communication was also on account of the realisation in the organisation that the Charter carried little worthwhile commitments which would need to be communicated. Even IFCs have not been used to publicise the Charter. The Charter is not displayed in most IFCs; in many, even a copy is not available for reference; and in some cases, the Charter was not even in the knowledge of the Counter Incharge of the IFC.

### *One-Time Exercise, Frozen in Time*

Another major problem area is that most Charters have not been reviewed since their formulation. Some of these have little meaning in the context of the far reaching changes which the organisations have undergone. The functions listed in the Charter have moved to the private sector operators in some cases. In others, even the structure of the organisation has undergone a change, yet the Charter document continues to be the same. In case of the Ministry of Coal, for instance, the website of the Ministry leads one to the old Charter of the 'Department of Coal', without even altering the changed status of the Department. Many of Charters do not reflect the latest developments and initiatives taken by the organisation, even though some of these have been placed on the website of the organisation. These have been a one time exercise, which was frozen in time, and lost any meaning for the organisation as well as citizens, who were to benefit from it.

### *Lacking in Accountability and Review Mechanisms*

In case of most organisations, no reporting mechanism has been evolved to assess the implementation of Charter. No review meetings take place to assess Charter implementation. Even the Annual Report does not include a review of Charter implementation or plans for implementation. In fact, as can be seen from the table below, the Annual Report of most Ministries and Departments do not mention the Charter. Some of them do not even have a Charter.

| Citizen's Charter and the Annual Report | |
|---|---|
| Ministry/Department | Whether Citizen's Charter appears in Annual Report |
| Ministry of Civil Aviation | No |
| Ministry of Coal | No |
| Ministry of Commerce | No |
| Ministry of Corporate Affairs | Yes, in a small para no1.14, to mention the Department's website where the Citizen's Charter is available. Para 1.14 also gives the content of the Charter in brief |
| Ministry of Culture | No |
| Ministry of Defence | No |
| Ministry of Development of North Eastern Region | No |
| Ministry of Earth Sciences | No |
| Ministry of Health and Family Welfare | No |
| Ministry of Home Affairs | No |
| Ministry of Power | No. The chapter on Power Grid Corporation indicates the Citizen's Charter of the Corporation but nowhere in the Annual Report there is anything about the Ministry's Charter. |
| Ministry of Rural Development | No |
| Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment | No |
| Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation | No |
| Ministry of Steel | No |
| Ministry of Textiles | Yes, but very briefly just to mention that the Ministry's Charter has been formulated and placed in its website. |
| Ministry of Tourism | No |
| Ministry of Tribal Affairs | No |
| Ministry of Water Resources | No |
| Ministry of Women and Child Development | No |
| Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports | No |
| Department of Agriculture and Cooperation | Yes (as Annexure 3.4 to the latest Annual Report) |
| Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries | No |
| Department of Biotechnology | No |
| Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals | No |
| Department of Consumer Affairs | Yes, but very briefly in a small para no1.4, just to mention the Department's website where the Citizen's Charter is available. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Fertilizers | No |
| Department of Food and Public Distribution | Paras 2.67 and 2.69 mention very briefly the content of the Citizen's Charter which was revised in July 2007 |
| Department of Heavy Industries | Yes. Para 1.10 of the last Annual Report indicates very briefly the Department's Citizen's Charter |
| Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion | Yes, as a full chapter (chapter 16) |
| Department of Information Technology | No |
| Department of Posts | No |
| Department of Public Enterprises | No |
| Department of Science and Technology | No |
| Department of Telecommunications | No |

Issues like the extent of incorporation of desired standards, the state of their implementation, the problems and constraints experienced in implementation, possibilities of addressing these and the Charter experience of specific units and their suggestions have no place in the Charter programme, which therefore remains largely trapped in the scenario of symbolic existence. There is no system of periodic reviews of Charter implementation engaging the staff at the cutting edge level in most organisations, without which it is impossible for the Charter to penetrate the thick layers of bureaucratic inertia and lack of citizen-centric responses, which characterise the organisational culture. Charter programme cannot make a mark on the organisational performance unless it is lived by the organisation in every day functioning at all levels.

*Devoid of Participative Mechanisms for Effective Performance*

The issue of assessing Charter effectiveness and impact on the performance of the organisation with the help of users has also not been regarded seriously by most organisations. No mechanisms for regular interface with users to ascertain effectiveness or a resort to user surveys, feedback forms, *jan sunvais*, social audit panels or suggestion analysis have been set up in most organisations. Even parameters to ascertain effectiveness and impact have not been identified, not to mention any exercise in this direction. The result is that the Charter remains a one-time documentation exercise rather than a mechanism for taking the organisation towards new accomplishments and improved public interface. Charter components do not get the requisite attention in the organisation, because of the absence of pressure which gets generated on account of a

periodic review exercise. Mechanisms and strategies to effect improvements through Charters are not incorporated by most organisations in their strategic plans. There is little seriousness regarding exploring the possibilities of Charter becoming an instrument of organisational recovery in the context of worsening resource scenario confronting most organisations.

V

*Conclusion*

It emerges from the analysis of questionnaires which were received as well as the discussions with officials and service users that the Citizen's Charter programme of most organizations suffers from poverty of participation and failure of communication, is marked by poor, undefined, ambiguous standards and commitments, carries low visibility and negligible presence not only in public domain but also within the organisation, possesses inadequate mechanism for fulfillment of commitments, however insignificant, lacks a strategy and resource support for its realisation, is shorn of the instruments of measurement, review and evaluation of implementation and outcomes, and has no strategy towards distinguishing the performers from non-performers. Without addressing these, the programme has only a symbolic presence and does not make much of a difference in altering the state of public administration in general and service delivery in particular.

# III

## International Experience in Charters [1]

 

The state of public administration and service delivery have been  major concerns the world over. In the context of globalisation and liberalisation thrust of recent times, these concerns acquired a renewed urgency and a new meaning too. The Citizen's Charter programme, evolved in the UK, emerged as a significant initiative, aimed at addressing the challenge of service delivery and citizen-centric administration. Many other countries also moved in similar direction and adopted the basic thrust of the Charter programme, though these developed their own specific features and used a different nomenclature, such as, 'Service Charters', 'Public Service Guarantees', etc. This Chapter looks at the Charter programme as it has taken shape across the world and the lessons that can be learned from these experiences.

**The Beginnings: Citizen's Charter Programme in UK**

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, a widespread discontent with the public administration system in the UK and the feeling within and outside the government that it was not adequately client-oriented and responsive led the Thatcher Government to search for new ways and means to improve standards, induce greater economy, efficiency and effectiveness of public services and make them more caring and client oriented. A series of reform measures were initiated in public services. The reform initiatives like 'The Efficiency Scrutinizer' in 1979, 'The Financial Management Initiative' in 1982 and 'The Next Step Programme' in 1988 formed the foundation of the Citizen's Charter experiment which was initiated by the Major Government in 1991.

---

[1] This chapter draws liberally from the official websites of the concerned states as well as other material available on the net. A mention may be made to the paper by Tom Madell, "From the Citizen's Charter to Public Service Guarantees- the Swedish Model", European Public Law, Vol 11, No.2, 2005;  Lourdes Torres and Vincente Pina, Service Charters: Reshaping the Government-Citizen Relation Ship- the Case of Spain, presented at the Conference of the European Group of Public Administration, Portugal 2003; and Citizen' Charters in Europe: an Overview, www.eupan.eu/3/92/&for=show&tid=108.

In a White Paper, published by the Cabinet Office in July 1991, the initial version of the UK Citizen's Charter was officially launched. It was based on six principles: standards, openness, information, choice, non-discimination and accessibility. These principles were later modified vide the 'Citizen's Charters: First Report' of 1992. With this, three other principles were added, namely, 'courtesy and helpfulness', 'putting things right' and 'value for money'. 'Consultation' was added to 'choice', 'openness' and 'information' were put together and 'non-discrimination' and 'accessibility' were removed from the list.

To put these principles into effect, a small Citizen's Charter Unit was set up within the office of the public service in the Cabinet Office in 1991 itself. This gave the programme the requisite power for success. The programme aimed at instituting the duties of public functionaries and changing the attitude of public managers. Charters were framed in the name of clients, such as Tax Payers (Revenue Department), Parents' Charter (Department of Education), Contributor's Charter (Social Security agency). Efforts were made the publise the Charter programme through seminars and publications. Audit Commission published Citizen's Charter Indicators in 1992. A White Paper under the title 'Open Government' was published in 1993. A 'Complaints Task Force was constituted in 1993, which produced a Report titled "Effective Complaints System: Principles and Checklist" to enable the organisations to test the effectiveness of their internal complaints handling system against the yardstick developed by it.

The idea behind the Charter programme was to measure public service in order that a better one could be delivered. The Government asked each service to institute means of redress when it fell short of its promised output levels. The public services were asked to set their targets themselves in order that they could feel that they 'own' their respective charters and those were not imposed on them from outside. This was done to raise morale of the officials so that they could take pride in delivering high quality public services. The rule was that if the targets were not met, there would be some demand for an explanation or if the shortcomings were serious enough, some sort of penalty. The aim was to make the public service providers conscious of the needs of their clients and to make them liable if they failed to meet the needs of the clients.

In order to further effect service improvement, the Charter Marks were introduced in 1992, shortly after the introduction of the Citizen's Charters. A number of Charter Marks were awarded each year, if the public services had achieved excellence in the designated areas of attainment. This created an intense competition for the coveted Charter Marks. To win a Charter Mark, the organization has to demonstrate excellence against the following nine Charter Mark criteria, namely, (a)performance standards, (b)information and openness, (c)choice and consultation (d)courtesy and helpfulness, (e)putting things right, (f)value for money, (g)user satisfaction, (h)improvements in service quality and (i)planned improvements and innovations.

When Tony Blair became the Prime Minister, there were 41 National Charters of major public services, such as, Patient's Charter, Parent's Charter, Taxpayer's Charter, Court's Charter etc. and over 10,000 local Charters. There was the Annual Charter Mark Award Scheme and 24 Charter Quality Networks. The local Charters were formulated by the local agencies, such as, doctors, hospital trusts and schools. The Annual Charter Mark Award Scheme was an instrument to recognize excellence and innovation in public services. The Charter Quality Networks were set up by the Charter Unit in 1994. Such 'Quality Networks' consisted of small groups of managers of public services and privatized utilities.

The Government of Tony Blair claimed credit for initiating the Charter experiment in local government of UK- the customer contracts of the English local authorities like the York city council served as the model. It, however, modified the programme, adopting lessons from the 'communitarian' movement and 'Clinton-Gore National Performance Review'. The Charter programme was modified. It was renamed as 'Service First' in June 1998. The new emphases included accessibility, consultation with staff, collaboration with other service providers and innovation to device ways of service improvement. In 1999, the major elements of 'Service First' were incorporated into the Government's White Paper, 'Modernising Government'. In February 2001, the Government announced a new 'consumer focus' in public services. The central drive for improved public service delivery, which marked the Charter programme, however, remained. The Charters remained well embedded as part of the service improvement culture at National and Local service delivery level.

**Europe and America**

The British experiment created waves of administrative reforms in other countries too. In 1992, Belgium introduced Public Service Users' Charter—Chartre de l'Utilisateur des Services Publics. It was aimed at encouraging the federal administrations to improve the quality of services delivered to citizens. According to the preamble of the Charter, the concern for adapting public services to the needs of each user is the keystone of the Charter initiative. The Charter includes one section of general principles and another of measurements of the stated principles. The general principles rest on three basic elements, namely, transparency, flexibility and legal protection. Also called the 'Code of Good Administrative Control', the Charter is expected to contribute to a relationship of trust between the public authorities and the public. It provides a list of rights and duties of users and of prerogatives and duties of the public sector and results in a need for transparency, flexibility and legal protection that increase the trust between all these stakeholders. Charters in Belgium do not include a system of compensation. Compensation is not regulated. The service commitments are considered promises, principles of good administration, which morally involve public authorities in the provision of services. It is important to note, however, that there is no comprehensive policy to introduce Charters in public services. As a result, the user Charter in the 1990s has fallen into oblivion at the federal level, though several initiatives do exist at the regional and local levels.

France brought in 'La Chartre des Services Publics', its 'Public Service Charter' in 1992, which set out the basic public service principles: transparency and responsibility, simplicity and accessibility, participation and adaptation; trust and reliability. At present the charters are still in the development phase and not many charters have been published. However, quality measures and standards have been developed and made public at central and local level. Systems of compensation as a means of repairing government service deficiencies do not exist; the public finance law does not allow monetary compensation.

Italy did not lag behind; it brought in 'Carta di Servizi' in 1993. The framework of the Charter contained five principles which provide for continuity and regularity in the

provision of services, the right of choice of the user of public services whenever possible, participation, efficiency and effectiveness. The Cabinet Unit had to check the suitability of standards and complaint procedures that each provider defined in its own Charter. The Italian Service Charters include a system of compensation, which is not regulated by law and could vary for different services. There is a common policy of compensation set by the basic principles included in the Prime Minister's directive, in which essential elements are complaint procedures, reimbursement- mostly in gas, electricity and mail services- and remedial action if standards are not reached. In effect, however, as some surveys suggest, the existence of the Carta dei servizi is ignored by most citizens.

In Spain, the Citizen's Charters have been used extensively across the Public Sector at the Central, Regional and Local levels since 1999. From July 2005, a new regulation based upon the previous experience was introduced. The main improvements brought out, included, among others, the compensation system in case of non-compliance and the Certification of the Charter on a voluntary basis. The 'inter-administrative' Charters regulating a service delivered by different administrative levels- Central, Regional and/or Local- are the other important innovations introduced to the second generation Charters. The Charters are one of the six programmes included in this new regulation with the aim of structuring a quality framework in public administration. The other five are: demand analysis and users satisfaction assessment, complaints and suggestions, quality assessment, quality and best practices awards and quality observatory. The service charters in Spain reflect a shift from legal tradition to one that meets citizen's needs and makes government more accessible, transparent and open to the public. Spain has also adopted a 'citizen first' programme, establishing and linking service charters, best practice prize and quality awards.

In Bulgaria, significant efforts have been made for customer satisfaction and improvement in access to administrative service and enhance its quality. Charters are an important instrument of this and have been widely used. A recent survey shows that for better service delivery, a large number of administrators in the country (76%) use Citizen Charters, which include the way of improving the access of administrative service and to help boost its quality. The Citizen Charters are in use in 79% of Central Administrations, 93% of Regional Administrations and 65.1% of Municipal Administrations of Bulgaria.

In Cyprus, the Citizen's Charters are in limited use in public services though in recent years, several Government Departments prepared 'Citizens' Guides' to inform the citizens about their services, the documentations needed and the relevant procedures. Thus, while Citizen Charter was prepared by Road Transport Department, 'Citizens' Guides' by the Inland Revenue Department, the Statistical Service, the Public Administration and Personnel Department and the Printing Office.

In Czech Republic, the 'Citizen Charter Method' was introduced in March 2006. The obligations of the organisation towards the citizens are an integral part of the Charter in case the provided service does not meet the standard given by the Charter. There is a provision for compensation corresponding with both the extent and character of the injury which results from non-provision of service. Clear procedures to file complaints written in local language have to be provided. The Charter method, however, is only beginning to take shape. Ten organisations from public sector took part in the project to begin with.

In Estonia, the guidelines for elaborating the Citizen's Charters and the obligation for their implementation at the Central Government level were approved in 2000. The promotion of quality management in the public sector was included in the 'Public Administration Reform Programme' of the Government in 2001. However, there is a wide variety in the content and quality of the Charters in use in Estonia despite there being an obligation to follow the guidelines. Only some Departments have been able to set up effective comunications and complaints system. There is little by way of citizen involvement, which weakens the programme. Besides, Citizen's Charters are not used at the local government level, where many of the public services are provided, which limits their effect.

In Latvia, introduction of Citizen Charters has been one of the concerns of the public administration reform strategy but the implementation has not been extensive. However, efforts have been made to create bases for communication and involvement of citizens and compensation and complaints procedures through strategic planning and annotation system, principles of publicity and transparency, law on administrative procedure, etc.

Although Lithuania does not have a formal Citizen Charter, the main aspects aimed at the Citizen Charters are clearly defined in the national laws. Citizen's involvement into public tasks, procedures about how citizens/consumers must be served in public institutions, the rights of citizens/consumers determined, and the procedures of complaints provided. In 2004, the Government of Republic of Lithuania approved a Strategy of Public Administration Development. The Action Plan for the implementation of the Strategy for 2007-2010 has been drafted and some measures regarding Citizen Charters are likely to follow.

In Finland, government resolution of 1998 contains recommendations to guarantee that citizens receive the service they need effectively and in a customer-oriented way. The key ideas which underline the quality strategy of public services accepted by the central and local governments are: promises to the service users to produce quality services, flexible and customer-centered approach to service provision, customer feedback and the correction of errors, description of the service in a service specification, and producing the best possible service efficiently. In most Finnish Charters, the main focus is on clear quality standards, communication and fast correction of mistakes rather than on compensation mechanisms. Service charters are both ethically and morally binding on public authorities but these are not legally binding decisions.

In Denmark, there is no central service standard initiative although many agencies and municipalities have established service standards on a voluntary basis. A number of agencies have sought certifications of their quality management systems, some in relation to requirements in performance contracts. Customer surveys have been widely used covering a wide number of services and at the level of specific services. Denmark has stipulated that municipalities will inform their citizens as to their service objectives at least every other year.

In Sweden, the 1998 Citizen's Service Act ushered in Service Charters, known as known as Public Service Guarantees, at national and local level. Based on this, the government started a programme to improve quality and service at the level of government agencies. Swedish legislation sets well-established standards of services, security and accessibility and opens channels for citizen complaint. This provides the

basis for local charters with an emphasis on commitment, quality, choice, standards and measurement, value for money and competition. The Charters emphasise the need to raise the general standard and quality of services, to find locally sensitive and responsive solutions to citizen problems, increase transparency and enhance the overall effectiveness of public programmes. There is no system of economic compensation. These Charters are more widespread at the municipality level although Sweden also had a pilot project during 2001-03 involving 21 Central Government agencies.

In recent years in Sweden there have been other initiatives to create a culture for achieving customer satisfaction and actual results called Commitment Quality Management. The main elements of such efforts include leadership based on clear specifications of performance, including quality standards; the results achieved for the citizens and their perception of them; performance commitments based on the participation of every employee in the process; measurement and evaluation of performance, including service standard quality; and a programme for continuous improvement of quality and efficiency. The local government provides relevant examples of these across a range of different public services, such as, childcare, education, and social security and care of elderly.

In view of the fact that various types of services require various types of Service Charters, the Swedish Local Authorities League has listed four different categories of public services or areas where citizens get in touch with public services in a more concrete or specified way.

(a) General and technical services. This group includes services in respect of which the citizen/ public service customer has virtually no physical contact with representatives of the municipality. Instances are refuse collection and street maintenance. The Service Charters used in this type of services will focus on regularity and dependability of supply, preparedness, costs, etc. The contents of the public service guarantees will be based on actual legislation, for instance, sanitary demands within public sanitation.

(b) Short-term contacts: Services in this group will be characterized by their short duration, as, for instance, the provision of application forms or library

services. The Service Charters used for this type of services will relate to the contents and extent of the services offered, the costs, opening and closing hours, accessibility, etc.

(c)    Permissions and approvals: Services in this group would result in contacts between municipality and citizens for a more prolonged period of time. The Service Charters used in these cases primarily deal with legal rights of the individual in respect of the correct handling of a matter, the expeditiousness of the handling, the right to informational access in the matter, etc.

(d)    'Soft' sector services:  This group includes services, such as, education, child and geriatric care, services in which the contact is both for a prolonged period of time and based on 'intimate' contact between municipality and citizen. To the extent that these services amount to an exercise of public authority, the same type of public service guarantees as in the third category would be present, whilst in respect of the 'service' part it would be necessary to look at the particular circumstances and terms of each activity.

In Norway, Citizen's Charters are being practiced both at local and central level. In 1998, the initiative was launched in the State Administration. All Central Government agencies have since 2000 produced 'Service Declarations'. In Germany, too, several pilot projects of Charters have been implemented at municipal level since 1999, mostly concentrating on quality standards, communication and strengthening customer orientation of administration. Some Municipalities have put considerable emphasis on development of Citizen Charters.

In Greece, although there is a law to create Citizen's Charters providing quality services to the citizens beyond the existing legislation in all public services, the programme has been implemented to a limited level. In Hungaria, a test pilot project on Citizen Charter was undertaken in Bacs-Kiskun County but launching of a Citizen's Charter at national level has not yet been approved.

Although Poland has not adopted a standardized Citizen's Charter, recently several initiatives have recently been taken in similar direction. In 2000 the civil service office disseminated among all government institutions a leaflet "My Rights at Office:

Manual of Government Administration Client". This was aimed at familiarising the citizens regarding their rights in respect of administration and administrative procedures. Since 2002, the public sector has worked under a law on the access to public information and since 2004 all public sector institutions are obliged to publish, among other things, information on service standards and rules in BIP (Public Information Bulletin) website. Many public institutions offer detailed information regarding their mission, vision, values as well as citizen's rights, rules of service, electronic forms to fill in, etc.

Ireland, too, does not have formal Citizen's Charters in place, yet each Government Department and Office in Ireland is required to develop and publish a Customer Charter, which involves four stages, namely, consultation with customers/stakeholders, committing to service standards, evaluating performance against those standards and reporting publicly on those results in Annual Reports.

In Luxembourg, a general legal framework guarantees rights and standards to citizens involved in administrative procedures. The promotion of quality management and is one of the main themes of the current administrative reform programme. In this respect, elaboration of guidelines and implementation of Citizen's Charters define the scope of action plans.

In Malta, the Quality Service Charter initiative was launched in 1999 and more than sixty Charters were developed. On the basis of this experience, minimum service standards have been drawn up and are applicable throughout the Public Service, including non-chartered offices since September 2006.

The Netherlands has about 50 Citizen's Charters. The Dutch e-Citizen's Charter was developed by Burger@Overheid (e- Citizen Programme), an independent platform which stimulates the development of e- Government from the Citizen's point of view. Burger@Overheid is an initiative of the Ministry of Interior. The e-Citizen's Charter consists of quality standards that define the digital relation between citizen and government, both in the field of information exchange, service delivery and political participation. These standards are formulated as the rights which citizens are entitled to, and matching obligations by government bodies. This Charter has been adopted as a standard for public service delivery.

In 1993 itself, Portugal brought in 'The Public Service Quality Charter'. With a strong public commitment of Prime Minister, the government disseminated the use of Quality Charter, in all public services. At present, some public services have Quality Charter in the shape of TQM practices or quality standards like ISO9001. The Directorate-General for Public Administration elaborated guidelines to help public services outline their Quality Charter. Those guidelines are displayed through a CD-ROM on Quality Management in Public Services.

Among the Anglo-American countries, which have pursued the Charter programme with zeal and determination, Mexico, Argentina and Jamaica are significant. One finds the adoption of Service Standards in Canada, Service Charters in Australia and Customer Service Plans in the USA. The Charter programme in Mexico got a boost in the year 2000 when President Vincente Fox came to power. In November 2002, the government announced the Agenda for Good Governance. Mexico now claims to use Citizen's Charters to put the needs of citizens at the centre of government services and as a vehicle to improve transparency. The Government of Mexico had set a goal of developing Charters for over 240 high impact services and regulatory transactions, by the end of 2005. More than 80 Citizen's Charters have been signed so far. Importantly enough, the Citizen's Charters in Mexico are signed documents having some legal force behind the commitments made therein. The Government plans to implement additional Citizen's Charters and to put in place a digital system for instantaneously measuring the customer satisfaction rate among those who receive the services covered by Citizen's Charters.

In Jamaica, Citizen's Charter was introduced in 1994 and Charters have since been in use. During 2000-01, 14 new entities (departments) were covered under the programme. It is not a static programme in Jamaica; the Government is introducing new measures frequently. The public sector entities in the island nation are showing innovativeness, initiative, creativity and ingenuity in their responses to the needs of the customers. The Ministry of Health established a Clients Complaints Mechanism, One-stop revenue services were set up in Montegue Bay and Twickenham Park and the National Housing Trust started offering on-line services to customers.

In Canada, the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat started a Service Standard Initiative in 1995 which took its cue from the Citizen's Charter of UK, but enlarged its scope considerably. This Service Standard Initiative in Canada was started against the backdrop of citizen expectations relating to friendly, respectful and courteous service, faster response time, extended hours at government offices; and 'one-stop-shopping'. At the same time, there was need to reduce the deficit and provide value for money through more efficient use of resources.

In the USA, the implementation of Service Charter initiatives was carried out within the framework of the National Performance Review (NPR) undertaken by the Clinton-Gore Administration to reform the way the federal government worked, make government more responsible and improve its public image. In 1993, President Clinton mandated that all federal agencies develop customer service plans, establishing the 'Putting Customers First' programme, thus making commitment to improve the service that customers received from government. This programme shared some of the fundamental principles on which the UK Charter Programme was founded. NPR took an initiative in 1994 to help agencies create their first sets of Customer Service Standards and thereby make them more responsive to customers. Agencies were required to identify and survey their customers, and to report back to the President. These surveys provided information about customer satisfaction levels. Agencies developed customer service standard, which customers could expect from government departments or agencies. The customer service plans of agencies were published in September 1994, and this survey information became the benchmark against which agencies were able to measure the success of their performance.

**Developments in Australia**

The Government of Australia launched its Service Charter initiative in 1997, called 'Putting Service First', as part of its on-going commitment to improve service quality by moving the government organization away from bureaucratic processes to customer-focussed outcomes. Service Charters are considered a powerful tool for fostering change and require the organization to focus on services delivered to measure and assess performance and to initiate performance improvement. 'Putting Service First'

provides a framework in which government bodies are able to change their customer relations culture and to improve service delivery. According to this document, a service Charter is a simple document which sets out clearly the quality and level of service that customers can expect. A key feature is a statement of who is responsible for the provision of the service at the level promised. By providing goals for agencies to strive forward, a Charter is expected to induce competition. Centrelink, a one-stop shop, provides access to Australian Government services for over six million customers. Centrelink claims to adopt one-to one service as an innovative and personalized approach to service delivery that treats customers with respect and consistency, taking the complexity out of dealing with government. The Minister for Consumer Affairs has the responsibility for over-sighting the implementation of Service Charters. All agencies are required to conduct an external performance audit against Charter objectives very three years and they are required to report annually to the Department of Finance and Administration on their performance against the Charter.

### Developments Across Africa

Several African countries have also adopted their Citizen's Charters. Significant Charter programmes have been launched in South Africa, Ghana and Namibia.

In his 2004 State of the Nation Address, the South African President Thabo Mbeki promised his people that the 'government will ensure that the public sector discharges its responsibilities to our people as a critical player in the process of growth, reconstruction and development of our country.' South Africa has adopted *Batho Pele* which is essentially a Citizen's Charter. *Batho Pele* is a traditional Sesotho adage meaning 'people first'. *Batho Pele* outlines eight principles for service delivery in South Africa. These principles are: courtesy, value for money, consultation, service standards, access, openness, information, redress and transparency. *Batho Pele* became public service policy in 1997. It requires that the departments should set service delivery standards and the Ministers must make annual statements of public service commitments. *Batho Pele* also requires that departments must report annually on performance against the standards they have set. The departments are required to listen to and respond to complaints from citizens, and consult the citizens on services at all stages in the policy

process and that information on services must be provided. The South African laws protecting the rights of citizens to administrative justice and access to information support the last principle. The programme includes unannounced visits by Ministers to service delivery points, a campaign to assist citizens to know their service delivery rights and responsibilities and a targeted access programme implementing integrated service delivery. It also includes *Khaedu*- a TshiVenda word which means 'challenge'- which places the senior civil servants at the point of service delivery(e.g. in a police station), after which they write a report to the relevant Head of the Department.

Another unique element of participatory democratic governance is *Imbizo* or *Izimbizo* (plural) programme. An *Imbizo* is a forum which enables face-to-face dialogue between government leaders and the public. It gives ordinary citizens the opportunity to engage the government leadership directly in an unmediated way to express their views on the successes and failures of government, especially in relation to governance and service delivery matters. In this forum, the President and other government leaders listen to the people who use the opportunity to voice their concerns and grievances on issues of development, governance and service delivery. The *Imbizo* offers a platform where the ordinary people inform the Government leadership about their experiences and the challenges they face in their communities and at the same time suggest solutions to address those challenges. The *Imbizo* is also an opportunity for the Government to communicate its programme of action, to note progress in implementation and challenges experienced.

Ghana has set up a Ministry of Public Sector Reform and adopted a Citizen's Charter in for effective public service delivery and good governance. The New Citizen's Charter is a brief public document that provides the essential information that citizens and stakeholders need to know about the services or functions of a government agency/department and the manner in which they can assess the services efficiently. The underlying assumption is that when people are empowered with such information, they will be able to hold the state and its agencies accountable. A sectoral approach was adopted in the development of the New Citizen's Charter by identifying and highlighting linkages and interdependencies in the task performance of agencies in order to exploit synergies and ensure that standards are realistic and well coordinated. The Land Sector

Agencies (Lands Commission, Survey Department, Town and Country Department etc.) and Tax Revenue Sector Agencies are being covered in the first phase of the programme. These sectors are being provided with the New Citizen's Charters in 2007. The Trade, Industry and Investment Promotion Agencies and Other Government Agencies (Audit Service, Ghana Ports and Harbour Authority, Passport Office etc.) will be covered in the second phase of the programme. The remaining phases will cover Utility Agencies, Transportation Sector Agencies, Security Sector, Health Services Sector and Sub-national Governance Bodies.

Namibia too has adopted 'Public Service Charter' which aims at improving the quality of public services. The basic principles of the Namibian Public Service Charter are standards (to be set, monitored and published);  information and openness;  courtesy and helpfulness in services; regular consultation and choice for service users; accountability and openness;  non-discrimination, quality of service and value for money.

 The other African countries like Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Nigeria also experimented with different models of Citizen's Charters but have not been very successful. These countries have not been able to bring in discernible improvement in public services because of the violent conflicts between the tribes, which have often led to widespread destruction of life and property and inflicted huge damages on the national economies.

### Developments Across Asia

In Malaysia, major landmark in public service reform designed to improve quality and to ensure accountability of service providers has been the introduction of Client's Charter in 1993. Essentially modeled on Citizen's Charter of UK, it is a written commitment made by public agencies pertaining to the delivery of outputs or services to their respective customers that outputs/ services will comply with the declared quality standards that are in consonance with the expectations and requirements of the customers. The Government policy in Malaysia requires that Charters should be formulated and implemented by government agencies at all levels, that is, statutory bodies, district authorities and local bodies and displayed in prominent places within the agencies/offices so as to make them clearly visible. In case an agency fails to comply with the quality

standards declared in its Charter, the public could lodge complaint for non-compliance. Thus, the Charter programme in Malaysia is expected to help reduce uncertainties over the delivery of standards. The service recovery mechanism introduced in Malaysia later in 1994, is expected to ensure that appropriate actions are taken to restore the customers' confidence should the agency fail to deliver services as promised in the Charter. A number of other measures have also been undertaken to strengthen public orientation of government agencies. Such measures include strengthening of public complaints management system and introduction of the '*Mesra Rakyat'* programme, under which, the agencies are required to observe a day at least once a month when the heads of departments and other officials make themselves available for a face-to-face meeting with the clients to receive complaints and suggestions. The Government of Malaysia also instituted a 'Best Client's Charter Award' in 1993 based on the Charter Mark model of UK.

In Bangladesh, the Charter programme has made some progress, though not very substantial. The Bangladesh Post Office has adopted a Citizen's Charter, which is more or less similar to the model formulated by the Government of India. The Postal Department Charter of Bangladesh has a vision statement, a mission statement, the list of customers, and the list of services, the time frame fixed for services and commitments to the customers. Hong Kong had adopted a Citizen's Charter and so also Singapore. In Mauritius, too, the Citizen's Charter was designed as an aid to increasing popular awareness of corruption. Indian experience of Charters has indeed been discussed in the previous Chapters.

**Conclusion**

A look at the Charter initiatives across the globe suggests a similar concern for improving service delivery and involving citizens in assessing performance. Despite the common management thrust evident in most Charter programmes, however, significant differences between the politico-administrative contexts of these countries have resulted in divergent strategies being adopted by these. These differences manifest with regard to the extent of legal backing enjoyed by these initiatives, the use of guarantees and compensation in case of non-fulfilment, the extent of delegation in respect of defining

standards and the choice of implementation mechanisms, the accent on market and non-market instruments and the commitment towards a review of implementation and action on that. Some countries emphasize efficiency, effectiveness, and value for money and lay greater accent on market mechanisms and notions of competitiveness, envisaging the citizen primarily as a client or consumer of services; these have adapted private sector experience to the public sector. Some of them have taken important initiatives towards devolution. Others have adopted legalistic style but laid stress on consultation and defined effectiveness in terms of citizen satisfaction.

Charters have thus not only taken a different shape and meaning but also varied in outcomes in respect of the state of public administration, in general, and service delivery, in particular. Significantly, these variations are evident not only across countries. Because of differences in the extent of delegation, important variations are evident in respect of the nature of commitments as well as effectiveness of Charters within specific country contexts too, across regions and services. It is therefore important to realise the scope for adapting the Charter programme to the specific county context and the possible strategies that can be worked upon to make these effective. In the context of India, the scope for variation across regions is also enormous on account of the vast regional diversity in the administrative culture as well as variations in the socio-economic and political context which affects the scope of citizen participation as well as the forms of accountability needed to improve effectiveness and efficiency.

# IV

## Critical Areas for Intervention in India

It is important at this point to draw lessons from the experience of Citizen's Charters in India and similar exercises undertaken elsewhere and identify the critical areas for intervention if the Charter programme is to deliver. It is important to note here that the Charter programme, even as it was conceived as an instrument of market ideology in UK and some other countries, also aimed at providing new opportunities to public institutions to gain public support and trust by improving service delivery. The programme is not designed to address the structural dimensions of public policy and service delivery. It can nevertheless address certain procedural dimensions of failing bureaucracy and induce some correctives in citizen-administration interface. In as much as administrative performance and service delivery are adversely affected on account of procedural failures, there is indeed scope for improvement in this regard through the Charter framework. Its capacity to initiate any transformative process towards (a) responsive and accountable governance (b) improvement in service delivery and (c) improvement of public trust in public institutions, however, is conditioned upon its being appropriately designed and effectively executed. Its capacity to effect a significant change in work culture, produce a creative space for participation of citizens in administration and help enhance the competence and capability of organisations are crucial to the process.

### *Clarity and Precision in Standards and Commitments*

For the Charter Programme to deliver its purpose, it is important to address the often ambiguous and poorly drawn vision and mission statements as well as the standards and commitments which are incorporated in the Charter document. The programme can gain meaning for organisational performance only if a major exercise to include precision into standards and commitments is undertaken and Charter content is defined in more specific and measurable terms. Whether it is service quality standards or service delivery

standards, these should be clear enough to facilitate the service users and stakeholders to frame their expectations and assess the performance of the organisation in accordance with these standards. These should also enable the employees to assess their own performance in terms of benchmarks provided by these standards.

*Organisational Presence of the Charter*

In order to make it a Citizen-centric programme capable of improving public administration and service delivery, the Charter programme requires not only a strong organisational commitment but also a deep understanding of the purpose and instruments of the programme. An innovative approach on the part of the organisation to attain the goals of the programme is important. Charter presence in the organisation's activity map is crucial to the success of the programme. It is important to not only integrate the Charter into the day-to-day activities of the organisation but also make it a live and growing document which serves as a guide for employees and which is used to assess the performance of the employees too. The existing Charters have remained mere ritualistic documents, with little resources, financial or human, devoted to the implementation of the broad thrust of the programme. The organisation needs a strategy and resource support for Charter realisation. It also needs instruments to distinguish the performers from non-performers in terms of Charter commitments. It also calls for a systematic review by the organisation of the operationalisation and outcomes of the programme to make suitable interventions at appropriate time. Without addressing these, the programme has only a symbolic presence and does not make much of a difference in altering the state of public administration in general and service delivery in particular.

*Instituting Charter Mechanisms*

Clearly identifiable programme instruments and mechanisms for delivery of standards must also be incorporated in the Charter document. There is little possibility of making the organisations citizen-centric through Charters unless the mechanisms for ensuring this are instituted. It is important to institute mechanisms for ensuring their effective delivery, such as, the Information Facilitation Counters with sound information management system for provision of information regarding various services offered and the procedures and rapid delivery of forms, etc., Public Grievance Cells, with adequate

allocation of authority and clearly laid down rules for quick redress of grievances and to carry out analysis of grievances for meaningful interventions aimed at grievance prevention, mechanisms to receive suggestions and allocation of responsibility for responding to and analysing suggestions which are received. Making administrative arrangements for streamlining procedures and meeting the timelines for these is also important if Charter commitments have to be delivered. In as much as the delegation of powers to offer redress has failed to materialise, the notion of redress has remained clogged in the files. The issues of appropriate allocation of authority and coordination need to be addressed in the context of implementation of other commitments too.

*Participatory Structures*

It is important to address the poverty of participation which marks the Charter programme from its conception and evaluation. Lack of participation of both employees at the cutting edge level and citizen's accounts for the failure of the programme to either deliver a meaningful statement of standards or evolve appropriate mechanisms for their delivery needs to be addressed. The institution of participatory processes at all levels and stages in Charter implementation can put some life into the Charter document of the organization and make it responsive enough to deliver the ends desired by the public. This, however, requires a commitment of organisations to create space for citizen participation and public accountability of organisations. This can take shape (a) in the process of defining standards (b) in setting up mechanisms for their realisation and (c) in monitoring, review and evaluation processes. It must provide the key to building bridges between the citizens and administration on the one hand and streamlining administration in tune with the needs of citizens on the other.

*Visibility and Communication*

Charter visibility to the public is crucial to its effectiveness in as much as it enables the citizen's to shape expectations and demands as well as provide suggestions in terms of the Charter framework. If Charters embody a statement of commitments towards the citizens which the organisation endeavours to fulfill, failure of communication of the Charter implies the absence of demand for the fulfillment of commitments. Further, Charter needs to not only provide for the instruments of measurement, review and

evaluation of implementation and outcomes of Charter but also publicise these to convey effectiveness and build public trust.

Proactive approach to publicise the Charter commitments through media as well display boards in the all office premises has been neglected by most organisations. This needs to be taken up at a scale that takes the Charter right upto the level of actual service users, however remotely placed they may be. Language barriers to communication also need to be addressed and publicity effort should take the local language into consideration when approach people in remote regions and incapable of understanding English or even Hindi. Charter and its performance should be communicated to the people in simple and understandable style. Local political and administrative institutions should also be effectively used for the purpose. Charter needs to not only provide for the instruments of measurement, review and evaluation of implementation and outcomes of Charter but also publicise these to convey effectiveness and build public trust.

*Conclusion*

Even though the Citizen's Charter Programme is a limited programme of reforming administration by redefining its approach to the people as participants as well as the recipients of the policies, programmes and administration for their delivery, if well-conceived and effectively implemented, the programme can indeed help to unlock (a) the organisational potential for delivery and (b) the organisational capacity to win public trust and further make room for other far-reaching reforms in administration.

**Action Plan for Ministries/ Departments/ Organizations**

Immediate Action Plan of Ministries/ Departments/ Organizations for the effectiveness of the Charter programme should have the following components:

- Initiate a review and revision of the content of Citizen's Charter in accordance with the Framework of Citizen's Charter developed by IIPA in case of the Ministries/ Departments/ Organizations, which do have a Citizen's Charter.

- Finalise the Citizen's Charters incorporating revisions in the light of the observations offered by IIPA on their draft Citizen's Charters in case of the Ministries// Departments/ Organizations, which submitted the same for review.

- Expedite the process of formulation of the Citizen's Charter in case of Ministries// Departments/ Organizations, which have yet to take initiatives in this regard.

- Institutionalise consultative and participatory processes to make Charter formulation, implementation, review and evaluation of Charter performance participatory, involving citizens, service users and stakeholders, including employees, in the process.

- Hold meetings/ workshops to involve employees at cutting edge level to identify the possible initiatives for the realization of service standards and define performance measures, evaluation criteria and mechanisms.

- Make Charter available at all levels, including at the delivery units. Wherever required specific local Charters in line with the broad framework evolved by the parent organization may be brought out.

- Give wide publicity to the specific service standards offered by the Citizen's Charter and visibility to the mechanisms which facilitate effective implementation, including the Information and Facilitation Counters and Public Grievance Cells. (Separate Reports in respect of these have already been submitted to DARPG).

- Improve procedures for effective implementation and outcome delivery, simplifying procedures, improving coordination and introducing single window facility and strengthening the web-site and making it interactive as far as possible.

- Institute an effective monitoring and evaluation system which ensures both the organization and service users to regularly review the performance of the Charter and thereby make the organisation participatory, responsive and accountable. Prepare a Charter implementation and review Report.

- Identify and address the infrastructure, technology and human resource needs and capacity development requirements of the Charter programme and invest resources in these on a priority basis.

- Incorporate information about the Citizen's Charter and its mechanisms as well as effectiveness in improving organisational commitments, ascertained through satisfaction surveys, in the Annual Report, the website and other public interface and communication channels of the organization, as also, publicise these through media and public meetings.

**Action Plan for the DARPG**

The DARPG needs to actively pursue its concern for the effectiveness of Citizen's Charter. It needs to:

- Make it mandatory for all Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations to adopt a Citizen's Charter clearly specifying commitments of the organisation towards ensuring its effective, efficient and responsive function and to ensure that the Charter is regularly reviewed and updated in tune with the new developments within and around.

- Revise and update the information about Citizen's Charters, as also, the names and contact numbers of nodal officers mentioned on its website. The Charter should also provide a link to the website of the Ministry/ Department/ organization concerned and the details of information provided to the citizens by it.

- Carry out wide publicity campaign to enable the citizens to know about the Citizen's Charters and their role in improving administration and service delivery.

- Seek the six-monthly report on the implementation of Citizen's Charter from the Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations and place the reports on the website, also mentioning those who do not comply. The page should be updated regularly.

- Seek citizen satisfaction surveys to ascertain the effectiveness of Charters in improving organisational performance.

- Take a quarterly meeting with nodal officers to review the implementation and effects of these on the functioning of the organizations, taking into account the user inputs as well as employee inputs.

- Carry out a comparative analysis of the performance of the Citizen's Charter and conduct user surveys to assess the same, and publicise the findings of the survey through print and electronic media, including its own website, annual report and other publications.

- Award the most exemplary performance on the Citizen's Charter based on organisational submission of feedback from service users/ stakeholders as well as feedback obtained through other mechanisms in consultation with the civil society organizations and the reputed Institutes of Public Administration.

**Parameters for Evaluation of the Citizen's Charter**

1. Vision Statement
2. Mission Statement
3. Identification of Services
4. Identification of Levels
5. Identification of Client Groups/ Stakeholders/Users
6. Specification of Time-Frames for Each Service
7. Specification of Time-Frames at Each Level
8. Specification of Service Quality Standards
9. Specification of Service Delivery Standards
10. Clear Information about Processes/ Procedures to Access Service Benefits
11. Clear Information about Contact Points for Obtaining Service Benefits
12. Clear Information about Information Facilitation Counters
13. Clear Information about the Functions of Information Facilitation Counters
14. Providing Information about the Public Grievance Redressal Procedures
15. Providing Information about the Public Grievance Redress Mechanisms
16. Information about the Time-frame for the Public Grievance Redress
17. Information about the Time-frame for Acknowledgement
18. Information about the Time-frame for Response
19. Information about Systematic Review of all Public Grievances:
20. Information about Outcome of Review of Grievances
21. Information about Procedures for Inviting Suggestions/ Inputs
22. Information about Time-frame for Review of Suggestions
23. Information about Mechanisms for Processing of Suggestions
24. Information about Systematic Review of all Suggestions
25. Information about Outcome of Review of Suggestions
26. Information about Monitoring Mechanism to Ensure Compliance with Commitments
27. Information about the Web-site, on-line Charter and Relevant Information
28. Information about Right to Information and Information Handbook

**Position of 28 Parameters in the Citizen's Charters of 47 Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations**

**Vision Statement**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 19 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 40.4 |
| | excluded | 28 | 59.6 | 59.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**MISSION**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 28 | 59.6 | 59.6 | 59.6 |
| | excluded | 19 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Identification of Services**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 46 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 97.9 |
| | excluded | 1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Identification of levels**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 32 | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.1 |
| | excluded | 13 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 95.7 |
| | on web site | 2 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Identification of Client groups**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 33 | 70.2 | 70.2 | 70.2 |
| | excluded | 14 | 29.8 | 29.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Specification of Time frames for each service**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 21 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 44.7 |
| | excluded | 26 | 55.3 | 55.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Specification of Time frames at each level**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 17 | 36.2 | 36.2 | 36.2 |
| | excluded | 30 | 63.8 | 63.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Specification of Service Quality Standards**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 29 | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 |
| | excluded | 18 | 38.3 | 38.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Specification of Service Delivery Standards**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 27 | 57.4 | 57.4 | 57.4 |
| | excluded | 20 | 42.6 | 42.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Clear Information about Processes of obtaining service benefits**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 28 | 59.6 | 59.6 | 59.6 |
| | excluded | 19 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Clear Information about Contact points for obtaining service benefits**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 39 | 83.0 | 83.0 | 83.0 |
| | excluded | 8 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Clear Information about Information Facilitation Counters

|       |          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------|
| Valid | included | 18 | 38.3 | 38.3 | 38.3 |
|       | excluded | 29 | 61.7 | 61.7 | 100.0 |
|       | Total    | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Clear Information about the Functions of Information Facilitation Counters

|       |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------|
| Valid | included    | 11 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
|       | excluded    | 34 | 72.3 | 72.3 | 95.7 |
|       | on web site | 2  | 4.3  | 4.3  | 100.0 |
|       | Total       | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Providing Information about Public Grievance Redressal  Procedures

|       |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------|
| Valid | included    | 21 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 44.7 |
|       | excluded    | 25 | 53.2 | 53.2 | 97.9 |
|       | on web site | 1  | 2.1  | 2.1  | 100.0 |
|       | Total       | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Providing Information about Public Grievance Redressal Mechanisms

|       |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------|
| Valid | included    | 43 | 91.5 | 91.5 | 91.5 |
|       | excluded    | 3  | 6.4  | 6.4  | 97.9 |
|       | on web site | 1  | 2.1  | 2.1  | 100.0 |
|       | Total       | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Information about Time frame for Public Grievance Redressal

|       |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------|
| Valid | included    | 27 | 57.4 | 57.4 | 57.4 |
|       | excluded    | 19 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 97.9 |
|       | on web site | 1  | 2.1  | 2.1  | 100.0 |
|       | Total       | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Information about Time frame for acknowledgement**

|       |          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | included | 18        | 38.3    | 38.3          | 38.3               |
|       | excluded | 29        | 61.7    | 61.7          | 100.0              |
|       | Total    | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Information about Time frame for Response**

|       |          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | included | 27        | 57.4    | 57.4          | 57.4               |
|       | excluded | 20        | 42.6    | 42.6          | 100.0              |
|       | Total    | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Information about Systematic Review of all Public Grievances**

|       |          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | included | 4         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 8.5                |
|       | excluded | 43        | 91.5    | 91.5          | 100.0              |
|       | Total    | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Information about Outcome of Review of Grievances**

|       |          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | included | 1         | 2.1     | 2.1           | 2.1                |
|       | excluded | 46        | 97.9    | 97.9          | 100.0              |
|       | Total    | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Information about Procedures for inviting Suggestions/ inputs**

|       |             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | included    | 16        | 34.0    | 34.0          | 34.0               |
|       | excluded    | 29        | 61.7    | 61.7          | 95.7               |
|       | on web site | 2         | 4.3     | 4.3           | 100.0              |
|       | Total       | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Information about Time Frame for Review of Suggestions**

|       |          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | excluded | 47        | 100.0   | 100.0         | 100.0              |

**Information about Mechanisms for Processing of Suggestions**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| | excluded | 46 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Information about Systematic Review of all Suggestions**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| | excluded | 46 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Information about Outcome of Review of Suggestions**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| | excluded | 46 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Connectivity and Networking**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 32 | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.1 |
| | excluded | 15 | 31.9 | 31.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Information about Right to Information Act**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 23.4 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| | excluded | 36 | 76.6 | 76.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Information handbook under RTI, 2005**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 3 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| | excluded | 44 | 93.6 | 93.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 47 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

## Citizen's Charters of 47 Ministries/ Departments/ Organisations: Position on 28 Parameters

### Ministry of Textiles

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 46.4 |
| | excluded | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Ministry of Civil Aviation

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 9 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| | excluded | 19 | 67.9 | 67.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Ministry of Consumer Affairs

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | excluded | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Central Power Research Institute

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 9 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| | excluded | 19 | 67.9 | 67.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

### Central Water Commission

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Electronics Corporation of India**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 60.7 |
| | excluded | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Passport Division: Ministry of External Affairs**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 8 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| | excluded | 20 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | excluded | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Lady Hardinge Medical College and SMT S.K Hospital**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 10 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 |
| | excluded | 18 | 64.3 | 64.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Environment and Forests**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 53.6 |
| | excluded | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Small Scale Industries**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 53.6 |
| | excluded | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Office of Development Commissioner for handicrafts - Ministry of Textiles**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Textiles-Weaver's Service Section**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 9 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| | excluded | 19 | 67.9 | 67.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Textiles-Handloom section**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | excluded | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Delhi Police**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Office of Development Commissioner Small Scale Industries**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 60.7 |
| | excluded | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital;**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 42.9 |
| | excluded | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Road Transport and Highways**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 14 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| | excluded | 14 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Safdarjung Hospital**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 10 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 |
| | excluded | 18 | 64.3 | 64.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Tax Payers' Charter**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | excluded | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Telecommunications**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 42.9 |
| | excluded | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | excluded | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Coal**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 7 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| | excluded | 21 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**CAPART**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | inluded | 5 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 17.9 |
| | excluded | 23 | 82.1 | 82.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Water Resources**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 10 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 |
| | excluded | 14 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 85.7 |
| | on web site | 4 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperaion**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 96.4 |
| | on web site | 1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Agro and Rural Industries**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 53.6 |
| | excluded | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Railways**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 8 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| | excluded | 20 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Posts**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 18 | 64.3 | 64.3 | 64.3 |
| | excluded | 10 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**KVIC**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 4 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 |
| | excluded | 24 | 85.7 | 85.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Rural Electrification Corporation (REC)**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Power Finance Corporation**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 60.7 |
| | excluded | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Central Electricity Authority**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 18 | 64.3 | 64.3 | 64.3 |
| | excluded | 10 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Fertilisers**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 14 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| | excluded | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 96.4 |
| | on web site | 1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 92.9 |
| | on web site | 2 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.1 |
| | excluded | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Directorate General of Supply and Disposals**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 9 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| | excluded | 19 | 67.9 | 67.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Directorate General of Foreign Trade**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 8 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| | excluded | 20 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Culture**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 11 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 39.3 |
| | excluded | 17 | 60.7 | 60.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Coir Board**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 5 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 17.9 |
| | excluded | 22 | 78.6 | 78.6 | 96.4 |
| | on web site | 1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Food Processing Industries**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 12 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 42.9 |
| | excluded | 16 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 10 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 |
| | excluded | 18 | 64.3 | 64.3 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Bio Technology**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 9 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 |
| | excluded | 19 | 67.9 | 67.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Department of Science and Technology**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 6 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 21.4 |
| | excluded | 22 | 78.6 | 78.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Directorate of Estates**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 46.4 |
| | excluded | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Land and Development Office**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 15 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 53.6 |
| | excluded | 13 | 46.4 | 46.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**CPWD**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | included | 8 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
| | excluded | 20 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 28 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

# FRAMEWORK OF CITIZEN'S CHARTER

Citizen's Charter is a document of commitments made by a Government organization to the citizens/client groups in respect of the services/schemes being provided to them or to be provided to them. The objective of Charter exercise is to build bridges between citizens and administration and to streamline administration in tune with the needs of citizens. This exercise, if appropriately conceived and carried out, can enthuse and enable organizations to tune their planning, policy and performance to the needs and concerns of citizens/ stakeholders/ users/ clients. For this transformative process to materialize, effective strategies of realization would have to be worked out at multiple levels and authentification of these strategies needs to be attempted at every level in the political and administrative system. These strategies must incorporate three elements. One, clarity at every level about the objectives of Charter as an instrument of policy rationalization and administrative tuning to deliver policy goals expected by the citizens. Two, designing and delivery of Charters as live instruments of citizen-administration interface and instituting citizen in public domain. Three, evolving mechanisms for Charter monitoring, Charter evaluation and Charter review. Instituting a system of acknowledging effectiveness in Charter implementation can help the process.

In a rapidly changing context where efficiency, effectiveness and competence of state institutions are being questioned, it is imperative for the state agencies to strive for improvement in performance. The Charter programme can become instrumental in promoting the objectives of responsive and accountable governance and also contribute to improvement in service delivery. This can, in turn, put organisations in shape and contribute to a change in work culture and staff satisfaction, thereby increasing the comfort level of citizens, who need to deal with these organisations. Enabling a creative space for participation of citizens in administration and policy processes is the goal towards which the Charter programme needs to be designed. However, this does not imply merely load-shedding by the state agencies on the shoulders of citizens. Rather, this has to be instrumental in enhancing the competence and capability of organisations to improve delivery of services and tune administration to the needs of citizens.

**Vision Statement**
The first key component of a meaningful Citizen's Charter is a clear statement of vision. Vision implies the ultimate direction in which the organisation seeks to move. Clarity of vision enables the organisation to plan and prepare itself to deliver specific outcomes. Every organisation has to be clear within as well as to the citizens as regards its vision. Vision statement may emanate from an open and consultative process, involving multiple points in the organisation as well as citizens, client groups or stakeholders. The

broadening of processes for defining vision through an active interface with citizens is likely to lend way to a vision which has far greater degree of acceptability and active support in fulfillment than would otherwise be possible.

**Mission Statement**
The 'mission' statement provides the specific objectives which drive the organization in tune with its vision. Specificity of 'mission' is significant to enable the organisation to move towards its vision. Organisation needs to think of the manner in which the vision is to be realized. This should help it frame its mission in more concrete rather than ambiguous terms.

**Identification of Services**
The Charter should clearly identify the services, which would be provided by the organisation to attain its mission and vision. This should list all the services, which would be made available through its various agencies. Some Charters give information about 'Details of business transacted by the organization'. The expression is not sacrosanct, one can always use different expressions like 'Our Function', or 'Our Duties and Responsibilities' or even 'The services being provided by us'. Regardless of the expression used, all services should be clearly mentioned in the Charter.

**Identification of Levels**
Since organisations operate at multiple levels and within each organisation, allocation of responsibilities and authority defines their commitment to specific client groups/ users/ stakeholders. Irrespective of whether the organizations mention 'details of business', 'commitments', 'functions' or 'services' in its Charter, it is necessary to indicate the specific levels of the services or functions etc., **i**n the Charter, there should be a clear identification of the levels at which specific services would be provided. This would enable the citizens/ clients to know the levels at which they can access a specific service and not waste their time and energy in approaching the wrong levels. It should also be mentioned if the Charter applies to all the agencies that come under the Ministry or Department or the agencies have their own specific Charters.

**Identification of Client Groups/ Stakeholders/Users**
A clear understanding of the client groups/ stakeholders/ users by the organisations would be necessary for an increased interface with these in matter of policy and administration. This will also enable the organisation to cater to the needs of these groups better. It is a matter of concern that most of the Charters of Union Ministries/ Departments do not identify the client groups/ stakeholders/ users with reference to the services offered. This is a serious deficiency, which should be rectified urgently. True, there may be some confusion about the relevance of these categories in case of some organizations, which do not have clearly identifiable client groups with whom organizations have a regular dealing. Some organizations may have direct clients, who pay for the service accessed. But others may have users who may access the service by virtue of being citizens. In some cases, despite not being the users of a service, citizens or groups may feel concerned about the organizational decisions as they have to bear the fall-outs of the decisions, as in case of many decisions related to industrial or mining projects, which

affect the local people even if they are not users or clients. Likewise, some organizations may prefer to use the term citizens rather than users/ clients/ stakeholders as all citizens are their potential users. However, in case of some others, the term citizen may seem to carry limited value as they also have foreign clients and stakeholders. It is therefore important for the organizations to use any of these terms while they indicate their commitments.

Big organizations having a number of client groups may have different services for different client groups. In such a situation, it is obvious that the Charter should list out the services for each client group and the 'commitments' for each of such services. This can be fine tuned further by listing out the specific 'commitments' at each level and the 'commitments' in terms of the special client groups like the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, religious minorities and other weaker sections. Steps taken by the organization to implement the commitments and listing out such steps in the Charter is desirable.

### Specification of Time-Frames for Each Service
There should be a clear commitment about the time-frame for delivery of specific services in the Charter. This would save the organisation from undue expectations as also enable it to project its capacity to commit delivery of service as well as to work towards it in its own organisational plans. Awareness of time-lines will also enable the citizen to opt for specific providers where options are available and better understand the capacity of organisation to deliver a service in a specific time-frame. True, some organisations provide certain services of perennial nature. For example, there may not be any time-frame for certain services provided by Department of Telecommunications, Indian Railways, Department of Posts, Department of Drinking Water Supply etc. However, in such cases also there can be specific time-frames, as, for instance, for redemption/final payment of postal deposits, installation of telephone connections, reservation/cancellation of reservation of Railway tickets etc.

### Specification of Time-Frames at Each Level
It is important that time-frames for service delivery are provided for each level at which specific services are delivered. Adherence to these needs to be ensured too. This may require an obligation to provide reports on the extent of adherence to time-frames at each level. Public sharing of a comparative picture of various levels in the organisation may introduce competition to improve performance.

### Specification of Service Quality Standards
Charter must indicate the specific quality standards to which the organisation is committed. This will enable the citizens/ client groups to exercise choice where available and raise voice where necessary to ensure that quality service is made available. Organisation can also exercise internal controls once standards are publicly specified. There is the added advantage for the organisation to do a comparative assessment of performance on meeting service quality standards. Undue expectations from citizens can also be averted if the citizens understand the quality standards, which the organisation is in a position to commit to. Service standards must also respect public policy objectives and not simply client interest in case of a conflict as can be seen in case of the interest

conflicts over passport delivery. Clients prefer speed, but public policy interest requires proper scrutiny.

**Specification of Service Delivery Standards**
Charter should provide clear commitment on service delivery standards such as timeliness, access, accuracy, reliability, affordability, responsiveness, fairness, sensitivity, and courtesy in the delivery of service. These standards should be stated as clearly as possible and should be in the form of commitments and not simply targets. These should be measurable and enable the organization to present performance in terms of these. These may vary for different levels of organization, or different services and different regions- uniformity should not be insisted but a model framework should be provided. In case of variations, the specific commitments should be publicized and a comparative picture should be presented in order to enable appreciation of the better-performing regions and to create pressure on others for improvement. Standards should be made as visible as possible and organization should think of possible strategies for publicizing these.

**Clear Information about Processes/ Procedures to Access Service Benefits**
It is important that the Charter provides information about the procedures etc. involved in obtaining the service and facilitates the citizen/ client to obtain it. Information about the forms, which may have to be submitted or the payment required to access a specific service should be provided in the Charter.

**Clear Information about Contact Points for Obtaining Service Benefits**
The names and addresses of the contact persons for obtaining specific services should be mentioned in the Charter. When they can be contacted should also be stated. This should be done with reference to the specific levels of organisation/ agencies at specific levels and locations.

**Clear Information about Information Facilitation Counters**
The specific location of the IFC must be mentioned in the Charter. This will enable citizens know how they can get their queries settled. Surprisingly, most of the Charters of Union Ministries/Departments do not make any mention of their IFC even if they have one. This needs to be corrected. In case the IFC has not been set up the Charter should commit by when this can be set up.

**Clear Information about the Functions of Information Facilitation Counters**
The IFC computer should be connected to the computers of the unit-heads or section-heads of the organization to facilitate its functioning and this should be mentioned in the Charter.  The IFC should also have a photocopier and preferably a touch-screen. Copies of the organization's Information Handbook brought out under the RTI Act, 2005 and the scheme booklets should be made available at the IFC, which should be manned by well-informed employees.  A Visitor's Register should be kept at the IFC. The person in charge of IFCs should be able to provide the information sought and not simply direct the visitor to consult the web-site. It should be mentioned in the Charter that all publications,

scheme-booklets and copies of Information Handbook of the Department are available in the IFC.

**Providing Information about the Public Grievance Redressal  Procedures**
Awareness of grievances is the first step which an organization can take towards introducing correctives in its functioning. Charter should encourage the citizens/ clients to ventilate their grievances and organizations should aspire to redress these. Charter should clearly lay down the grievance redressal procedures in case citizens/ users/ clients/ stakeholders have any grievances and would like to seek redressal. Procedures for inviting and addressing grievances within the organization may also be taken up seriously as the performance and image of the organization is often adversely affected by the persistence of grievances of clients/ stakeholders/ users or citizens at large. The centralized PGRAM of the DARPG should be mentioned. The same needs to be publicized as a general window for submitting grievances to the Department of Administrative Reforms. It is desirable that the Charter provides information about the committee for taking complaints about sexual harassment, which has been set up by the organization.

**Providing Information about the Public Grievance Redress Mechanisms**
Charter must clearly inform about the grievance redress mechanism available to the citizens/ clients at various levels in the organization. A sufficiently senior officer should be made responsible for inviting and processing 'grievances' for redressal.  His/her name, designation, office room and telephone numbers and e-mail id should appear in the Charter. The officer in charge of the 'grievances should ensure that grievances are received, diarised, acknowledged in a day or two and examined.   Mechanisms should be evolved by the organization to provide redressal, such as, a committee for review, weekly or monthly meetings with concerned officers at various levels, reports on the number and type of grievances received.

**Information about the Time-frame for the Public Grievance Redress**
Information about the time-frame of the grievance redressal should be an essential feature of all the Charters.  The time-frame laid down for grievance redressal should be realistic and implementable by the employees and secondly, the organization has to ensure that the time-frame is actually honoured and acted upon.  Final reply should be sent to the aggrieved person within the specified period indicating the action the organization has taken on his grievance. In case the aggrieved person has been informed that his/her grievance has been accepted, he/ she should also be informed of the action taken by the organisation on acceptance of his/ her grievance. In case of the rejection, the reasons for rejection should be communicated to the person. In case of dissatisfaction of the aggrieved, a provision for appeal should be made and the contact person for appeal should be mentioned.

**Information about the Time-frame for Acknowledgement**
Since grievance-redressal may take some time, acknowledgement should be sent on receipt of the grievances. Time-frame for sending acknowledgement on receipt of a grievance should be clearly indicated in the Charter.

**Information about the Time-frame for Response**

The time-frame for settlement of a grievance should be indicated to the person seeking redress. The Charter can indicate the time-frame for different type of grievances and also commit to inform the citizen about how the specific grievance has been classified and how much time it will take them to redress it.

**Information about Systematic Review of all Public Grievances**

All grievances should be analysed and reviewed periodically and information about the periodicity of such reviews as well as the levels at which these reviews are undertaken should be mentioned in the Charter.

**Information about Outcome of Review of Grievances**

Information about the outcome of reviews and initiatives taken to carry out the recommendations which emerge from the review should also be shared with the citizens. This generates confidence among the citizens and client groups or stakeholders who may have submitted their grievances, even when they were not happy with the outcome of their personal complaint or grievance. This also creates interest among the rest to submit their grievances for redressal and retain their faith in the organisation.

**Information about Procedures for Inviting Suggestions/ Inputs**

Charter should invite suggestions from the public about the activities and functioning of the organisation. If the Department is implementing programmes and schemes, the citizens may be requested to give their suggestions for retaining or changing the provisions/scope/coverage of the programmes or schemes. They may also be requested to suggest on ways of improving the delivery mechanism. The organization should also request the citizens to send suggestions on the ways to improve its own functioning and brighten its transparency. The organizations should also invite suggestions from their clients and stakeholders, such as, the State/UT Governments, Autonomous Bodies, R&D Institutions, Multilateral/Bilateral Donors, Public Institutions and civil society groups on how far its services are effective or deficient, how they can be improved and whether any new services should be introduced. The client groups may be requested to give suggestions regarding changes needed in the provisions and coverage of the schemes and services, improvements necessary in the delivery mechanism, and whether new services/schemes should be introduced, particularly to cater to the sections of the client groups hitherto uncovered. The Charter can very well extend this invitation.

Most of the Charters of Union Ministries do not make any mention of the mode of obtaining suggestions from citizens/ client groups/ stakeholders or having any interaction with them. The Charter must indicate how the citizens would communicate their suggestions to the Department. If there is an on-line facility for this, it may be mentioned and the web-site address should be provided. To invite suggestions from the citizens who lack access to the inter-net, the option of submitting written suggestions to a particular officer (Contact Officer for Suggestions), either by hand or by post as well as the option of dropping suggestions into the suggestion boxes placed at specific locations should be provided. Full name, office room number and office telephone number of the Contact

Officer should appear in the Charter. It is felt that either the Contact Officer's e-mail address or the Department's website may be indicated in the Charter in order that suggestions can be sent by e-mail also. The Charter should also indicate the location of the 'Suggestion Boxes'.

It is felt that the 'Contact Officer for Suggestions' should be a senior person in the organization, who is familiar with the functioning of organization at various levels and is in a position to take up the suggestions for implementation.

**Information about Time-frame for Review of Suggestions**
The Contact Officer for Suggestions should be made responsible for letting the suggestion-maker know whether his suggestion has been accepted or rejected and if rejected, the reasons for rejection. For suggestions received on-line, replies/ responses can also be provided on-line.

**Information about Mechanisms for Processing of Suggestions**
The 'Contact Officer for Suggestions' should ensure that the Suggestions Boxes of his Department are emptied daily and all suggestions are diarized in a separate register on a daily basis. The same register should have columns to indicate disposal of each suggestion and the number and date of the letter by which the suggestion-maker was informed of the acceptance or rejection of his suggestion. The Contact Officer should be made responsible for acknowledging each suggestion, letting the suggestion-maker know whether his suggestion has been accepted or rejected and if rejected, the reasons for rejection.  All on-line suggestions should also be processed and responded to on-line by the contact officer and a record of progress made on these should be maintained.

**Information about Systematic Review of all Suggestions**
All suggestions, whether these are obtained regularly or as a result of special survey, should be reviewed systematically in order to examine their significance for improving administration and service delivery. Insights obtained from the suggestions regarding policy changes should be analysed too. This should be shared with the citizens and how the organization intends to share it should be available in the Charter.

The Charter should also provide contact points for 'Interface with Citizens' indicating the surveys the organization conducts periodically to ascertain the needs of its client groups, the extent to which such needs are being met by the organization, the citizen's perceptions about its performance and image, the level of satisfaction of client groups and the quality and efficiency of the delivery of services/schemes.  The agencies which may do the independent surveys on all-India basis and regional basis should be selected and their list annexed to the Charter.  The periodicity of the surveys should also be indicated in the Charter.  The organization should also decide what it would do with the survey findings.  The findings of a review of these may lead to systemic changes, reforms in the services/schemes, procedural improvements and improvements in accessibility of the client groups to the schemes/services?

**Information about Outcome of Review of Suggestions**
If a review of suggestions is undertaken, sharing it with the public can add credibility to the organisation as well as enthuse citizens to provide valuable inputs to the organisation for improving its performance. Many times the solutions to a problem are within reach, yet these are beyond the imagination of officers in the organisation. Many such ideas reach the decision-makers through suggestions of citizens and therefore should be encouraged and duly analysed. In case any citizen surveys are done, and the outcome of the review of these should also be shared with the public.

**Information about Monitoring Mechanism to Ensure Compliance with Commitments**
There should be clear information in the Charter about the monitoring mechanisms created by the organization in order to ensure that Charter does not remain merely a superficial document, with little capacity to ensure its own implementation. This monitoring mechanism may include people from the organization as well those outside-the clients/ stakeholders or civil society groups.

**Information about the Web-site and Relevant Information**
The Charter should indicate the information/ services, which can be obtained through the web-site of the Ministry along with the address of the web-site. Forms and other processes available on-line should also be mentioned.

**Information about On-line Charter**
On-line Charter should also provide as many services as possible on-line and enable interface with citizens by creating windows in this regard. The Charter should be made interactive and information about that should be provided to the citizens through the Charter, which is printed or through other communication methods including display at the outlet level, at IFCs and at the headquarters.

**Information about Right to Information**
Every Charter should inform the citizens about their 'Right to Information'. With the enactment of the RTI Act, 2005, implementation of the provisions of the Act has become mandatory. In the organization's Charter there should be a brief statement on how it facilitates implementation of the Act's provisions. The names, room numbers and office telephone numbers of the Coordinating Central Principal Information Officer/CPIO/APIO and the First Appellate Authority of the organization should also be provided.

**Information about Information Handbook**
Charter should also contain information about the Information handbook, what it contains, the place where it is available and charge, if any, which has to be paid to obtain it. The date when the 'Information Handbook' has been brought out by the organization, and when it is scheduled to be updated should also be mentioned.

**Draft Citizen's Charters, which were sent for review and on which detailed observations were provided to the DARPG**

- Citizen's Charter of the Ministry of Food Processing Industries

- Citizen's Charter of the Ministry of Mines

- Citizen's Charter of the Ministry of Water Resources (MoWR)

- Citizen's Charter of Betwa River Board (MoWR)

- Citizen's Charter of Bansagar Control Board (MoWR)

- Citizen's Charter of Narmada Control Authority (MoWR)

- Citizen's Charter of the Water and Power Consultancy Services India ltd. (MoWR)

- Citizen's Charter of the Ministry of Housing and Poverty Alleviation (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of National Building Organisation (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of Hindustan Prefab Limited (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of National Cooperative Housing Federation of India (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of Building Materials & Technology Promotion Council (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of Central Government Employees Welfare Housing Organization (HUPA)

- Citizen's Charter of Bharat Dynamics Ltd., Ministry of Defence

- Citizen's Charter of the Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting

- Citizen's Charter of All India Radio, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting

**Registered Participants in the Workshops on "Citizen's Charters: Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation", "Effective Functioning of Information Facilitation Counters"and "Installation of the Public Grievance Mechanism in Government of India Ministries and Departments" organized by IIPA and DARPG at IIPA on 13th 14th and 18th February 2008**

| S.No. | Name | Address |
|---|---|---|
| 13.02.2008 | | |
| 1. | Shri Manish Mohan | 505 Sardar Patel Bhawan, New Delhi |
| 2. | Shri R..K. Ahlawat | Deptt. of CRPC Shashtri Bhawan New Delhi |
| 3. | Shri R.K. Singh | Chief Engineer All India Radio P.G, AIR New Delhi |
| 4. | Shri D.K. Paliwal | Under Secretary Ministry of Water Resources Shram Shakti Bhawan New Delhi |
| 5. | Shri Vijay Singh | Director Ministry of Agriculture Deptt. of Agri Cooperation Krishi Bhavan New Delhi |
| 6. | Shri S.K. Agrawal | Director M/o Environment & Forests CGO Complex, Lodhi Road New Delhi |
| 7. | Shri Kshitij Mohan | Under Secretary (PG) Deptt. of Telecom, Sanchar Bhawan; 20, Ashoka Road New Delhi –110001. |
| 8. | Shri R.K. Singh | Director (PG) 12th Floor Sanchar Bhawan New Delhi |
| 9. | Shri K. Satish nambudiripad | Director (Admn CDN) Deptt. of H.E. Ministry of HRD (Higher Education) Shastri Bhawan New Delhi |
| 10. | Ms. Kalpana Tewari | Dy. Director General Deptt. of Posts Goldak Khana New Delhi |
| 11. | Mrs. Shyama Kutty | Department of Administrative Reforms & Public Grievances |
| 12. | Ms. Manisha Sinha | Regional Provident Fund Commissioner EPFO, Bhikaji Cama Place New Delhi. |
| **14-2-2008** | | |
| 1. | Sh.Rajesh Verma | JS & FA Ministry of Power |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. | Sh.Vijay Singh | Director<br>Ministry of Agriculture<br>Department of Agriculture and Cooperation |
| 3. | Sh. Vinod K. Samuel | Dy. Director<br>Railway Board |
| 4. | Sh. D.K. Mandal | Deptt. of Public Grievances<br>Ministry of Railways |
| 5. | Sh. B.B Sharma | Dy. Director<br>Ministry of Tribal Affairs |
| 6. | Sh. P.S. Rana | Under Secretary<br>Ministry of Environment & Forest |
| 7. | Sh. O.P. Sharma | Dy. Industrial Advisor<br>Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilizers<br>Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals<br>Shastri Bhawan<br>New Delhi-110001 |
| 8. | Sh.  R.K. SINGH | Director (PG)<br>Ministry of Communication<br>Sanchar Bhawan |
| 9. | Sh. Kshitij Mohan | Under Secretary (PG)<br>Department of Telecom |
| 10 | Sh. Alok Roy Choudhory | Assistant<br>Ministry of Coal |
| 11 | Sh. Rita Kumar | DDG (Admn.)<br>Doordarshan<br>Prasar Bharati |
| 12 | Ms. Noreen Naqvi | DDG (C)<br>All India Radio |
| 13 | Sh. Sunil Kumar | JS & Director (PG)<br>Ministry of Human Resource Development<br>Shastri Bhawan<br>New Delhi-110001 |
| 14 | Sh. Gautam Dixit | Regional PF Commissner<br>CPFO(HO)<br>14, Bhikaji Cama Place<br>New Delhi |
| 15 | Sh. Badri Parsad | Dy. Director (PG)<br>DAPRG |
| 16 | Ms. Utpauarna Hazarika | Director Passenger<br>Railway Board |
| 17 | Sh. P.S. Chauhan | Under Secretary<br>DARPG |
| 18 | Mrs. Shyama Kutty | Under Secretary<br>DARPG |
| 19 | Sh.Lokesh Kumar | Research Assistant, DARPG |
| 20 | Sh. Manish Mohan | DARPG, Sardar Patel Bhawan,<br>New Delhi |
| **18-02-2008** | | |
| 1. | Dr. Ajay Sehgal | Director<br>Department of Food,<br>Parliament Street, New Delhi |
| 2. | Shri Kailash Nath | Jt. Industrial Advisor<br>Department of Chemicals & Fertilizers<br>Shastri Bawan, New Delhi |
| 3. | Shri Ravindra Babra | Assistant Provident Fund Commission |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Employees' Provident Fund Organisation, H.O. 14, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi |
| 4. | Shri Harish Anand | Deputy Director (Publicity) The DC(MSME) M/o MSME Nirman Bavan, New Delhi-110091 |
| 5. | Shri P.S. Chauhan | DARPG |
| 6. | Shri O. S.Narula | Dy. Secretary Ministry of Power |
| 7. | Shri D. Mandal | Section Officer Railway Board |
| 8. | Shri Kshitij Mohan | Under Secretary (PG) Department of Telecommunication Sanchar Bhawan New Delhi |
| 9. | Shri R.K. Singh | Director (PG) Department of Telecommunication Ministry of Communication Sanchar Bhawan |
| 10 | Shri K.S. Mahajan | Under Secretary (IFC) Ministry of Human Resource Development Department of Higher Education |
| 11 | Ms. Asha Mehta | Section Officer Ministry of Water Resources New Delhi |
| 12 | Shri S.S. Dayal | Dy. Director DGAR |
| 13 | Shri Vinod K. Samuel | Dy. Director-APIO Ministry of Railways |
| 14 | Ms. Madhumita Biswas | Jt. Director Ministry of Environment & Forest |
| 15 | Dr. D.C. Misra | Formerly Chairman Task Force on IT Policy Govt. of NCT of Delhi New Delhi-110092. |
| 16 | Ms. Lekha Kumar | DARPG |
| 17 | Shri Manish Mohan | DARPG |
| 18 | Mrs. Shyama Kutty | DARPG |