

# Beyond Interoperability

## A new policy framework for e-Government

# Contents

Introduction	2
A brief history of interoperability	3
The CS Transform Policy Framework for Citizen Service Transformation	4
Making it happen	7
Annex A: source for major reference models	8
Annex B: glossary of Policy Products not covered by major interoperability reference models	9

## Status of this White Paper

This document is Version 1.0 of the White Paper, published in November 2009. We will keep its contents under review, posting updated versions of the White Paper at [www.cstransform.com](http://www.cstransform.com) to reflect the ongoing development of this agenda and comments on this version by users and practitioners.

If you would like to comment on this document - or to find out more how CS Transform could help you develop a Policy Framework for Citizen Service Transformation as described in the White Paper - please email us at [impact@cstransform.com](mailto:impact@cstransform.com).

# Introduction

For much of the past decade, achieving interoperability has been a key focus of e-Government strategy. The great majority of the world's leading e-Governments have adopted formal interoperability frameworks (IFs), and dozens of new IFs are currently being developed by governments around the world. Indeed, bodies such as the World Bank and the United Nations are funding much of this work because they believe IFs to be essential to the delivery of successful e-Government:

*'Recognizing that e-Government should be transformative and become more citizen - rather than government - focused in delivering public services, investing in the development of an e-Government interoperability framework is fundamental. Otherwise, the millions of dollars spent on e-Government would rarely lead to good governance and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.'*<sup>1</sup>

In this paper, however, we argue that the interoperability agenda is failing to meet the expectations that have been raised for it. The paper - which is authored by the senior civil servants from the UK government who architected the UK's eGIF (the earliest and most influential of IFs), and who have since worked as consultants to help governments address interoperability challenges in over 35 countries around the world<sup>2</sup> - argues that a much broader approach to interoperability is needed.

The paper is in three main sections:

- First we look briefly at how the interoperability agenda has developed over the past decade, and highlight some of the major gaps that currently exist in the reference models which governments are using.
- Next we describe what a new, more holistic approach might look like - the Policy Framework for Citizen Service Transformation.
- Finally, we highlight a set of pragmatic, tried-and-tested principles which will help governments to succeed as they work to establish such a transformational framework.

*e-Government was premised on the idea that individual agency investment was okay, so long as it was standards-compliant: that "interoperability frameworks" would deliver joined-up services. That approach has failed. This paper describes the much broader approach to policy-making which is needed for citizen service transformation.*

<sup>1</sup> e-Government Interoperability: Overview" UNDP, 2007  
<sup>2</sup> See [www.cstransform.com](http://www.cstransform.com) for details of our experience.

# A brief history of Interoperability

The first serious attempt at interoperability came in 2000 when the UK government published the first version of its e-Government Interoperability Framework (e-GIF). This version only focused on the standards to be used for the UK government Gateway but subsequent versions have expanded that scope into a full set of standards for G2G, G2C and G2B e-services. That e-GIF set the benchmark for other Governments to follow and over the last decade many others have developed their own IFs or simply copied the UK's version. Annex A shows some of the major IFs currently being used and closer examination of them shows that the content of all now broadly follows the UK model.

A drawback of this model is it focuses very much on technical and data interoperability - and does not sufficiently address broader organizational barriers to inter-agency collaboration.

This has led to a number of attempts to broaden the interoperability agenda. Perhaps the most significant new IF in this period is the European Commission's e-Government Interoperability Framework (EIF)<sup>3</sup> which has set its focus on the delivery of pan-European Services. It identifies 5 domains of interoperability: the technical domain, the semantic domain, the organizational domain, the legal domain and the policy domain, and expands upwards the very technical focus of the earlier IFs.

Some governments, most notably USA and Canada, took a different approach to interoperability and focused their efforts on producing an Enterprise Architecture (EA) with a much more top-down approach to ensure that technology standards and decisions were driven by business strategy. Whilst this approach was good in theory, and soundly based on the use of the Zachmann Framework, some of the early attempts at EA were far too complicated and implementation was very difficult. Later attempts by both USA and Canada and also now by other governments have simplified the various EA models and associated processes, and as a consequence are producing better results. Annex A shows some of the major EAs currently being used.

Both approaches are welcome developments, but governments are still very far from having a comprehensive set of interoperability products which they can use to drive genuine service transformation. In particular, we see three major pitfalls being encountered by governments now seeking to develop and use IFs:

- **Over-engineering:** much of the technical content in many IFs is at a level of detail which, nowadays, is unnecessary. The market has matured significantly in recent years, so the solutions to many of what were previously seen as technical barriers to interoperability are now 'designed in' to a wide choice of competitive, commercial products. When the UK launched eGIF, for example, it was an important and market-shaping decision to specify the use of XML for data exchanges and IP for interconnections - but now, in a mature market, the need for such government standard-setting is much reduced. Yet many governments still seek to specify long lists of detailed standards. This over-engineering at the technical level results in two problems:

*First, unnecessary mandation of standards by governments can distort the market, damaging competition and innovation, especially in areas where technology is still nascent and there are multiple possible standards that could emerge in a particular area.*

*Second, it distracts attention and resources from the harder issues - that is, the business, organizational and cultural barriers which prevent agencies from joining-up services around customer needs.*

- **Lack of focus on government-wide business transformation:** fundamentally, the interoperability agenda is still a technically-driven one. The focus on Enterprise Architecture has helped, but the work on this has been very much shaped by the specific needs of the largest government in the world, the USA. The US Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA), which many others look to as a model, is very much focused around improving the efficiency of each individual agency (with every federal agency being required to develop its own EA consistent with the FEA), and much less focused on transforming the relationship of citizens with the government as a whole. And in Europe, the debate on expanding interoperability into the organizational and policy layers is right in principle, but in practice is being drowned out by the continued over-emphasis on the technical layer in the EIF. Moreover, the EIF debate is being carried out separately from much of the real progress that some governments are making to address organizational barriers to citizen service transformation.
- **Inadequate implementation:** finally, many governments struggle in moving their IF from being a written document to a delivered reality. Despite the concerns raised above about the limitations of the interoperability agenda, there is no doubt that it also contains much which is good and useful. Too often though, governments find that a published framework can be difficult to translate into sustained and transformational change in practice.

# The CS Transform policy framework

## for Citizen Service Transformation

Our philosophy on e-Government is set out in our first White Paper: "Citizen Service Transformation: a manifesto for change in the delivery of public services". This argues that the reality of many countries' experiences of e-Government have been of duplicated ICT expenditure, wasted resources, no critical mass of users for online services, and only limited impact on core public policy objectives. However, an increasing number of governments are now starting to get to grips with the much broader and more complex set of cultural and organizational changes that need to be made in order to reap the real benefits which technology can offer.

This is the process which we call citizen service transformation.

Our first White Paper sets out a top-level approach to delivering citizen service transformation. This is built around "the Citizen Service Transformation value chain": the four core processes of government service delivery to citizens and businesses, each of which needs to be refocused in a user-centric manner in order to achieve citizen service transformation:

- Business management
- Customer management
- Channel management
- Service-oriented technology management

Of these, business management is the most critical: a government's ability to set out a vision for the citizen-centric transformation of public services, and to manage a cross-government set of policies, governance structures and business processes which will deliver that vision. And a key element of business management identified by our value chain is "Policy Products" - that is, the policies, frameworks and standards which are needed to guide the transformation effort.

We define a "Policy Product" as: any document which has been formally adopted on a government-wide basis in order to help achieve the goals of citizen service transformation. These documents will vary in nature (from statutory documents with legal force, through mandated policies, to informal guidance and best practice) and in length (some will be very lengthy documents; others just a few paragraphs of text). Policy Products are important drivers of change within government: first because the process of producing them, if managed effectively, can help ensure strategic clarity and stakeholder buy-in; and second because they then become vital communication and management tools. Over recent years, several governments have published a wide range of Policy Products as part of their work on Interoperability Frameworks and Enterprise Architectures, and other governments are therefore able to draw on these as reference models when developing their own Policy Products.

However, we believe that the set of Policy Products required to deliver a holistic, government-wide vision for citizen service transformation is much broader than is currently being addressed in most Interoperability Frameworks and Enterprise Architectures.

In Figure 1 on the next page, we have mapped the four layers of our CS Transform value chain for citizen service transformation against the five interoperability domains identified in what is the broadest of the current IFs, the European Interoperability Framework (EIF): technical, semantic, organisational, legal and policy interoperability. And we have populated the resulting matrix with the Policy Products which, in our experience from working with a wide range of governments, are needed in order to define and deliver successful citizen service transformation.

Figure 1. The CS Transform Policy Map for citizen service transformation

		Interoperability Domains					
		Political	Legal	Organisational	Semantic	Technical	
The Citizen Service Transformation value chain	Business	Cross-govt vision for citizen service transformation Governance model <sup>1,2,3</sup> Strategic Business Case for overall programme <sup>1</sup> Risk Management Strategy Identity Management Strategy <sup>1</sup> Privacy and Data Sharing Policy <sup>1,2</sup>	Legal vires for inter-agency collaboration Legal framework for public private partnership	Transformation Roadmap Key Services Portfolio <sup>1</sup> Funding model Franchise Operation model Transformation competency framework	Business case best practice guidance <sup>1</sup> Performance Measurement Framework <sup>2</sup> Benefits Realisation Plan <sup>1</sup>	Metadata Repository <sup>1,3</sup> Business Process Model <sup>2,4</sup> Logical Data model <sup>2,4</sup>	Technology Roadmap <sup>1,4</sup> Information Preservation Framework
	Customers	Identity Management Strategy <sup>1</sup> Privacy and Data Sharing Policy <sup>1,2</sup>	e-Signatures and e-Business enabling legislation <sup>1,2</sup> Privacy, data protection and data security legislation <sup>1,2</sup>	Federated trust model for cross-agency identity management <sup>1,2</sup> Marketing and Communications strategy Cross-government customer segmentation framework Service definition for One-Stop Government service Brand Management guidelines	Common data standards (especially for name, address, key personal attributes) <sup>1,2,3</sup>	Single-sign on architecture <sup>3</sup>	
	Channels	Digital Inclusion strategy E-Service take-up strategy Intermediaries policy <sup>3</sup> Accessibility policies and compliance <sup>1</sup>	Pro-competitive regulatory framework for the telecoms sector	Channel Integration Framework <sup>2</sup> Channel Management Guidelines <sup>2,3</sup>	Web Accessibility Guidelines <sup>1,3</sup>	Presentation <sup>4</sup> Architecture	
	Technology	Information Security Policy <sup>1,2,3</sup>	Procurement legislation <sup>1</sup> Framework contracts <sup>1</sup>	Supplier management guidelines Service level agreements <sup>1</sup>	Physical data model <sup>4</sup>	Interoperability Framework <sup>1,3</sup> Security Architecture <sup>1,3</sup> Application Architecture <sup>4</sup> Network Architecture <sup>4</sup> Service-oriented Architecture <sup>1</sup>	
		<b>Sources for reference models</b>					
1: European Interoperability Framework v2 draft, <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/en/document/2319/5644">http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/en/document/2319/5644</a>				3: UK GovTalk, <a href="http://www.govtalk.gov.uk">www.govtalk.gov.uk</a>			
2: US Federal Enterprise Architecture <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/fea/">www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/fea/</a>				4: Zachmann, <a href="http://zachmaninternational.com/index.php/home-article">http://zachmaninternational.com/index.php/home-article</a>			

We have reviewed this map of Policy Products against four major references which are widely used by governments around the world as sources of precedents: the European Interoperability Framework, the UK's eGIF (and related policies managed through the UK's GovTalk process), the US Federal Enterprise Architecture, and the Zachmann Framework.

Those Policy Products written in black text are those for which clear reference models exist in these sources, and which governments can reuse in the knowledge that they have already been validated through intensive and collaborative discussions across a wide range of government practitioners.

Those highlighted in red, however, are Policy Products for which such reference models do not exist, at least not within the mainstream interoperability agenda. Indeed, in simple numerical terms, over half of the Policy Products outside of the technology and data parts of the matrix are not covered. Yet they are equally as important. Annex B explains briefly what each of these Policy Products entails, and examples of where governments have implemented some of these are shown in Figure 2.

Developing a comprehensive set of Policy Products to drive forward citizen service transformation as illustrated in the Policy Framework at Figure 1 is not a short-term exercise. And the nature and timing of the work will vary from government to government depending on the legacy situation and government priorities. That said, we believe that there are some overarching principles which should guide every government as it seeks to develop its own Policy Framework for citizen service transformation. These principles are explored in the following section.

*Figure 2. Policy Products for organizational interoperability - case examples*

## Transformation Roadmap: Bangladesh

In 2002, the Bangladesh government adopted a National Policy on ICT, setting out a high level vision for ICT-enabled service transformation. Several years later, the government continued to have inadequate capacity and infrastructure to harness the benefits of ICT in improving public sector management and processes.

To overcome this lack of progress, the government engaged the CS Transform team to work with key government stakeholders to develop the National ICT Roadmap for Bangladesh. The result was a full five year implementation work plan, covering prioritisation, workstreams, deliverables, critical milestones and governance processes, that was widely welcomed by stakeholders.

## Transformation Competency framework: UK

The UK government's IT Competency framework<sup>4</sup> sets out the key competency groups which are needed to drive ICT-enabled business transformation in the public sector. It is based on the private-sector developed Skills Framework for the Information Age (SFIA)<sup>5</sup>, and provides all public sector organisations with a common language to describe the skills and attributes of IT Professionals. This is a key component of "organizational interoperability", in that it:

- enables sharing of people, ideas and best practice within and between organisations and across the wider public sector
- supports the government in creating communities of professionals
- enables individuals to identify the community to which they belong, and to better manage their personal career development.

## Franchise operating model: South Australia

The Government of South Australia launched the 'Ask Just Once' programme in 2008, to improve overall service delivery by creating a single entry point delivering more effective services through the internet, telephone and service desk channels.

The government concluded that in addition to an agile technology and channel management platform, they would need a new operational model within government to replace existing service models that were driven by the structure of government bureaucracy. The government therefore chose to adopt the "franchise" operating model developed initially in the UK to support [www.direct.gov.uk](http://www.direct.gov.uk), and since enhanced and expanded through its adoption by other governments on four continents.

The franchise operating model provides a risk-averse operational structure that enables functionally organised government to deliver customer focused services without the need for fundamentally restructuring government, thus saving significant time and cost. Each franchise is responsible for understanding and meeting the needs of their customer segment, and must follow a precise operating model so as to ensure quality and consistency. The initial release of the citizen-facing service supported by this new operating model is now live at [www.sa.gov.au](http://www.sa.gov.au).

### Sources for reference models

4: [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/itprofession/competency\\_framework/framework\\_v4.aspx](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/itprofession/competency_framework/framework_v4.aspx)

5: <http://www.sfia.org.uk/>

# Making it happen

Every government is different - the historical, cultural, political, economic, social and demographic context within which it operates is different, as is the legacy of business processes and technology implementation from which it starts. So a cookie-cutter approach to transformation is doomed to failure. But we believe that there are a set of principles which are universally applicable for governments looking to build their own Policy Framework for citizen service transformation, although the detail of Policy Products and their content will vary from government to government. These principles are:

**1 Ensure top-level ownership:** the whole programme must have total buy-in from the top so that the difficult decisions get made and get implemented.

**2 Focus on business change, not technology:** the major barriers to citizen-centric services lie at the business, channel and customer management layers, not the technical one - so make sure this is your priority.

**3 Ensure cross-government coordination:** put in place administrative systems that will turn the top-level ownership into effective cross-government decision-making and implementation, and subsequent change management. This should include reviewing the budgeting processes, since in most governments these are not conducive to funding this type of work and new ways need to be found to fund this activity.

**4 Map the current environment:** understand your starting points and identify what changes will be necessary.

**5 Prioritise:** don't try and do everything all at once. Produce your Key Services Portfolio to identify which are the most important and most cost-beneficial services to start with; and ensure that your Transformation Roadmap sets out a pragmatic and phased approach to delivery.

**6 Don't re-invent wheels:** there are a lot of well-established, mature interoperability products available. Make use of them and the experience of those that have already done it. The CS Transform Policy Framework illustrated at Figure 1 on page 5 highlights some major sources of reference models; others are listed at Annex A.

**7 Promote competition and innovation in the IT supply market:**

don't seek to micro-manage the technology market. Only specify the minimum technical standards needed to guarantee a competitive market place and to ensure system and data interconnectivity for your e-Government programme - more than this risks closing off innovation. When you do specify standards, make sure you do so through an inclusive and transparent process which is open to all stakeholders, and aim to select standards which are:

**Open** - have been developed through an open decision-making process

**Mature** - have been around for some time and therefore are tried and tested

**Internationally accepted** - are global in nature and not parochial to any specific country or region

**Easily deployable** - are openly published (including availability of specifications and supporting material), either with no royalties and other restrictions on reuse, or with any such restrictions offered on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms

**Well supported in the market place** - a standard is more than a ratified specification, it should have gained acceptance in the marketplace, including a choice of suppliers whose products support the standard.

**8 Don't assume you have all the skills in-house:** many of the Policy Products will take most governments into new territory and it is unlikely that you will have the skills necessary for all of this in-house. Be prepared to buy-in the expertise in the short term, and then build a longer term strategy to develop in-house capabilities.

**9 Drive Change:** the purpose of every Policy Product is to change behaviours and deliver transformation, not to sit on the shelf as a glossy document. This means it is vital to identify and engage with all key stakeholders - when developing the Policy Products, throughout the implementation process, and in ensuring that all products are kept up to date.

**10 Be prepared for the long haul:** citizen service transformation programmes are never short exercises. They can and do take a long time to implement and then require considerable maintenance and continuous enhancement. So plan for and be prepared to commit for the long term.

# Annex A:

## sources for major reference models

### 1. Interoperability Frameworks

- 1.1. Australia see [www.finance.gov.au/e-government/service-improvement-and-delivery/australian-government-information-interoperability-framework.html](http://www.finance.gov.au/e-government/service-improvement-and-delivery/australian-government-information-interoperability-framework.html)
- 1.2. Denmark see <http://digitaliser.dk/ressourcer?tagSort=1966330295=alpha>
- 1.3. Estonia see [www.riso.ee/en/files/framework\\_2005.pdf](http://www.riso.ee/en/files/framework_2005.pdf)
- 1.4. European Commission see <http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/en/document/7728>
- 1.5. Germany see [http://www.cio.bund.de/cln\\_094/sid\\_12DB2B60740A6EB99B6FEEB9DADF3A03/DE/Standards/SAGA/saga\\_node.html](http://www.cio.bund.de/cln_094/sid_12DB2B60740A6EB99B6FEEB9DADF3A03/DE/Standards/SAGA/saga_node.html)
- 1.6. Hong Kong see [www.ogcio.gov.hk/eng/infra/eif.htm](http://www.ogcio.gov.hk/eng/infra/eif.htm)
- 1.7. Malaysia see [www.mampu.gov.my/mampu/pdf/ISPlan/ispdoc/Interoperability%20Framework.pdf](http://www.mampu.gov.my/mampu/pdf/ISPlan/ispdoc/Interoperability%20Framework.pdf)
- 1.8. Mauritius see [www.gov.mu/portal/goc/telecomit/files/egiffinal03.pdf](http://www.gov.mu/portal/goc/telecomit/files/egiffinal03.pdf)
- 1.9. New Zealand see [www.e.govt.nz/standards/e-gif/e-gif-v-3-3](http://www.e.govt.nz/standards/e-gif/e-gif-v-3-3)
- 1.10. South Africa see [www.dpsa.gov.za/documents/ogcio/2007/mios.pdf](http://www.dpsa.gov.za/documents/ogcio/2007/mios.pdf)
- 1.11. UK see [www.govtalk.gov.uk/schemasstandards/egif\\_document.asp?docnum=949](http://www.govtalk.gov.uk/schemasstandards/egif_document.asp?docnum=949)

### 2. Enterprise Architectures

- 2.1. Australia see [www.agimo.gov.au/publications/2007/june/AGA\\_Reference\\_Models](http://www.agimo.gov.au/publications/2007/june/AGA_Reference_Models)
- 2.2. Canada see [www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/inf-inf/index-eng.asp](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/inf-inf/index-eng.asp)
- 2.3. Denmark see <http://modernisering.dk/da/projekter/forretningsarkitektur/>
- 2.4. New Zealand see [www.e.govt.nz/about-egovt/strategy/nov-2006/strat11.html](http://www.e.govt.nz/about-egovt/strategy/nov-2006/strat11.html)
- 2.5. Singapore see [www.igov.gov.sg/Programmes/iGov\\_2010/SGEA.htm](http://www.igov.gov.sg/Programmes/iGov_2010/SGEA.htm)
- 2.6. UK see [www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/153624/enterprise\\_architecture\\_uk.pdf](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/153624/enterprise_architecture_uk.pdf)
- 2.7. USA see [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/fea/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/e-gov/fea/)

# Annex B:

## glossary of Policy Products not covered by major interoperability reference models

### 1. Policy Products for political interoperability

#### **Cross-government vision for citizen service transformation**

A clear description of the desired future state for more effective and efficient service delivery, which is endorsed at the highest political and administrative levels of the government<sup>6</sup>.

#### **Risk Management Strategy**

A cross-government view of the key risks to achieving the overall vision for service transformation, underpinned by mitigation strategies, including best practice guidance to individual agencies on how to manage agency-level risks<sup>7</sup>.

#### **Digital Inclusion Strategy**

A strategy for ensuring that all citizens can enjoy the benefits of service transformation through digital channels. Typically, developed in partnership with the private and voluntary sectors, such a strategy will set out the government's approach to addressing the key access, confidence and motivation barriers to digital engagement<sup>8</sup>.

#### **e-Service take-up strategy**

A statement of the government's approach to ensuring high levels of take-up for e-services, covering service design, marketing, incentives, compulsion and other techniques, including best practice guidance to individual agencies on how to develop effective take-up strategies for individual services.

### 2. Policy Products for legal interoperability

#### **Legal vires for inter-agency collaboration**

This represents the legal basis for inter-agency collaboration, data and information exchanges and other joint activities. Very often existing laws and practices prohibit full inter-agency working, for example by limiting the ability of an agency to act for tightly prescribed purposes. An early step in the Transformation Roadmap for many governments is therefore the identification and redressing of such legal barriers.

#### **Legal framework for Public Private Partnership**

A Public Private Partnership (PPP) involves a relationship between a public sector authority and a private party, in which the private party provides a public service or project and assumes substantial financial, technical and operational risk in the project. There are a number of ways that a PPP can be introduced and most if not all will require some sort of legal framework in which to operate. Given the potential importance of PPP in delivering citizen service transformation, putting in place the necessary enabling legislation where this does not already exist can be an important task in the Roadmap.

#### **Pro-competitive Regulatory Framework for the Telecoms sector**

A key foundation for citizen service transformation is the low-cost bandwidth and service innovation which flows from a competitive telecommunications sector. There is a strong body of evidence (from organisations such as the OECD, World Bank, and ITU) showing that privatisation, liberalisation and effective competition regimes drive down prices, drive up choice and innovation, and result in significant levels of market growth.

This requires both guiding policy and suitable legislative provisions, along with a designated and empowered authority to implement them. Together, these constitute the Regulatory Framework within which the sector is controlled and managed<sup>9</sup>.

### 3. Policy Products for organizational interoperability

#### **Transformation Roadmap**

A Transformation Roadmap takes the overall cross-government vision for service transformation and underpins it with a detailed, multi-year delivery plan<sup>10</sup>.

#### **Funding model**

An agreed funding model and budgetary process which is tailor-made to meet the needs of a cross-government transformation programme. Most governments find that traditional, "silo-based" budgetary mechanisms are insufficient to deliver citizen-centric e-Government, and that new funding models need to be developed. Examples include central government innovation funding (from Treasury), top slicing, donation funding, large player sponsorship and reinvesting revenue from volume based fee services.

#### **Franchise Operating model**

Governments implementing citizen-centric, multi-channel service delivery platforms require a detailed operational model to enable traditional silo-based agencies to collaborate in a citizen-centric way. CS Transform recommends the "franchise model", developed initially by the CS Transform team whilst in the UK government to support www.direct.gov.uk and since enhanced and expanded through its adoption by other governments on four continents. This model puts into place a number of agile cross-government virtual "franchise businesses" based around customer segments. These franchises are responsible for gaining full understanding of their customers' needs so that they can deliver quickly and adapt to changing requirements over time in order to deliver more customer centric services - which in turn, is proven to drive higher service take-up and greater customer satisfaction. The operating model for such a franchise needs to be documented in detail, to ensure quality and consistency, and to facilitate effective change management.

#### **Transformation Competency Framework**

A taxonomy of the competences required to deliver ICT-enabled transformation in the public sector, along with tools enabling organisations to assess their competency gaps and individuals to build their own personal development plans<sup>11</sup>.

#### **Marketing and Communications strategy**

A government-wide approach for promoting the services made available through a citizen service transformation programme, covering: the process of understanding and segmenting citizen requirements; establishing what the messages are, how they are communicated (language, format), where they are communicated (channel management) and at what stages throughout the lifetime of the programme.

#### **Cross-government customer segmentation framework**

A methodology for mapping out the diverse types of e-Government customer, giving all public sector service delivery organisations: a) a common basis for segmenting their customer base, relating to characteristics that cause their customers to have differing product or service needs (including geographic, demographic, psychographic and behavioural factors); and b) a framework for identifying which services address overlapping customer segments and therefore need to be developed, delivered and marketed in an integrated manner.

#### **Service definition for One-Stop Government service**

Citizen service transformation programmes typically involve a shift from silo-based delivery towards an integrated, multi-channel, citizen-centric service delivery platform offering "one stop" government. Developing such a service requires a clear end-to-end service definition: a comprehensive documentation describing the product which will be offered to citizens.

#### **Brand Management guidelines**

The government-wide strategy and supporting operational processes needed to ensure a trusted, consistent brand identity for an integrated, multi-channel, citizen-centric service delivery platform.

#### **Supplier management guidelines**

Citizen service transformation requires effective, partnership-based relationships with suppliers. Supplier Management guidelines set out a formalised and robust way of managing, monitoring and developing supplier performance. They focus on the overall relationship with the supplier rather than the specific relationship around an individual contract<sup>12</sup>.

6. See for example [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/transformational\\_government/strategy.aspx](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/transformational_government/strategy.aspx)
7. Risk management is a well developed field, with best practice standards including ISO 31000: Risk management – Principles and guidelines on implementation ([http://www.iso.org/iso/iso\\_catalogue/detailed.htm?cdi=number=43170](http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/detailed.htm?cdi=number=43170)). In a government context, an example of best practice guidance at an agency level is the UK's "Management of Risk" framework ([http://www.ogc.gov.uk/guidance/management\\_of\\_risk\\_4441.asp](http://www.ogc.gov.uk/guidance/management_of_risk_4441.asp)). There are no major references however specifically for risk management on a government-wide transformation programme.
8. See for example the EU's strategy ([http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/einclusion/policy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/einclusion/policy/index_en.htm)) and the UK's strategy ([http://www.culture.gov.uk/what\\_we\\_do/broadcasting/6216.aspx](http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/broadcasting/6216.aspx)).
9. See [http://www.europe.eu/information\\_society/policy/ecomm/current/index\\_en.htm](http://www.europe.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/current/index_en.htm)
10. See for example [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/transformational\\_government/implan.aspx](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/transformational_government/implan.aspx)
11. See for example the UK's eGovernment Competency Framework at [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/tprofession/competency\\_framework/framework\\_v4.asp](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/cio/tprofession/competency_framework/framework_v4.asp)
12. See for example <http://www.ogc.gov/documents/StrategicSupplierManagementOverview.pdf>

t +44 (0) 845 465 4683 f +44 207 681 3908 e [impact@cstransform.com](mailto:impact@cstransform.com)  
Head office: CS Transform limited 100 Pall Mall London SW1Y 5NQ UK

CSTransform 